

AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM.—STRIKE, BUT HEAR.

A

DEFENCE OF RUSSIA

AND THE

Christians of Turkey;

INCLUDING A SKETCH OF THE EASTERN QUESTION FROM
1686 TO SEPTEMBER, 1877, WITH ITS BEST SOLUTION,
"THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE GREEK EMPIRE,"
WITH STRICTURES ON THEIR OPPONENTS;
AND AN ORIGINAL CARTOON OF THE TURKISH ATROCITIES,
AND A MAP.

BY

Sir Tollemache Sinclair, Bart., M.P.

"What will this babbler say?"

"It would be absurd to think of bolstering up the Turkish power in Europe. It is gone, in fact. We must reconstruct the Greek Empire. There is no doubt it would have been better for the world if the Treaty of Adrianople had not been signed, if the Russians had entered Constantinople, and if the Turkish Empire had been dissolved."—*The Duke of Wellington*, in 1829.

The Russians actually occupied Constantinople in 1833 as allies of the Turks.—*Alison's History of Europe*.

"The protection of the Christians of Turkey by Russia was, no doubt, prescribed by duty, and sanctioned by treaty."—*Lord John Russell's Dispatch to Sir Hamilton Seymour*, 1853.

"The newspaper outcry against Russia is no more respectable to me than the howlings of Bedlam, proceeding as it does from the deepest ignorance, egoism, and paltry national jealousy."—*Carlyle*.

"No grass grows where the hoof of a Sultan's horse has trod."—*Turkish Proverb*.

"I am altogether a Russ."—*Lord Chatham*, 1773.

"The Pall Mall Gazette seems to be written by maniacs for fools."—*Forsyth*.

"Shall we ally ourselves with Sodom?"—*Freeman*.

LONDON:

CHAPMAN & HALL, PICCADILLY.

An edition of Sir T. Sinclair's work on the Eastern Question is now ready, bound in cloth, with Ethnological Map and Original Cartoon of the Turkish Atrocities. In two Vols., 2s. 6d. each. An edition of 7,400 in the Russian language will be published at St. Petersburg immediately, at the cost of a Russian Committee.

This Book may be gratuitously published in any foreign language but Russian.

Also, by the same Author, Price Sixpence,

BY THE SAME AUTHOR,
JUST PUBLISHED, PRICE SIXPENCE,

THE GREAT BATTLE

OF

KATSH-TARTAR BAZARDJIK !

FROM THE SPECIAL TWENTY-FOURTH EDITION OF THE "BLOOD AND
THUNDER GAZETTE."

GLORIOUS TURKISH VICTORY!

SEDAN OUTDONE!!!

DEFEAT AND CAPTURE OF THE WHOLE
RUSSIAN ARMY BY A TURKISH FORCE OF
LESS THAN ONE-TENTH OF THEIR NUMBER!!!!
234,567 RUSSIANS KILLED, WOUNDED, AND
MISSING!!!!!!

THE TURKISH ARMY MARCHING ON ST.
PETERSBURG!!!!!!!!!!

TO WHICH IS ADDED :

1. KINGLAKE'S INTERVIEW BETWEEN AN ENGLISHMAN AND A TURKISH PASHA.
2. THACKERAY'S FRIGHTFUL RUSSIAN ATROCITY—MANNERS IN THE EAST—
BRITISH SNOBS ON THE CONTINENT—MURDER OF SULTANA'S CHILDREN.
3. SALA ON GLORY.
4. DESCRIPTION OF THE SULTAN AT THE OPENING OF THE FIRST TURKISH
PARLIAMENT, AND OF THE KING AND QUEEN OF THE SOCIETIES FOR
AIDING THE TURKISH WOUNDED.—FROM "TRUTH."
5. THE RUSSIAN ATROCITIES, AND EXTRACTS FROM THE "RIDE TO KHIVA."
—FROM "PUNCH."
6. LESSONS FROM THE RUSSIANS ON REFINEMENT.
7. THE ENTHUSIASTIC WELCOME BY THE BULGARIANS OF THEIR RUSSIAN
LIBERATORS.
8. THE BUCKINGHAMSHIRE BUFFOON.—FROM THE "PALL MALL GAZETTE."
9. PHOTOGRAPH OF AN M.P., BY DICKENS—*A Propos* OF THE ANNEXATION
OF THE TRANSVAAL—SATIRICAL PARAGRAPH FROM HEINE.

With a Cartoon,
"TURKISH RECREATIONS;" being their idea of "Integrity" and "Independence;"
Or, "Liberty! Equality!! and Fraternity!!!"

LONDON:

CHAPMAN AND HALL, PICCADILLY.

A
DEFENCE OF RUSSIA,
AND THE
CHRISTIANS OF TURKEY.

A P P E N D I X

TO

SIR T. SINCLAIR'S

DEFENCE OF RUSSIA

AND THE

CHRISTIANS OF TURKEY.

L O N D O N :

CHAPMAN AND HALL, PICCADILLY.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY W. H. AND L. COLLINGRIDGE,
ALDERSGATE STREET, E.C.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
SOME CURIOUS AND COMIC INCIDENTS OF THE DEBATE ON THE EASTERN QUESTION	1
PART OF MR. GLADSTONE'S SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE EASTERN QUESTION	8
MR. GLADSTONE ON RUSSIAN DEEDS IN TURKISTAN	13
MR. BRIGHT ON THE EASTERN QUESTION	24
EXTRACT FROM WALLACE'S "RUSSIA"	31
EXTRACTS FROM MR. FREEMAN'S "OTTOMAN POWER IN EUROPE"	36
TRANSLATION OF COMTE SEEBACH'S "OPEN LETTER" TO LORD BEACONSFIELD, PUBLISHED IN THE "NORD" OF BRUSSELS, ON 23RD JUNE, 1877.	42
INTERVIEW BETWEEN AN ENGLISHMAN AND A TURKISH PASHA	57
SKETCH OF MANNERS IN THE EAST, BY THACKERAY	62
EXTRACT FROM "RIDE TO KHIVA," FROM "PUNCH"	66
"PUNCH" ON ALLEGED RUSSIAN ATROCITIES	68
A FEW REMARKS ON THE ALLEGED RUSSIAN ATROCITIES	71
SOME REMARKS ON BARON HENRY DE WORMS' BOOK ON "ENGLAND'S POLICY IN THE EAST"	98

LORD R. MONTAGU'S "FOREIGN POLICY AND THE EASTERN QUESTION"	108
"THE JEWS THE IMPLACABLE FOES OF THE CHRISTIANS" .	112
OPINIONS ON TURKEY BY TRAVELLERS OF VARIOUS NATIONALITIES	155
PROFESSOR MARTENS ON THE EASTERN QUESTION . .	176
"THE BUCKINGHAMSHIRE BUFFOON" (LORD BEACONSFIELD), POLITICAL SQUIB, 1874	178
THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE AID OF THE WOUNDED IN WAR AND THE STAFFORD HOUSE COMMITTEE . .	181
PHOTOGRAPH OF AN M.P., BY DICKENS	231
"THE GREAT BATTLE OF KATSH-TARTAR BAZARDJIK" .	241
AN ILLUSTRATION OF THE UTTER IMPOSSIBILITY OF PER- SUADING ENGLISHMEN TO BELIEVE ANYTHING CON- TRARY TO THEIR PRECONCEIVED NOTIONS . . .	249
LIST OF INDIVIDUALS AND AUTHORITIES QUOTED . .	251

APPENDIX.

SOME CURIOUS AND COMIC INCIDENTS OF THE DEBATE ON THE EASTERN QUESTION.

I PROCEED to make a few remarks on the great debate on the Eastern Question, in which I took part myself, which lasted five nights, and on which occasion fifty-one members spoke, whilst many others were "crushed out" of the discussion, which occupies about sixty columns of the *Times*. By far the larger portion of the speeches were, as Byron said of a speech of Wilberforce, "Words, words, nothing but words," with hardly any ideas, facts, or arguments—in short, even more insipid than those articles in magazines which are known as padding. A large number of members only profess—and rather glory in—complete ignorance of foreign languages and foreign politics, and they remind me of a lady who had spent some years in Italy, and who, on being asked if she had acquired the Italian language, said she had escaped wonderfully well.

In the discussion which preceded the debate the Chancellor of the Exchequer fully and candidly admitted that the Conservatives were the stupid party, and if it had been my fate to have followed him I would certainly have said, "It would be rude to contradict you." Lord Sandon, at a later period of the debate, congratulated himself on his party having been at last elevated by Mr. Childers into "an

intellectual party," but this opinion found no support on the Liberal side, and the course pursued by the Conservatives must have soon dissipated Mr. Childers' amiable delusion, and I am inclined to think that some of them who had received a classical education were under the impression that the true meaning of the words *rus in urbe*, which they had learned at Eton, was that the *Russian* should never be allowed to put his foot in the *City* of Constantinople, like the witty politician who supported a motion for taxing the funds on the words, *Quodcunque infundis ascendet*.

Many of those who spoke relied wholly for their materials on preceding speeches, and served up the same indigestible and unpalatable hash time after time with a refinement of cruelty to the wearied listeners of which even a Turk would hardly have been guilty. Some of them had a faint notion that there had been a rebellion in Herzegovina and a massacre in Bulgaria, but whether these provinces were north, south, east, or west of the Balkans, they had not the faintest idea. Then they had heard of the Andrassy Note, the Berlin Memorandum, and the Protocol; and the Philo-Turks were told by their leaders that these documents meant coercion, and coercion meant war and destruction of British interests, and that the Ministers had acted right, whilst the Philo-Christians held that the policy of Ministers was wrong, that coercion was the only way of avoiding a bloody war, and that there was no fear of British interests being imperilled, and we had the permutations and combinations on these and a few other topics, which, by the rules of arithmetic, amount to an almost infinite number.

A most ludicrous feature of the debates in the House of Commons, especially on great occasions, is to observe the anxiety with which members who intend to speak watch for the conclusion of the speech of the member actually addressing the House, and the look of discomfiture and disgust which they assume when, after one legitimate peroration, the orator—as, alas! they often do (especially front benchers, who seem, though often excruciatingly wearisome, to think that their dignity requires that they should speak at considerable length)—indulges himself (but not his audience) in a second or even a third peroration; and, if he halts for a moment to take breath or a sip of water, and there is a false start, you may often observe a

dozen members rise, like so many postboys in the saddle. At last when the speaker comes to a full stop, there is another uprising of possibly a score of members, like a covey of partridges, and then the Speaker, who has been previously told by the whips on both sides who is to speak next (who is supposed to be the individual who first catches the Speaker's eye), calls out the name of the selected person, and sometimes sees a man of the most diminutive proportions behind a Daniel Lambert, and the others, chopfallen, have to resume their seats, often amidst the humiliating titters of the audience; and I myself was not called, after rising more than a score of times, till the fifth night of the debate. Nothing can be more absurd and undignified than the whole proceeding, and it is obviously unfair and undesirable, as small, aged, infirm, and plainly-dressed speakers cannot be expected to catch the Speaker's eye as rapidly as colossal, young, and vigorous men, with perhaps a very conspicuous cravat or other article of attire; and in all other countries there is either a ballot for precedence in speaking, or else each member is taken in the order in which he writes his name in the list of intending speakers; but in England even Liberals are apt to think any English custom absolutely perfect, however clearly absurd to any unprejudiced mind; even the cruelties which disgrace the English public schools, such as fagging, bullying, flogging, and "tunding" little boys by older and stronger youths, which caused a poor little Blue-coat School boy the other day in sheer despair to commit suicide.

The extreme right of the pro-Russian position was at first occupied by Mr. Courtney, who was favourably heard on that night, whilst he spoke on a subsequent day in favour of woman's rights amidst that unceasing storm of interruption which in France is called a *charivari*. Mr. Courtney advocated the immediate and gradual dismemberment of Turkey for its own preservation, just as the amputation of a mortified limb sometimes saves the human body, and he was in favour of the coercion of Turkey by England and Russia alone, if the other Powers would not join; but I myself went a step further, and held that we should even have coerced Turkey single-handed, if Russia and the other Powers would not have joined us.

The furthest advanced post on the Philo-Turkish side, in the

absence of Butler Johnstone Pasha, was occupied by Dr. Kenealy, after whom Elcho Effendi was a bad second. The House learned some very surprising facts from the learned doctor, which might fitly be placed in a new edition of the veracious and amusing life of Baron Munchausen; but the extravagance and absurdity of his language injured his own cause so that the advocates of Turkey must have exclaimed, "Save us from our friends; as to our enemies, we can take care of them ourselves." Previously, however, to arriving at this climax of absurdity, which turned the debate into a screaming farce, I must notice a few of the other speeches.

Mr. Cross, though his speech was, on the whole, business-like and sensible, committed himself to the following very absurd statements. "Why the Suez Canal should be attacked by Russia in any shape I cannot imagine." Sydney Smith tells us that it requires a surgical operation to get a Scotchman to understand a joke; and it would require apparently some such process to excite the sluggish imagination of the Home Secretary. Egypt, as part of Turkey, is at war with Russia, and if the lukewarm Khedive joined the Sultan heartily in the war, and proposed to despatch as many troops as he did to Abyssinia, namely, 50,000 men or more, instead of the 12,000 he is now sending, it would be then of the utmost importance to Russia, not only to take possession of the Suez Canal, allowing neutral traffic to continue, but to occupy the whole of Egypt. He then goes on to say, "Take another place in which the world is interested. I mean Egypt." But having thus "taken Egypt" (I write from the report in the *Times*), he does not say what he or Russia should do with it, but rushes with breathless speed to the Dardanelles; and then he winds up magnificently with the following rather presumptuous sentence, "Is it necessary for carrying on the war between Russia and Turkey, and for the protection of the Christians in Turkey, that Constantinople should be either attacked, approached, or occupied? I say, 'No.'" In other words, "*Sic volo sic jubeo stet pro ratione voluntas.*" It takes one's breath away to see that a Cabinet Minister, who has never had even the most superficial knowledge of military affairs, should actually take it upon him to pronounce *ex cathedra* that it could not be necessary for carrying on the war that Constantinople even should be

approached! Why, it is impossible to carry on the war at all without a forward movement, which is necessarily an approach to Constantinople, unless Mr. Cross's idea of carrying on war is to remain stationary, or perhaps that the Russians should obtain a victory by retreating from their frontier towards Archangel or Siberia. It has been held as an axiom, since the creation of the world, that the shortest and most effectual way to vanquish an enemy is to aim at his heart, and in the case of a hostile country, to attack the capital; and if the Germans, for instance, had not marched upon Paris in the Franco-German war they would never have attained so signal and speedy a victory. This new Moltke of the Ministry should give a course of lectures on tactics and strategy, and no doubt the Russians will be curious to listen to the arguments on which this extraordinary opinion is based.

I come now to Lord Sandon, who said he "confessed that at one time this session he began to feel despondent as to the prospects of the Conservative party." This tallies with what Lord Beaconsfield had said in the autumn, that "it would be affectation in me to pretend that the policy of the Government is backed by the country;" and proves that they know they are acting counter to the wishes of the nation, and are therefore bound in honour to dissolve, as Mr. Gladstone did with double the majority, and appeal to the country.

We had then a most sensible and excellent speech from Mr. Baxter, in a House containing about a dozen members, in which he told us that Sir Henry Elliott "was a much greater believer in the Turks than the Turks were in themselves." He "saw a good many Turkish Pashas, and all of them gloried in having none of their money invested in the Turkish funds."

I will now briefly notice the frothy but amusing speech of Sir Robert Peel, which went in at one ear and out at the other, leaving Mr. Forster only one remark to answer, namely, that the hon. baronet had said that the Liberals "are hungry wolves without a shepherd;" but, as the House of Commons is neither quick nor critical, and easily amused with the feeblest attempt at wit, this Irish bull was not detected till the speech was over, when Mr. Forster quietly observed that "we might be hungry, and we might be wolves, but in that case it is not likely we should want a shepherd."

I now come to Mr. Bourke's speech, who "put his foot into it" with a vengeance, as I shall proceed to show in the following amazing passage:—"The hon. member (Mr. Courtney) said the Turkish fleet was commanded by Englishmen; that there was not a single ironclad in it which did not depend for navigation on an English engineer; and that, if war broke out between England and Turkey, the consequence would be that the Ottoman fleet would be reduced to inaction unless the English on board would forego their nationality. *They received the money of Turkey on the faith that they were to stick to their ships in time of war, and that to throw over their master would be to play the part of a traitor.*" This extraordinary statement was received with cheers from the Conservatives, who would equally have cheered an assertion that black was white, and I suppose we ought to receive it as a maxim of law laid down by no less a person than the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, that in case England went to war with Turkey, it would not be treason, as we hitherto supposed, for Englishmen in the Turkish service to fight against their country, but it would be treason for them to refuse to fight against it! The force of absurdity could hardly go further. He further remarked that "it was important in the present emergency, for the sake, not only of this country, but of the world, to show *Europe and the universe* that we were a united people." Now, there was not a single member of Parliament on either side who had a word to say against the first resolution, and if the Government had only agreed to it, as many on their own side wished, and Colonel Lindsay expressly recommended, we should have presented precisely that firm and united front to the world which Mr. Bourke desired, but hardly "to the universe," as he enthusiastically wished, since the heavenly bodies can hardly be expected to take an interest in the attitude of even so august a body as the British Parliament.

Lord Elcho subsequently, with his usual "bumptiousness" and self-confidence, in which the House does not share in the smallest degree, roundly stated that "Lord Salisbury and those who went out with him were entirely ignorant of the character of the Turkish mind, and of the feelings and sentiments of the country; and they disregarded altogether the warnings of those who were acquainted with the position of affairs at the Porte." There are thus three policies before the

country—that of the Government, that of Mr. Gladstone, and that of Lord Elcho, in which, however, I believe he has not a single follower—“*l'état c'est moi.*” Lord Elcho, with more temerity than discretion, avowed the opinion “that by the first week in July Russia would be at Adrianople, and that by the first week in August she would be at Constantinople; others put it sooner.” We have now reached August, and the Russians have not yet completely crossed the Danube, so that the oracular prediction of Lord Elcho has not the slightest chance of fulfilment.

I will now refer to Major O’Gorman’s speech, in which he told us the hitherto unimagined fact that “among the Bashi-Bazouks were Spaniards, Portuguese, Frenchmen, Hollanders, Prussians, Germans, Austrians, Hungarians, Italians, Greeks, Maltese, Cretans, Cyprians, Samians, and even Trojans! There were also Russians, and he ventured to say that, if they were paraded to-morrow at the Wellington Barracks, it would be found that 75 per cent. of them were Russian troops sent by the Emperor Alexander for the purpose of committing the atrocities, paid with Russian money, and probably commanded by Russian officers.” I fear the House of Commons and the country are not sufficiently grateful to the Irish for returning the gallant Major and other Home Rulers to enlighten us on these and other points, which are utterly unknown, and would not be believed in any part of Europe. We now come to the acme of absurdity, in the shape of Dr. Kenealy’s speech, in which he made the following astounding statements: “Every person in Bulgaria had at this moment as much local liberty as was enjoyed anywhere. The number of persons destroyed by the Bashi-Bazouks did not probably exceed 4,000 or 5,000. We considered ourselves to be at the head of civilization and Christianity, and yet the number of persons we had massacred in putting down rebellions would amount to the same number of millions;” so that, according to Dr. Kenealy, England has massacred at least four thousand millions, or about four times the entire population of the globe!!!

The House of Commons and the country, until this immortal speech, were not aware of the enormous and unprecedented influence wielded by Dr. Kenealy, for it appears from his account of

himself (his trumpeter apparently being dead), that he carries along with him the whole House of Commons, except one member (Mr. Whalley), which no other man ever did since Parliament existed, and also overwhelming numbers of his countrymen:—"Now, from my place in this House, I myself warn Russia, speaking the voice of millions, speaking the voice of all present with the single exception of the honourable member behind me, that if she attempted to take Egypt, Constantinople, or the Euphrates valley, England would resist her to the last drop of her blood." I can imagine that the Russians must have trembled when they read this crushing speech, and how they must have thanked their stars that Dr. Kenealy is not, as he ought to be—having the entire House of Commons, all but one man, in his favour—Prime Minister of England, with, perhaps, the Claimant as Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Whalley the sole but formidable occupant (a host in himself) of the Opposition benches. It is refreshing to turn from these absurdities of the debate to the able but rather prolix speech of Mr. Gladstone, from which I extract the following admirable passages, the latter forming the conclusion of this powerful oration.

PART OF MR. GLADSTONE'S SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE EASTERN QUESTION.

"I do not deny that coercion involves the possibility of war; but I say that history shows that coercion, adequately supported and in a good cause, need not be followed by war. I hope the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs has given up his view that Mr. Canning did not contemplate the use of force. Although the Treaty of 1827 did not use the word 'force,' yet in its additional articles it as plainly contemplated it as if the word had been actually employed. In the instructions which were subsequently given to the Admirals the word 'force' was used. The battle of Navarino, although a

result of the employment of force, was not war. The whole of our history is full of such examples of coercion. In 1832 there was coercion of Holland by the united action of England and France. England on that occasion blockaded the Scheldt. Another instance occurred in 1850, when Greece was compelled to submit to the principal claims of England in the case of Don Pacifico by the undisguised use of coercion. Coercion was again, in 1853, applied to Greece to prevent her from taking any part—her action would, of course, be adverse to Turkey—in the Crimean War. In 1860, too, in the case of Turkey herself, coercion was used as a threat by England and the other Powers, and it was that which induced her to agree to the occupation of the Lebanon. Now, in not one of those five instances was there a state of war. Well, among the strangest fictions which have been set abroad by those who take a contrary view from that which I am advocating, is the existence of a hardy, indomitable—as it has been termed by the First Lord of the Admiralty—pluck in Turkey. Indomitable pluck! Most indomitable, undoubtedly, in destroying women and children in Bulgaria, and in campaigns against the ploughmen and swineherds of Servia. Where, I would ask, was this indomitable pluck when she had to meet the heroic soldiers of Montenegro? In the course of years and of revolution, almost every capital in Europe has been occupied by hostile troops, but Turkey has never waited for the occupation of her capital. Long before her enemy has reached Constantinople she has taken care to make her peace. Therefore, from our whole experience of Turkey, it is an idle and visionary pretext to suppose that war between Turkey and united Europe, or war even between Turkey and any great combination of the Powers, would have been the result of a threat of coercion. But, sir, is there a united Europe? There never has been a united Europe, but only because you prevented it. Russia said to Turkey, ‘You must.’ Austria was willing to undertake naval operations. We have no evidence that France would have declined, but in November France was aware that England would have no coercion, and France then held aloof. Another doctrine has been set up by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He says that no country gets any benefit from the use of foreign arms. But if a country has a tyrannical government,

and you substitute for it a free government, that is, I think, a very great improvement. That was done in Spain in the Peninsular War. That was done for Belgium in 1830. The liberties of Greece and Italy were established by the use of foreign arms—in the case of Italy by the arms first of France and then of Germany. The liberties of Portugal were established and confirmed by Mr. Canning in 1826 by the use of foreign arms. The liberties of the United States themselves were only established by the powerful aid they received from foreign arms. I do not hesitate to say that the cause of the revolted subjects of Turkey against their oppressors is as holy a cause as ever animated the breast, or as ever stirred the hand of man. Sir, what part are we to play? Looking at this latter controversy—the controversy between Turkey and her subjects—the horrible massacres of last year, the proofs which had been afforded that they are only parts and indications of a system, that their recurrence is to be expected, and is a matter of moral certainty if they are now allowed to pass with impunity—looking at the total want of result from Lord Derby's efforts, at that mockery which had been cast in our teeth in return for what I quite admit was upon ordinary principles an insulting despatch. Can we, sir, say with regard to this great battle of freedom against oppression which is now going on, which has been renewed from time to time, and for which one-third of the population of Bosnia and Herzegovina are at this moment not only suffering exile, but, terrible to say, absolute starvation, upon which depends the fate of millions of the subject races that inhabit the Turkish Empire—can we, with all this before us, be content with what I will call a vigorous array of remonstrances, well intended, I grant, but without result, as the policy of this great country? Can we, I say, looking upon that battle, lay our hands upon our hearts and, in the face of God and man, say with respect to it, 'We have well and sufficiently performed our part?' Sir, there were other days when England was the hope of Freedom. Wherever in the world a high aspiration was entertained or a noble blow was struck, it was to England that the eyes of the oppressed were always turned—to this favourite, this darling home of so much privilege and so much happiness, where the people that had built up a noble edifice for themselves

would, it was well known, be ready to do what in them lay to secure the benefit of the same inestimable boon for others. You talk to me of the established tradition in regard to Turkey. I appeal to the established tradition, older, wider, nobler far—a tradition not which disregards British interests, but which teaches you to seek the promotion of those interests in obeying the dictates of honour and of justice. And, sir, what is to be the end of this? Are we to identify the fantastic ideas some people entertain about this policy and that policy with British interests, and then fall down and worship them? Or are we to look, not at the sentiment, but at the hard facts of the case, which Lord Derby told us fifteen years ago, namely, that it is the population of those countries that will ultimately possess them—that will ultimately determine their future condition? It is to this that we should look, and there is now before the world a glorious prize. A portion of these people are making an effort to retrieve what they have lost—I mean those in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Another portion—a band of heroes such as the world has rarely seen—stand on the rocks of Montenegro, are ready now, as they have ever been during the four hundred years of their exile from their fertile plain, to meet the Turk at any odds for the re-establishment of justice and of peace in those countries. Another portion still, the five millions of Bulgarians cowed and beaten down to the ground, hardly venturing to look upwards, even to their Father in heaven, have extended their hands to you, they have sent you their petition, they have prayed for your help and protection. They have told you that they do not want alliance with Russia or with any foreign power, but that they want to be delivered from an intolerable burden of woe and shame. That burden of woe and shame—the greatest that exists on God's earth—is one that we thought united Europe was about to remove, that in the Protocol united Europe was pledged to remove, but which for the present you seem to have no efficacious means of contributing to the removal of. But, sir, the removal of that load of woe and shame is a great and noble prize. It is a prize well worth competing for. It is not yet too late to try to win it. I believe there are men in the Cabinet who would try to win it. It is not yet too late, I say, to become competitors for that prize; but be assured that whether you mean to claim for yourselves a part of the immortal

C

crown of fame which will be the reward of true labour in that cause, or whether you turn your backs upon that cause and your own duty, I believe, for one, that the knell of Turkish tyranny in those provinces has sounded. It is about to be destroyed, perhaps not in the way or by the means that we should choose; but come the boon from what hands it may, I believe it will be gladly accepted by Christendom and by the world."

MR. GLADSTONE ON RUSSIAN DEEDS IN TURKISTAN.

AN outcry being raised against Russia for alleged atrocities in Asia, I subjoin the following:—

1. After the taking of Khiva, and the conclusion with the Khan of the new arrangements, owing to the restless ambition of the officers, General Kauffmann intimated to the Yomud Turkomans, on the 17th of July, 1873, that out of the war indemnity to be paid they must find 300,000 roubles, or £41,000, in cash within nineteen days. This they promised after some hesitation. He detained as hostages twelve among the elders whom he had himself invited to Khiva to receive the announcement. He placed a force under General Golovatschef in close proximity to the Yomuds, and prescribed, by an order dated July 18, No. 1,167, of which Schuyler gives the translated words, that, if they assembled with a view to resistance, or even to leaving the country, they and their families should be completely destroyed, and their herds and property confiscated. General Golovatschef also said, "You are not to spare either sex or age; kill all of them." On the 31st General Kauffmann arrived at Ilyali. At this time "the butchery and destruction by the troops had been so great" (of this no details are given beyond the burning of villages along the road) "that the Turkomans showed signs of yielding." It was agreed to take half the amount in camels; for the other half (of 310,000 roubles) the women had to sell their ornaments at forced prices* in the Russian camp. The time had been extended to August 14. On that day only one-third of the sum had been paid, and the troops proceeded to act upon their orders. The numbers

* MacGahan, however, says that they were taken by Kauffmann's order at twenty-five roubles to the pound of silver.

of the tribe, the amount of execution, are nowhere stated; but the Cossacks cut down everybody, "seemed to get quite furious," and "cut down everybody, whether small child or old man." This was on August 19. The Turkomans, in their irregular manner, availing themselves of every covert, resisted bravely, but in vain. Schuyler, in this part of his statement, quotes the statement made to him by a Russian eye-witness, Mr. Gromoff (ii. 359), who saw several such cases; saw one dead woman, one dead and one wounded child; and relates, on two later days, when the Turkomans had attacked and been repulsed—

"We burned, as we had done before, grain, houses, and everything which we met; and the cavalry, which was in advance, cut down every person, man, woman, or child. . . . They were generally women and children whom we met. I saw much cruelty" (ii. 361).

2. My next duty is to give the most material allegations of fact in reply from the paper of "A Russian." He states:—

a. That this campaign of eleven days was one of most severe and desperate fighting against formidable warriors: the General (Golovatschef), and nearly all his staff, were wounded, Prince Leuchtenberg twice barely escaping death. The Russians, he appears to convey, were enormously outnumbered.

This statement as to the character of the campaign is not inconsistent with, but is in some degree supported by, Schuyler's narrative. "A Russian" also refers largely to MacGahan's "Campaigning on the Oxus."*

b. That in the movement of these military nomads, the wives and children were mixed with the men, and often in the midst of the mortal struggle. "The French in suppressing the Commune certainly killed a much larger number of women and children than in that Turkoman campaign." But some were slain unavoidably and inadvertently.

c. That all the Turkomans except the Bagram Shali (Schuyler uses the name of Yomuds) were left unmolested by the expedition.

d. That after a bloody battle near the Uzbek village of Ilyali, in

* Sampson Low. London, 1874.

which the Russians suffered severely, the Uzbeg inhabitants were not molested (MacGahan, p. 392).

e. That on the submission of the Turkomans, all operations ceased; that the wounded and prisoners were well cared for.

f. Noticing some positive errors of date in Schuyler's account of Gromoff's statement, he thinks there are probably errors of fact also. The statement is not endorsed by Gromoff.

g. "A Russian" relies implicitly on the evidence of MacGahan, as an impartial American who actually went through the operations of the campaign. He is quoted (pp. 363—365) to the effect that, himself present in the action of the first day, he saw the Cossacks pass by a group of twenty or thirty women and children. One left the ranks, and aimed his piece at them; but it missed fire, when MacGahan himself struck him across the face with his riding-whip, and ordered him back to his place.* The man obeyed: and with this exception "there was no violence offered to women and children." But he saw a young Cossack officer punish one of his men with his sword for "having tried to kill a woman." The apologist does not believe that there was or could have been such an order as that ascribed by Schuyler in his translation to Kauffmann; and he points out that the destruction of property, not of life, was the true way of striking an effectual blow at the refractory tribe.

h. He questions upon grounds which he sets forth, the soundness of Schuyler's translations, and thus the genuineness of the citations. I may add that the later battle, one of great severity, is described in MacGahan, chap. x. He tells of women cowering in silent dread—"They expected to be treated as they knew their own husbands, brothers, and lovers would have treated the vanquished under like circumstances" (p. 399); of a woman holding her dying husband's head; of children sitting in the baggage carts, or crying, or crawling about among the wheels; of a child laughing at General Golovatschef's banner; of an old woman wounded in the neck, "but she might easily have been taken for a man, as she wore no turban. . . .

* It is, perhaps, fair to give the counterpart to this truth. "It was curious to see a Cossack stop from his work of plunder to give a child a piece of bread or a drink of water from his flask, in the gentlest manner possible, and then resume his occupation" (p. 406).

This was the only woman I saw wounded, though I was told there were three or four other cases." He mentions, however, in p. 400, another woman, "with bleeding face," seen by himself.

MacGahan's account of the orders given is in conflict with Schuyler's. The orders were to "give the *men* no quarter, whether they resisted or not" (p. 401). On the other side, he tells of a Russian picket of six, probably surprised by the Turkomans, and all found naked and headless (p. 376). In p. 400 we have a general summing up:—

"I must say, however, that cases of violence towards women were very rare; and although the Russians here were fighting barbarians, who commit all sorts of atrocities upon their prisoners, which fact might have excused a good deal of cruelty on the part of the soldiers, their conduct was infinitely better than that of European troops in European battles."*

3. I have next to set forth the representation of the case as it was given in the *Pall Mall Gazette* of October 5, in its leading article, under the head of Russian Atrocity. Atrocity, when imputed to Russia, of course did not require the inverted commas, which in the case of the Bulgarian acts had been boldly used for denoting disbelief. In this leading article, the proof is at once treated as complete. With this promptitude we may compare the reserve maintained on the "sentimental" side, which for weeks and weeks declined to assume the truth of the reports from Bulgaria, until official attestation had been obtained, the accusation made known to the parties, and ample time for contradiction allowed.

It was boldly asserted that the proceedings offered "an almost exact parallel to the Turkish atrocities;" "differing *only* from them in some circumstances which make them less excusable."

Let us see what these circumstances of difference are.

(1) "The tribes" (Schuyler mentions a tribe, the Yomuds) were "virtually independent communities, which had sometimes submitted to intermittent control from the Khan of Khiva." They were nomad subjects of the Khan, ranging over parts of his dominions

* MacGahan, humanely carrying off a little girl, meets an officer of the staff doing the same, and makes the remark, "The Yomuds seem to have abandoned their girls with less reluctance than their boys" (Cf. pp. 403—411).

included in his treaties, constantly interfering in his government, and independent only in the sense in which Donald Bean Lean (see "Waverley") and his Highlanders, 120 years ago, were virtually independent of the King of England.

(2) These Turkomans had "given no special offence." It may be hard to say what is a "special offence" on the part of a race whose common non-special occupation is that of pillage and slave-dealing, with the murders attendant upon them. In the very account from which the *Pall Mall Gazette* was quoting is given a specimen of conduct which deserves notice:—

"There were a large number of Persian slaves in Khiva. On taking the town the Russians declared slavery at an end. The Persians were to be sent back to their country [Schuyler, ii. 353] in parties of five or six hundred. They desired to go by Mashad, but the route by Krasnovodeh was preferred, *that they might escape the Turkomans*. Two parties were sent accordingly by this safe route. One of them was attacked by the Turkomans, and the Persians either killed or reenslaved" (ii. 364).

The special offence, as towards the Russians, seems to have been that, while the Turkomans were the bravest and most truthful, they were also the fiercest and most intractable of the inhabitants of Khiva; that they alone offered the Russians a keen resistance; and that, rightly or wrongly, a measure of great severity against the largest of their tribes was judged to be indispensable for the establishment of anything like peace or order in the country. According to MacGahan, these Yomuds, from what he learned after his arrival in Europe, fell upon their Uzbek neighbours, and pillaged them, by way of compensation for their losses from the Russians (p. 410).

(3) General Kauffmann, says the journal, issued his orders.

"Here they are. 'I order you immediately to move on the settlements of the Yomuds . . . and to give over the settlements of the Yomuds and their families to complete destruction, and their herds and property to confiscation.'"

This is *part* of a sentence; the commencement, which is omitted, completes the sense by supplying the condition. Before the words just extracted come these words (ii. 357): "If your Excellency sees that the Yomuds are not occupying themselves with getting

together money, but are assembling for the purpose of opposing our troops, or perhaps even for leaving the country, I order you," and so forth. It seems to have been thought well to represent the Turkomans as an innocent, unresisting race; and for this purpose a conditional order is turned into one without conditions.

(4) Certainly the officers (Schuyler, ii. 355) praised the Turkomans for honesty and straightforwardness; and they had been kind and hospitable to certain Russian exploring parties (*ibid.*); and so had all the inhabitants (ii. 354). But it is the cheerful submission of to-day, followed by the deadly assault of to-morrow, that constitutes one of the greatest difficulties of a position like that of the Russians among these Asiatic tribes. That these wild piratical tribes were trustworthy in their ordinary dealings is quite possible. Schuyler does not give his authority for these statements, but I do not doubt them.

(5) It does not so greatly touch the conduct of General Kauffmann, but as regards the Russian Government and people, an impartial observer might take note that the responsibility is not quite the same for what was done in a land of railways, at less than 200 miles from the capital, to a peasantry foreign to the ordinary use of arms, and one of the most pacific in the world, but stirred by long and incurable oppression, and for what was done to a tribe of robbers, at ten times the distance, in the heart of the Asiatic deserts, with the channels of information slow, and the central power of administration wholly without share in the particular transaction.

(6) It is very strange that this newspaper-writer should fail to notice that the climax of Turkish iniquity in Bulgaria does not lie in mere slaughter; but in the combination, without protest or resistance from any, of widespread destruction of life with exquisite refinements of torture, and with the wholesale indulgence of fierce and utterly bestial lusts. We can hardly conceive that these features of the case, which raise or sink it from the human to the diabolical, are absolutely of *no* account in the view of the *Pall Mall Gazette*.

We seem, then, to have before us, first, as well established, an unsparing slaughter in hard-fought action of the brave warriors of a marauding tribe, down to the time of their submission. I am

not able to say whether this was necessary or not. MacGahan seems to have thought the measure ill-advised, if not more. But I hold that we English are not in a condition to condemn it, either as a Bulgarian atrocity or as any other, unless upon the principle—too often, I am sorry to say, tolerated—that there is to be one rule for us, and another for other nations. I will here refer only to the slaughter of the Dyaks in their boats, less than thirty years ago, by Rajah Brooke and a British naval force. They were pirates; but they offered (I speak from memory) no resistance. They had no alternative of submission offered. The case was discussed in England and in Parliament, and the conduct of Rajah Brooke was approved by the majority. Lord Herbert and Mr. Hume were among the small number who condemned it.

Secondly, we have alleged orders of General Kauffmann, conditional, it is true, but, as set out by Schuyler, commanding the extermination of the women and children, as well as the men, of the marauding tribe. It cannot, I hope, be long before we know incontrovertibly whether this order has been correctly understood and given by Schuyler. If so, it can find no apologist here; but the mere issue of it, whether executed or not, will stand, though as a perfectly isolated, yet as a brutal and shameful act, deserving, as was well said in the *Daily News*, every censure except that bestowed on, and so richly due to, the Turkish proceedings in Bulgaria, and the Government which rewarded their authors.

Thirdly, as to the fact whether the women and children were slaughtered or were spared. We have here a distinct and singular conflict of evidence. Schuyler, founding himself on the verbal statement of Gromoff, a Russian eye-witness, which he took down "from his lips" (p. 359), affirms it. MacGahan, the friend of Schuyler, trusted by him, and himself an eye-witness on foot and horseback of the whole campaign, not less distinctly denies it, and affirms that the conduct of the Russian soldiery, under most trying circumstances, was "infinitely better than that of European* troops in European battles."

* The Cossacks engaged in these actions appear to have been Cossacks of the Kirghiz country, distinct from and (Schuyler, ii. 232) inferior to the well-known Cossacks of the Ural and the Don.

On every ground we must hope that this contradiction will be cleared up. As between the two, I cannot but think the testimony in MacGahan, who is an eye-witness, and writes in very full detail, preferable to that of Schuyler, who only reports one, and gives us a rough, hasty sketch; and also because it has been much longer before the world. I can charge no unfairness upon others who may think otherwise. But what are we to say of the enlightened anti-sentimental newspaper which gives and exaggerates the statement in Schuyler, and passes without notice, in its judicial work, the evidence of MacGahan, long ago set before the world?

But fourthly, and lastly, the editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette* did more: he suppressed and garbled evidence material to the case from the very book, the very pages, he professed to quote. Of this we have already seen something; but not nearly all.

a. He suppresses the case of Kuldja. This town was occupied by the Russians after a campaign of eleven days, with two battles. Before the entry into the city one of the tribes in Kuldja, exasperated at the surrender of the Sultan, massacred more than 2,000 of the others. The Russians entered; and here is the account of their conduct, reported by a Chinese agent to his Emperor:—

"The Dzian-Dziun* of Semiretch quieted in every way those who remained in Suidun, both Mantchoos and Chinese, both soldiery and civilians, as well as the Chinese Mussulmans, not harming anyone; not even a single blade of grass, nor a single tree; not a fowl, nor a dog received any harm or injury; not a hair was touched. All this is owing to the orders of the Dzian-Dziun of Semiretch. . ."

And again at the close—

"The leader of the Great Russian Empire, the Dzian-Dziun of Semiretch, with his army, inspired with humanity and truth, has quieted everyone. This petty foreign power saved the nation from fire and water; it subdued the whole four countries without the least harm, so that children are not frightened, and the people submitted not without delight and ecstasy" (ii. 186—188).

b. In the opening of the article of October 5, I find this passage—

"In the early part of his work on Turkistan, he (Schuyler) expressly compliments the Russians on their humanity in Central Asia, *probably then not knowing what stories he should have to tell before he had done.*"

* General Kolpakofsky.

This is a garbling which simply amounts to falsification. It means, if it means anything, that Schuyler's compliment refers to the early part of his experience, and could not have been given when it was completed; as if the work were a journal in which the remarks are to be taken with respect to the date at which they are given. It is nothing of the sort. The passage occurs in connection with the capture of Tashkent. It will be found in vol. i., p. 75:—

“It is said that the bazaar was sacked, and many of the inhabitants massacred. If so, this was an exceptional case; for *the Russian movements in Central Asia have been marked by great discipline and humanity.*”*

The writer in the *Pall Mall Gazette* had evidently read the passage, of which he gives an account (without a reference) that it would be weakness to call anything but dishonest. It has nothing to do with earlier or later experience. At Tashkent, he had no experience at all, for his visit was some nine years after the capture; and he takes occasion, from a rumour he heard there, to give a general judgment on the operations of the Russians in direct contradiction to the charges which the *Pall Mall Gazette* has to make, and in complete accordance with the testimony of MacGahan.† Hence the passage had to be let alone or falsified; and the latter of the two was chosen.

c. Even yet I have to give another instance of this editor's wonderful faculty of suppressing evidence:—

In vol. ii., p. 354, on the page containing the commencement of the Turkoman narrative which he quotes, we find the account of the massacre of the Persians, which he suppresses; and in pp. 352, 353*

* I ought, perhaps, to state that I have read the whole of Schuyler's book, and that I am not aware of any passage in it, apart from what is treated in this article, which can in any way impugn this strong and general commendation.

† A week later, in a review of Schuyler's book—in the literary, not the political department of the paper (written as a literary and not a political article)—it is stated that “in some instances” we have “ample evidence” from his book that “the Russians have not always pursued a barbarous or heartless policy.” This is a little better, if it be not indeed a little worse—as providing a sort of quotable passage in defence of any accusation of disingenuousness—a passage, be it observed, however, late enough not to interfere with the effect of the previous falsification, for which no sort or kind of apology is made.

the account of the capture of Khiva and the fearfully severe discipline enforced on the Russian soldiery:—

“These arrangements being made, General Kauffmann declared to the population of the Khanate the mercy of the Emperor, on condition that they should live quietly and peaceably, and occupy themselves with their business and with agricultural labour. . . . Strict orders were given at the same time to the soldiers to send out no foraging parties, and to take nothing from the inhabitants, but to pay cash for everything at the bazaars. . . . In one case a soldier was sentenced to be hung for stealing a cow. The evidence of the native accuser had been accepted without other proof, and he was only able to escape because his comrades and the officers of his company proved that the cow had followed the company ever since crossing the Amir Darya. At another time, six soldiers were sentenced to be shot; but these severities were exercising such discontent among the troops, officers as well as soldiers, that at the personal request of the two Grand Dukes the men were pardoned.”

On what principle of justice, charity, or decency is General Kauffmann to be deprived of the benefit of this remarkable testimony? But the introduction of this passage immediately preceding would have sadly marred the telling and needful parallel between Khiva and Bulgaria, and this, too, was suppressed accordingly.

Such is the “information” supplied, at this epoch of blazing light, in a most great and solemn cause, to millionaire drawing-rooms, to the loungers in arm-chairs at clubs, to Tory members of Parliament,* greedy for something to say to constituencies but recently astounded by the discovery of a huge iniquity, too long kept back from them; and this by a journal which in the faintest perfume of humanity smells a dangerous fanaticism. But what means are not sanctified by their end, when the purpose is, not indeed to whitewash Islam in Bulgaria, for that is now despaired of, but to do the next best thing, namely, to black-wash the country which is its historical antagonist?

* See, for example, the speech of Sir Thomas Bateson, M.P., a few days ago, at Belfast; and the speech of Mr. Hanbury, M.P., at Hanley. “Mr. Schuyler went also into Central Asia with the Russian Army, and he narrated how precisely the same atrocities had been committed by the Russians in Central Asia.”—*Staffordshire Daily Sentinel*, October 18, 1876. The sentences would be correct if the word “not” were inserted in each of them. It is truly a royal road to learning, when research begins and ends with the leading article of a newspaper.

To expose cruelty is good : but there are other things besides cruelty which ought to be exposed, and among these is the deliberate fraud of a trusted or, in his own chosen phrase, a responsible* adviser. Untruth, even when used for beneficial ends, is bad and base. It is here used for no good end. It is not meant to draw forth tears for Turkomans, not undeserving of them, though in some respects they be. It is meant to sow strife, with the risk of bloodshed ; and the end in view, and the means employed, are worthy of one another.

W. E. GLADSTONE.

* *Pall Mall Gazette*, October 23, p. 9 : "Immunity in Politics."

MR. BRIGHT ON THE EASTERN QUESTION.

YET, considering our vast interests and our vast peril, there is always—at least, so far as my recollection goes—a war party in this country. There is a war party in the press. Unfortunately for the public interest, there is hardly anything which tends so much to enhance the profits of the proprietors of newspapers as a stirring and exciting conflict. We have a war party in Parliament. There are always men who sit there, and though the great majority sit upon the side opposite to that which I sit, still there are, unhappily, a few upon our side who, if we look to their conduct, are not strongly in favour of peace.

In 1870 there was a war between Prussia and France. You know the result was that France was vanquished and that Prussia became Germany. There were persons then who advised that we should take sides. Some said, "There is great danger to ourselves." Some said one thing and some another, and eminent men said, "If you are in favour of peace, as England would be, you should declare war against that Power by whom war is declared—that is, if France declares war against Prussia, you should support Prussia in the interests of peace, and declare war against France; if Prussia should declare war against France, then you should join France in the interests of peace, and make war against Prussia."

Well now, in these cases, you see that war was avoided, that we escaped its penalties, and I would ask you now, is there one single man in the United Kingdom outside Bedlam—and I doubt if there be one inside it—who regrets the course of neutrality which the people and the Government of the United Kingdom pursued? But

there was one case in which we took a different course, and that was the case of the war between Russia and Turkey in 1853. Turkey declared war against Russia, and after advising the Turk to accept a proposition of mediation and arbitration, which the Turk refused, and which Russia accepted, we took sides with Turkey, notwithstanding, and entered into a sanguinary conflict with Russia. Now, if in 1853 we had advised the Porte to make the concession urged upon it by Russia, which was only to strengthen the hands of Russia in defence of the Christian subjects of Turkey, Turkey would have avoided that war which was the forerunner, it may be, of its destruction. We should have avoided the contest into which we entered; three-quarters of a million of men, according to Mr. Kinglake (more, I think, he puts it at) would have been saved from slaughter and death by toil and neglect and disease; millions—I know not how much, perhaps two or three hundred millions—of treasure would not have been wasted; and in all probability we should have avoided the vast increase of the armaments of the Continent which was made after that war and as an immediate consequence of it, and some of the many subsequent wars that have disturbed the peace of Europe. I remember a line that Milton wrote. In one of his grand sonnets he says,

“For what can war but needless wars still breed?”

and that war has bred indescribable loss and suffering to several of the nations of Europe. But the war party is always jealous of somebody; it always hates somebody. Forty years ago it was jealous of Russia; and at that time to such an extent were the people afraid of Russia that they believed that we in the North of England, especially on the eastern coast of Yorkshire, were in danger of an invasion from the Baltic. Now, we know that that would have been a game that would have established the lunacy of any man who sent out a fleet with such a purpose; and yet, under that sort of panic, the Government of that time added 5,000 men to the English navy, and then the public began to think that after all perhaps they might be safe.

I am sorry to say that the course pursued by England, represented by Her Majesty's Government, made European concert all

but impossible. It may be thought reasonable that, if we were not willing to enforce the verdict arrived at, we might, at any rate, have stood aside and left Turkey to her fate. Russia has undertaken to enforce that verdict. Now, I have not anything to say in defence of Russia except this, that if the Conference was wise, and the negotiations were a joint interference, it seems to me to be only in accordance with reason and logic that somebody should enforce the verdict. Russia on the borders of Turkey suffers more, of course, than we do from the disturbances in Turkish provinces, and the people of Russia have got sympathy with the Christian population of Turkey; that sympathy exercises a great influence on the Russian Government, which, therefore, steps forward, in accordance with the conduct of nations, as we find it in all the histories, to defend that Christian population and to put down evils, disturbances, and oppression which had become intolerable in the eyes of Europe. We might have supposed that our Government would be entirely neutral, but its neutrality is not exactly of the kind which I think it ought to have shown. For example, we say to Russia, "You must not touch Egypt"; but Egypt is at war with Russia, because Egypt is constantly sending ships of war and troopships and soldiers to the Sultan. Russia, sensibly enough, not anxious to come in contact with England, pledges herself that Egypt shall be kept outside of the military operations in which she is engaged. We say further, at least many people say—I am not sure whether the Government have said it in express language, but people believe they mean it—that Russia shall not approach Constantinople; but if Russia is not to approach Constantinople, what is that but to prolong the war?—to give Turkey an inducement not to make peace, and to shut out Russia from one of the commonest rights of the victor; for surely to attack the capital city of an empire or kingdom at war, and to occupy it, is the speediest mode of bringing that war to a conclusion. Our Government now appears to hold as far as it can the doctrine and the policy of 1854; it adheres to what has been called the ghostly phantom of the balance of power. That balance of power is a curious shadowy thing which has been served for much evil. In 1830 the French, under Charles X., captured Algiers, and made themselves possessors of a large tract on the northern

shores of the Mediterranean. At that time it was said that France was making the Mediterranean into a French lake, and was disturbing the balance of power. Happily we did not go to war for it. Ten days after the capture of Algiers, the King of the French—King of France, as he called himself—was a refugee on the shores of this island, and from that time to this has Algeria been a costly burden to the French people. I do not doubt that in forty-seven years since that transaction France has spent 100 millions of money as the result of its possession of Algeria, and it would be a small estimate to say that it has cost them more than a hundred thousand French lives, and France is not a bit stronger to-day and the balance of power is not in the smallest degree disturbed by the conquest of Algeria by France. Russia has over and over again proclaimed in every form of word, by every kind of solemnity of expression, that it is not their intention even to attempt to hold Constantinople. Then there comes the question of opening the Straits, and you hear continually the word Bosphorus. The Straits are open to the trade of all nations, and were opened by the Russians themselves a hundred years ago, after they had been closed to the new commerce of the world during 300 years of their possession by the Turks. Now, I hold the opening of the Straits to be absolutely inevitable, but under conditions which the Powers of Europe could find no difficulty in arranging. But there is no reason to suppose that Russia, any more than France, would interfere with the Canal. There is no country in Europe that until these vile suspicions were aroused was more disposed to a perpetual amity with England than the country of Russia.

One more observation on this: I said that those Straits pass through Turkish territory; and that you might make provision that not more than one ship or two ships, or whatever limited number was thought proper, should be at one time in the Straits between the two seas, and therefore the possessors of Constantinople, whether the Turks or the Greeks, would be free from menace and bombardment from any fleet passing down the channel. But surely the Straits, which the Creator of the world made for the traffic and service of the world, have as good a right to be open to the world as the canal which was made by M. Lesseps with the money of his French shareholders. It seems to

me only the other day that I heard Lord Palmerston, when he was Prime Minister in the House of Commons, declare that this Suez Canal was a chimera—that it was a sort of thing that could not be made; that it could not succeed if it were made; that it would be no advantage to England; that England should have nothing to do with it; and that none of its money should be spent upon it. Well the result was that it was all thrown upon France, and France, stimulated by the hostility of the English Minister, brought forth its money in vast sums; and under the wonderful energy of M. Lesseps the Canal was made, and not only made, but succeeds, and will pay. Well, I believe also that the other nations would be quite willing to see the Straits between the Black Sea and the Mediterranean just as freely open. They have no kind of interest such as we pretend to have. Our interests are, to my mind, purely visionary. Russia is not a nation, nor likely to be for a long time a nation that will have great fleets to traverse the Mediterranean as we have, and if she had a fleet there it would be no more hostile to us than the new created and growing fleet of Italy, or the now existing and formidable one of France; and when I come to consider the position of Russia, shut up as she is in the north, in the Baltic by the frost, her only entrance by the Sound, which is narrow, that she has no great navigable rivers running into the ocean—I say it is one of the most unjust ideas, and one of the very wildest and unstatesmanlike notions, that this country can perpetually forbid a nation of eighty millions of people to obtain that access to the main ocean which the Creator of the world made equally for all his people upon the globe.

A year and a half ago, I suppose now, they astonished the country by the announcement that they had become the possessors of a large number of shares in the Suez Canal. They gave twice as much for them as it was said the Khedive had offered them for in another quarter. But I am not objecting to a couple of millions here or there.

Well, Lord Salisbury was endeavouring by all the means in his power to urge the Turk to make those most moderate concessions which at the time of the conference only demanded that with which Russia would have been content and the war would have been avoided; but the war party in this country, the war press, the war public men, and that portion of the public which I call the rowdy war party—there are

rowdies among the rich as well as among the poor—all that party were speaking with another voice, and stimulating and encouraging the Turk to resist, thus bringing Turkey to the catastrophe in which she now finds herself.

I was talking the other day to a Frenchman, a very eminent Frenchman, who, in all probability, when there is another Liberal Government in France—which I hope may be soon—will form an important member of it. We had been talking about Egypt and upon the language which was held by some people in this country with regard to it. I said to him, "What would be thought in France if England were, under any pretence and by any means, whether by force or by purchase, or in any way, to obtain possession of Egypt?" He said he thought it would create the very worst impression in that country, and his opinion was, that no Government could maintain itself in France which permitted such a measure without the strongest protest and remonstrance; and whether protest and remonstrance would be all it was not very easy to determine.

Now, in this discord with regard to what should be done, there is one other consideration of great importance, and that is, that England has no allies. I believe there is no country in Europe at this moment, no other country, that feels with us in reference to this question. We are alone in Europe, utterly, I believe, with reference to the Bosphorus, and with reference to any question of danger as connected with the closing of the Canal. Among other nations our demands are felt to be unreasonable and arrogant, and I confess I sometimes feel that we stand a risk of some European combination against us, and that we shall find ourselves not triumphant, but baffled. And when the final settlement comes of these questions, unless we can be moderate and just, I suspect there is great danger that we may suffer a humiliation which not the nation only as a whole, but which all of us individually may be made severely to feel.

I began by saying that we were a great Empire; it becomes a great State like this to set always to the world a great and noble example. I quote a passage from a recent speech of Lord Derby with a sentiment of the utmost admiration and the fullest concurrence. He says "We must always remember that the greatest of British interests is the interests of peace." Let us believe, whether it be the United

States on the other side of the Atlantic, or whether it be the great empire of Russia in the east of Europe, that there are good and great and noble men in those countries ; that there is no disposition whatsoever, as I believe there is none, to make quarrels with this country or to do evil of any kind to us. Great as our nation is and its dependencies in every quarter of the globe, great will be its influence for good ; and, though the world moves but slowly—far too slowly, for our ardent hopes—to its brighter day, history will declare with an impartial voice that Britain, clearing off her ancient errors, led the grand procession of the nations in the path of civilization and of peace.

EXTRACT FROM WALLACE'S "RUSSIA."

MR. WALLACE, after passing six years in Russia, speaks of it as follows :—"The village Communes, containing about five-sixths of the population, are capital specimens of representative constitutional government of the extreme democratic type. No class of men in the world is more good-natured, pacific, and loyal than the Russian peasantry.

"The advocates of women's rights will be interested to hear that women who, on account of the absence or death of their husbands, happen to be for the moment heads of households, as such are entitled to be present in the village assembly, and their right to take part in the deliberations is never questioned. The decisions of the village assembly are therefore usually characterized by plain, practical, common sense. There are many villages in the Eastern provinces of European Russia which have been for many generations half Tartar and half Russian, and the amalgamation of the two nationalities has not yet begun; they live in perfect good fellowship; elect as village elder sometimes a Russian and sometimes a Tartar, and discuss the commercial affairs in the village assembly without reference to religious matters. I know one village where the good fellowship went even a step further: the Christians determined to repair their church, and the Mahometans helped them to transport wood for the purpose. It therefore is clear that while the Mussulmans rob, plunder, and massacre the Christians in Turkey, where they have the upper hand, and are armed, the Christians in Russia, who are the dominant race, treat their Mussulman fellow

subjects with the utmost kindness and respect, and that the Mahometans themselves are happier and better under Christian than Mussulman rule.

“In each Province there is an assembly called the Zemstvo. This assembly is composed partly of nobles and partly of peasants, the latter being decidedly in the majority, and no trace of antagonism seemed to exist between the two classes. Landed proprietors and their *ci-devant* serfs evidently met for the moment on a footing of equality. . . . Instead of that violent antagonism which might have been expected there was a great deal too much unanimity. During the three weeks I was daily present at their deliberations. . . . The Zemstvo of Novgorod’s proceedings in the assembly of 1870 were conducted in a business-like satisfactory way. The Zemstvo is, however, a modern institution created about ten years ago; it fulfils tolerably well its ordinary every-day duties, and is very little tainted with speculation and jobbery. It has greatly improved the condition of the hospitals, asylums, and other benevolent institutions committed to its charge, and it has done much for the spread of popular education; it has created a new and more equitable system of rating and a system of mutual fire insurance. Of all the countries in which I have travelled, Russia certainly bears off the palm in all that regards hospitality. All classes of the Russian people have a certain kindly apathetic good nature which makes them very charitable towards their neighbours. Russia advances in the path of progress by a series of unconnected frantic efforts, each of which is naturally followed by a period of temporary exhaustion. The Russian noblesse has little or nothing of what we call aristocratic feeling; little or nothing of that haughty domineering exclusive spirit which we are accustomed to associate with the word aristocracy . . . we can scarcely ever find a Russian who is proud of his birth, or imagines that the fact of his having a long pedigree gives him any right to political privileges or social consideration. The son of a small proprietor, or even of a parish priest, may rise to the highest offices of state, whilst the descendant of the half mythical

Rurik may descend to the rank of peasants. It is said that not long ago a certain Prince Krapota gained his living as a cabman in St. Petersburg. There are hundreds of princes and princesses who have not the right to appear at Court, and who would not be admitted into what is called St. Petersburg society, or indeed into refined society in any country; there are 652,887 hereditary nobles in Russia, and 374,367 personal nobles, together 1,027,254. Between the nobles, the clergy, the burghers, and the peasants there are no distinctions of race and no impassable barriers.

"The Crimean and other Tartars used to make raids into Russia and Poland, and up to 1783, when the Crimea was conquered and annexed to Russia, large numbers of Russian men, women, and children were sold as slaves in Constantinople, and to the Persians, Arabs, and Syrians. When they have valuable boys and girls they first fatten them, clothe them in silk, and put powder and rouge on their cheeks.

"The experiment of Jewish colonies has failed, their houses are in a most dilapidated condition, and their villages remind one of the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the Prophet.

"The Slavophiles seem to favour the idea of a grand Slavonic confederation, in which the hegemony would belong to Russia.

"The Emperor Alexander is of a kind-hearted, humane disposition, singularly free from military ambition; he has a goodly portion of sober common sense, a limited confidence in his own judgment, and a consciousness of enormous responsibility.

"To protect an open frontier against the incursions of nomadic tribes three methods are possible, the construction of a great wall, the establishment of a strong military cordon, and the permanent subjugation of the marauders. The first of these expedients, adopted by the Romans in Britain and by the Chinese on their north-western frontier, is enormously expensive, and utterly impossible in a country like Russia; the second was constantly tried and found wanting; the third is alone practicable and efficient. Though the Government has long since recognised that the acquisition of barren thinly populated steppes is a

burden rather than an advantage, it has been compelled to go on making annexations for the purpose of self defence.

"Russia has on four occasions since Peter the Great ceded territory. To Persia she ceded in 1729 Mazanderan and Arkabad; and in 1735 a large part of the Caucasus. In 1856, by the Treaty of Paris, she gave up the mouth of the Danube and part of Bessarabia; and in 1867 she sold to the United States her American possessions. To these ought perhaps to be added the strip of territory which she lately conquered from the Khivans and handed over to Bokhara, and, Kuldja which she ceded to the Chinese.

"Certain it is that the Russian peasantry have reason to congratulate themselves that they were emancipated by a Russian autocrat, and not by a British House of Commons; and it is equally certain that in some of the annexed provinces the lower classes enjoy advantages which they would not possess under British rule. (This is the sentiment to which Mr. Arch gave utterance recently.) If the Khan of Khiva had conscientiously fulfilled his international obligations the expedition would not have been undertaken. Russia must push forward her frontier towards India until she reaches a government which is able and willing to keep order within its boundaries, and to prevent its subjects from committing depredations on their neighbours. As none of the petty states of Central Asia seem capable of permanently fulfilling this condition, it is pretty certain that the Russian and British frontiers will one day meet. As to the complications and disputes which inevitably arise between contiguous nations, I think they are fewer and less dangerous than those which arise between nations separated from each other by a small state which is incapable of making its neutrality respected, and is kept alive simply by the jealousy of rival powers. Germany does not periodically go to war with Holland or Russia, though separated from them by a mere artificial frontier, whilst France and Austria have never been prevented from going to war with each other by the broad intervening territory.

"As to the Slavonic Committee, whatever it did it did openly.

Detailed reports of its proceedings were largely circulated in Russia, and freely given to foreigners.

"Tchernayeff has made for himself the reputation, by his campaigns in Central Asia, of a brave, able soldier, and an honest patriotic man. I must say that I know no body of men who are more sensitive to humanitarian conceptions than the Russian educated class. Probably about 4,000 Russian volunteers went to Servia.

"Russian autocracy, founded on the unbounded hereditary devotion of the people, peasantry and nobles alike, cannot for a moment be compared with French autocracy in the time of Napoleon III.

"Again and again whilst observing Russia's policy towards the Servians and Montenegrins, I have been reminded of the anecdote about the French revolutionary leader, who, before advancing to a barricade, pointed to the crowd and whispered confidentially to a friend, '*Il faut bien les suivre, je suis leur chef.*'"

As to the cleanliness of the Russian peasants, Mr. Wallace tells us that they take a weekly vapour bath, which cannot be said of the peasantry of any other country in the world, including our "great unwashed;" and he further says, "I encountered peasants who had a small collection of books, and twice I found in such collections, much to my astonishment, a Russian translation of 'Buckles' History of Civilization.'" Now, if all Europe were ransacked, it is doubtful if two other peasants could be found who possessed a book of the same calibre.

EXTRACTS FROM MR. FREEMAN'S "OTTOMAN POWER IN EUROPE."

"It is a fact well worthy of remembrance, that both the Bulgarians and, somewhat later, the Russians, when they became dissatisfied with their own heathen religion, had Mahometanism and Christianity both set before them, and that they deliberately chose Christianity. . . . The Christian subject of the Turkish Government does not wish to reform the Turkish Government ; he does not wish to reconstruct it after the model of some other Government ; he simply wishes to get rid of it altogether. . . . The Bosnian Christian looks upon the Servian or Montenegrin as his countryman ; he looks on the Turk as a foreigner. Christianity has got rid of the two great evils of polygamy and slavery. Mahometanism cannot get rid of them, because they are allowed and consecrated by the Mahometan law. There are at this day vast nations of Turks, some of them mere savages, who have never embraced Mahometanism. . . . It was the increased wrongdoing of the Turks, both towards the native Christians and towards the pilgrims from the West, which caused the cry for help that led to the Crusades. There were no Crusades as long as the Saracens ruled ; as soon as the Turks came in the Crusades began.

"Othman bears a high character among Turkish rulers, yet he murdered his uncle simply for dissuading him from a dangerous enterprise. . . . Orkhan first demanded a tribute of children. The deepest of wrongs which other tyrants did as an occasional

outrage thus became under the Ottomans a settled law. A fixed proportion of the strongest and most promising boys among the conquered Christian nations were carried off for the service of the Ottoman princes, and were brought up in the Mahometan faith, and in this way the strength of the conquered nations was turned against themselves. They could not throw off the yoke, because those among them who were their natural leaders were pressed into the service of their enemies. It was not till the practice of levying the tribute on children was left off that the conquered nations showed any power to stir. While the Ottoman power was strongest, the chief posts of the Empire, civil and military, were constantly held not by native Turks, but by Christian renegades of all nations, and the flower of the army were the janissaries formed of tribute children.

"The Turks were able to use each people that they brought under their power as helpers against the next people whom they attacked. Thus at Kussova, Amurath had already Christian tributaries fighting on his side. From this time, till Servia was completely incorporated with the Turkish dominions, the Servians had to fight in the Turkish armies against the other Christian nations which the Turks attacked.

"The most remarkable conquest of Bajazet was in Asia. Philadelphia still held out, and its citizens still deemed themselves subjects of the Emperors at Constantinople. Yet, when Bajazet thought proper to add the city to his dominions, the Emperor Manuel and his son were forced, as tributaries of the Sultan, to send their contingent to the Turkish army, and to help in the conquest of their own city.

"Eubœa was conquered by the Turks in 1471, when the Venetian governor, Erizzo, who had stipulated for the safety of his head, had his body sawn asunder. . . . The last Bosnian king was promised his life, but he and his sons were put to death none the less. . . . Speaking roughly, the lower clergy throughout the conquered lands have always been patriotic leaders, while the bishops and other higher clergy have been slaves and instruments of the Turks. . . . In Albania

a large part of the country did become Mahometan, while other parts remained Christian, some tribes being Catholic and some Orthodox. . . .

"The Mufti Djemali, whose name deserves to be remembered, several times turned the Sultan from bloody purposes. At last he withstood Selim, when he wished to massacre all the Christians in his dominion, and to forbid the exercise of the Christian religion. . . .

"In the days of Sobieski and Eugene, men had not learned to talk about the integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire, or to think it a good thing for Christian nations to be held in Turkish bondage. They did not openly profess the doctrine that certain nations should be deprived of the rights of human beings for the sake of the supposed interests of some other nation.

"When Belgrade submitted in 1813, the Turks promised to put no man to death. Turk-like, they beheaded and impaled the men to whom they had promised their lives. Men still live who remember seeing their fathers writhing on the stakes before the citadel of Belgrade. . . .

"The Albanians generally, both Christian and Mahometan, have always kept up a strong national feeling. . . . They have always been discontented and often rebellious subjects of the Turks.

. . . It is most important to remember that the rising (for independence) was in no way confined to the narrow bounds of that part of Greece which was set free in the end. The whole Greek nation rose in every part of the Turkish dominions where they had numbers and strength to use. They rose throughout Greece itself, in Epiros, Thessaly, and Macedonia, in Crete too, and Cyprus, and others of the islands. The Greek revolution was mainly the work of the Greeks themselves, counting among them the Christian Albanians.

"Ibrahim, who afterwards, like most tyrants, was honourably received in England, went on the deliberate principle of making the whole world a desert, by slaying or enslaving the whole Christian population.

"Prince Leopold, afterwards King of the Belgians, accepted the crown (of Greece), but he presently resigned it, because he saw that no Greek state would flourish which was pent up in such a narrow frontier.

"If we could fancy a state of things in which our English country was free, and the next country was under Turkish bondage, it is quite certain that the men of the free country would help their enslaved neighbours when they revolted . . . but then they ought to be called 'foreign intriguers' too, for there is no greater difference between the men of Montenegro and the men of Herzegovina, than there is between the men of Yorkshire and the men of Lancashire. . . .

"Some of these poor people (the Cretans) were carried off in safety to Greece in ships of several European nations, amongst others in the English ship 'Assurance.' . . . But the English Foreign Secretary, now Earl of Derby, forbade that any such act of humanity should be done again. It does not appear that any other European nation acted in the same way. England alone . . . must bear the shame of having in cold blood forbidden that old men and women, and children, and helpless persons of all kinds, should be saved from the jaws of the barbarians. No blacker page in the history of England, no blacker page in the history of human nature, can be found. . . . No treaty, no oath, can bind a man to commit a crime, nor can it bind him, when he has the power of hindering a crime, to allow it to be done.

"They (the alleged foreign intriguers in Turkey) are foreign intriguers in the same sense in which Sir Philip Sidney was a foreign intriguer when he died at Zutphen, for the freedom of the Netherlands. . . . As Englishmen then fought and died for the freedom of a kindred land, so now many men from Montenegro (from Austria), from Russia, and from Italy, too, fought and died the same glorious death for the freedom of the oppressed Slavonic land. . . . At a time when no Montenegro prisoner was ever spared by the Turks, but when Turkish prisoners, a Pasha among them, were living quite comfortably in Montenegro,

we were told of the horrible atrocities of the Montenegrins.

. . . The old custom which the Montenegrins had learned of the Turks was to bring home the heads of slain enemies as trophies . . . but it is not now done by any troops who are under Montenegrin discipline. But the custom of cutting off the dead enemy's nose has still been sometimes kept up by the irregular insurgent band, and in one or two cases a man who was thought to be dead was wakened up by the loss of his nose. . . . After all, though to cut off a dead man's nose is a brutal thing, it is hardly so brutal as roasting, torturing, and impaling living people. . . .

"When Sir Henry Bulwer was Ambassador at Constantinople, a circular was sent to the British Consuls in the Turkish dominions, bidding them send in an account of the state of the country. Another letter went with the circular, bidding them to make their report as favourable as they could to the Turks.

. . . He (Sir Henry) was to act as an honest man sent to *lie* abroad for the good of his country. . . . We look on, we count the cost, we see how the wrong-doer deals with his victim, and we determined to uphold the wrong-doer, because we think that to uphold him will suit some interest of our own. There is no question of national glory, no question of national honour, nothing which can stir up even a false enthusiasm. It is a calm mercantile calculation that the wrongs of millions of men will pay. The Turkish bully is at heart a coward. . . . A wanton murder of Mussulmans by Mussulmans has been known to go unpunished when Christian witnesses only could prove the fact.

"The Bosnian Beys, the descendants of renegades, still keeping up the old spite of the renegades, are described none the less as very lax votaries of Islam, as remembering their Christian descent, as treasuring up the patents of nobility which their forefathers received from the ancient Christian kings. Those who know them well think that if they were put under a Christian government, their re-conversion would not be hard, the Bey would easily slide back into the baron. . . . There is a mosque at Chalkis, and there is a mosque at Belgrade. The few Mahometans

at Chalkis suffer no wrong or disability. . . . When the Turkish garrison left Belgrade, the settled Mussulman population went also. But why did they go? Not by their own free-will—not by the will of the Servians, who wished them to stay. They went by orders from Constantinople, where the ruling powers wished to make out a case against Servia, as if Servia had driven them out. But the mosque is there still, and its minister is paid by the Servian state for his services towards any Mussulman remnant that may be left, or towards any Mussulman traveller that may pass by."

TRANSLATION OF COMTE SEEBACH'S "OPEN LETTER" TO LORD BEACONSFIELD, PUBLISHED IN THE *NORD*, OF BRUSSELS, ON 23RD JUNE, 1877.

"MANY years have elapsed, my lord, since I had the good fortune to make your acquaintance, and our paths having no longer crossed each other, I would fear to have become an unknown person to you if I was not certain that the circumstances—important for you as well as for me—in the midst of which we met must have preserved for me in your recollection the place which you have not ceased to occupy in mine.

"Our relations, it is true, have not survived the interests which had created them, but they lasted long enough to have obtained for me on your part proofs of esteem and of confidence to which I am happy to be able to pay even tardily my debt of gratitude in bringing you, my lord, by this open letter, an irrefutable testimony against the calumnies which impute to you the responsibility of the inundation with which Europe is now threatened.

"To this effect I have to evoke the recollection of a time already far from us, and to formulate summarily the political situation which then brought us together. It was, my lord, at that period of the Crimean War when a great storm was formed over the head of Lord Palmerston.

"In the course of the first winter campaign the most important London journal had unveiled the faults of the military organization of England with great patriotic courage, and rendered the Government responsible for the evil consequences of the indolence

which had left the third of the army to perish in physical sufferings past human endurance. At these heartrending revelations a great cry of stupor and indignation had resounded in the three kingdoms, from one end to the other, and it burst forth with all the more force when the bloody repulses undergone under the walls of Sebastopol placed the fear of a great disaster in the place of the hopes of peace which the prompt reconstitution of the army had caused to revive.

"All the political atmosphere was troubled by these cruel deceptions. On both sides of the Channel the ancient antagonism, which even blood shed in common and the intoxication of the first successes had not succeeded in entirely extinguishing, was re-kindled. The distrust, which had never ceased to reign secretly in the camps, penetrated into the Governments; and the report having spread that the Emperor Napoleon would proceed to the theatre of war, all the English journals attributed to him more or less openly the intention to seek the occasion of a meeting with the sovereign of Russia to negotiate directly a peace to the detriment of the honour of England.

"The word treason was pronounced, and for the first time the mass of the country began to doubt the ability of the statesman to whom it had confided its destinies, and who, until then, had held the British lion in a leash whilst imprinting on his policy always and everywhere the seal of the brutal motto of the Romans. The proud sentiment of *Civis Romanus sum* being no longer allowable to the English nation, the popularity of Lord Palmerston was shaken at its base; and being chief—not in name, but in fact—of the Opposition, you were, my lord, justified in thinking that the moment for securing his succession was near. The ministerial combinations of your party had reserved to you without contest the direction of foreign affairs, which you did not then, however, know except by the newspapers, and you adopted then the resolution to go to Paris to draw from better sources, and to ascertain especially, yourself, the reality or the erroneousness of the apprehensions which the oscillations of French policy caused in England.

"A mutual friend, who had preceded you to explore the ground, made me aware of your projects, my lord, and as soon as you arrived you did me the honour to come and see me, and to place immediately our relations on the footing of intimacy in making me acquainted from the very first with all the phases of the political life of the 'Nobody' of former times, as it pleased you to call yourself, and in admitting to me afterwards, without reserve, that, being on the point of reaching the summit of the social ladder, you had to ask me for a service which would assist you to surround your name with a new glory.

"To be believed, on my word, that I have rendered you this service, of which the preliminaries were the frankness with which you expressed yourself towards me concerning the direction which you intended to impress on English policy, and which permits me to guarantee your real sentiments in the present crisis, it is necessary to define the situation which the war last made for me in Paris.

"Nominated Minister of Saxony in France, a short time before the disappearance of the Republic, after having filled during fifteen years the same functions at St. Petersburg, where I had become the son-in-law of the Chancellor of the Empire, Count Nesselrode, I had been received by the chief of the State with much good-will, which was due in part to private affairs which he had at heart, and also to the illusion that my family connections might be utilised in the difficulties which even then the French Government foresaw on the side of Russia at the moment when it would change in form.

"In both cases my duties prevented me from responding to the expectations of the Prince President, but I had been fortunate enough to be able to reconcile them with the wishes I formed at this time with the men of order in Europe for the consolidation of the Napoleonic dynasty, and the Emperor recollected this.

"Grateful by natural disposition—as no man ever was in a greater degree—he gave me credit for the attachment which I had shown for his person; and when the curtain rose in the East for the prologue of the great drama to which the struggle taking

place at this moment on the banks of the Danube will, perhaps, furnish the epilogue, the Emperor Napoleon gave me a great proof of regard by conducting me spontaneously into his study to have with me a distinct and clear explanation on the subject of the evident conflict between my official position and my well-known sympathies for the adversary that France was going to combat.

"Far from diminishing the confidence which, in the course of the negotiations which preceded the rupture, the Emperor had never ceased to testify towards me by confidential communications on his personal grievances against Russia, this conversation strengthened it, and left him the certainty that, whilst regretting profoundly his policy of the moment, I was, nevertheless, ready to serve him loyally, with the approbation of my sovereign as soon as it was modified.

"In this order of ideas I had demanded and obtained authority from the French and Saxon Governments to accept the mission which the Cabinet of St. Petersburg wished to confide to me, to take under the protection of my legation the Russian subjects who remained in France; and the terms in which the Emperor expressly confirmed it verbally showed me clearly that he attached to it the same anticipations as myself.

"As I am not writing a chapter of my memoirs, I may dispense with enlarging on the ways and means which have realized them, by conducting gradually, in the midst of the clang of arms, and in spite of diplomacy, to a tacit reconciliation between the sovereigns of Russia and France. This reconciliation furnished, after the taking of Sebastopol, the basis of the confidential negotiations between the two Governments, from which arose the Conferences and the Peace of Paris.

"This reconciliation was still little advanced at the time when we met, my lord, but I was sufficiently aware of the dominant ideas at St. Petersburg to be able to assure you that the vague and adventurous policy of the Emperor Napoleon would never prevail there against that which you had decided to cause England to follow, as soon as you had taken the reins of Government.

"In your prepossessions, my lord, a very small place was reserved for the present time, of which you considered the difficulties as a Minister directing a great Empire aware of his personal superiority.

"Deeply convinced that the coalition into which England had allowed itself to be drawn placed it in the position of a dupe, you determined to dissolve it by concessions to the just exigencies of the adversary, which would hasten, if necessary, in spite of France, the conclusion of peace.

"All your glances were turned towards the future, which you judged with the clearness of the prophet kings of the Old Testament. In your eyes, my lord, Europe was of necessity condemned to be transformed by accident, by fire, and blood, if England and Russia did not come to an understanding on the leading features of their policy in the East, and you had no doubt of establishing this concord by adopting principles diametrically opposed to those of Lord Palmerston.

"According to you, the vital interests of the two Governments enjoined on them to remain strictly united in Europe, as well as in Asia, in order to preserve to each the sphere of action agreed upon.

"The programme which you traced for yourself, determining distinctly its character and limits, and knowing it to be identical with that which the Emperor Nicholas and Count Nesselrode in his long and brilliant career had used all their efforts to establish, I was sure that the prospect of seeing it realised by your initiative, my lord, would become at St. Petersburg an element of peace. I transmitted it then at your express demand to the Chancellor, with the request to make his august master acquainted with it. Both hailed it as the certain promise of a new era of repose in Europe.

"Unfortunately the English people did not fulfil these hopes, and banished yours amongst those with which vanquished parties too often delude themselves. Lord Palmerston remained in power.

"I stop here, my lord, for I think I have attained the object of my letter.

"A statesman who has grown old in the management of great affairs may modify his views, but he cannot renounce the convictions of his whole life at the end of his career without being enlightened by experience. Now, since the period of which I have just spoken, all the events in the East have shown the correctness of the fundamental principle of the policy which you preached a quarter of a century ago; and as it would be an injustice to you, my lord, to believe that you had adopted it lightly, the world may, at least, in strict justice accuse you of not having had the courage to adhere to your opinion in the council of the Queen, whilst before God the heavy responsibility for the torrents of blood which will be shed in a few days must fall wholly on the heads of your colleagues, who have taken advantage of your weakness by doing violence to the convictions which sleep in the recesses of your conscience.

"Be so good, my lord, as to receive my letter with the sentiments which have dictated it, and of which I claim all the merit, not having had in my complete independence to ask counsel or advice from any one. Accept at the same time, my lord, the assurance of my highest consideration.

"COUNT SEEBACH.

"Château d'Unwürde, near Loeban, Saxony."

COUNT SEEBACH'S CHARGES AGAINST LORD BEACONSFIELD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "DAILY NEWS."

SIR,—An interesting letter addressed to Lord Beaconsfield from Comte Seebach, who was Saxon Minister at Paris during the Crimean War, appears in the *Nord* of June 23rd, from which I extract the following passages concerning Lord Beaconsfield, which conclusively show that his inner convictions on the Eastern Question are entirely at variance with his acts and language. Lord Beaconsfield, then Mr. Disraeli, fully expecting the fall of the Government after the harrowing account of the dreadful sufferings of the English troops during the first winter of the Crimean War,

and that he would succeed to power, went to Paris to study the political situation, and put himself into communication with Comte Seebach, sitting at his feet as a disciple, "and placing our relations on the footing of intimacy by making me aware from the first of all the phases of the political life of the 'Nobody' of former times, as it pleased you to call yourself, and in acknowledging to me without concealment that, being on the point of reaching the summit of the social ladder, you had to ask me to render you a service which would aid you to surround your name with a new glory. . . Profoundly convinced that the coalition into which England had allowed itself to be inveigled reserved for it the part of a dupe, you promised yourself to dissolve it by concessions to the just requirements of the adversary (Russia), which would hasten, if necessary, in spite of France, the conclusion of peace. . . You did not doubt that you could establish an agreement (with Russia) by adopting principles diametrically opposed to those of Lord Palmerston.

"According to you, the vital interests of the two Governments (England and Russia) demanded from them to remain closely united in Europe, as in Asia, to preserve to each the sphere of action agreed upon. . . .

"The programme which you had traced for yourself, determining distinctly its character and limits, knowing it to be identical with that which the Emperor Nicholas and Count Nesselrode in his long and brilliant career had used all their efforts to carry out, I was sure that the prospect of seeing it realised by your initiative would become at St. Petersburg an element of peace. I transmitted it then on your express demand to the Chancellor, with the request to bring it to the knowledge of his august master. Both welcomed it as the certain promise of an era of repose in Europe. As, since the time respecting which I have just spoken, all the events in the East have shown the truth of the fundamental principle of the policy which you advocated a quarter of a century ago, and as it would be an injustice to you, my lord, to think that you then adopted them inconsiderately, people may at least in fair justice accuse you of not having the courage of maintaining your opinion in the council of the Queen, whilst the responsibility before God for

the torrents of blood which will flow in a few days must fall wholly on your colleagues who have taken advantage of your weakness by violating the convictions which sleep in the recesses of your conscience."

It is clear from this important document that Lord Beaconsfield is, after all, only the tool of more designing colleagues, and that he is playing a part which is contrary to his convictions, and which he knows to be contrary to justice and to the interest of England. I may add that for the chief of the Opposition to send a message to the Czar intimating his entire disapproval of the policy then being pursued by his country, when we were at war with Russia, seems in the highest degree reprehensible and unpatriotic.

The Speaker has refused to allow me to put any question whatever on this subject to the Government in the House of Commons, but I sent the letter in the original French to Lord Beaconsfield, with a private letter from myself, and a copy of the question which I am not allowed to ask, because it relates to an event stated to have happened upwards of twenty years ago, when Lord Beaconsfield was not Minister!

Lord Beaconsfield, instead of committing himself by a written reply to my letter, has informed me, through the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that he has no recollection of having made the statement attributed to him by Comte Seebach, but he does not positively deny their substantial or even their verbal accuracy, and no unprejudiced person can possibly believe that he can really have forgotten the substance of his communication through Comte Seebach to the Emperor of Russia. I have in my possession the original letter of Count Seebach to the editor of the *Nord*, written on paper bearing his monogram and coronet; also a letter from him to a Breslau paper, in which he pledges his word of honour that the letter to Lord Beaconsfield was not written at the instigation of Russia; and as I personally know the editor of the *Nord*, I am quite ready to assume the whole responsibility of guaranteeing the authenticity of this letter, and of stating my firm belief that every syllable which it contains is literally true.

Your obedient servant,

J. G. T. SINCLAIR.

LORD BEACONSFIELD AND COUNT SEEBACH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "DAILY NEWS."

SIR,—I observe in your columns to-day a letter from Sir Tollemache Sinclair, in which my name is mentioned, and which appears to require some explanation on my part.

Sir Tollemache Sinclair some days ago informed me that he was about to put a question to me on the subject of a letter which he said had been written by Count Seebach, but of which I had not previously heard. On my telling him that I knew nothing about it, he gave me a letter addressed to Lord Beaconsfield, which he had left unfastened in order that I might read it and give it to the Prime Minister, together with a notice that he was about to put a question to me on the subject.

I accordingly read the letter myself, and then sent it to Lord Beaconsfield. He wrote to me in reply a letter which I took down with me to the House of Commons, prepared to read it in answer to Sir Tollemache Sinclair's question, but I was informed by the Speaker that he had ruled that the question could not be put.

When I subsequently met Sir Tollemache in the lobby I had not the letter itself at hand, but I mentioned its general purport to him.

I much regret that Sir Tollemache did not express to me his wish to see the letter itself, as I should of course have shown it to him. There was no intentional want of courtesy towards him either on my own part or certainly on that of Lord Beaconsfield, who naturally regarded his letter to me as the answer to that which he had received at my hands, and to which he did not think that any other reply was expected.—I have the honour to be, sir, your obedient servant,

July 6.

STAFFORD H. NORTHCOTE.

P.S.—I subjoin a copy of Lord Beaconsfield's letter.

"2, Whitehall-gardens, S.W., June 30, 1877.

"MY DEAR CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER,—I remember meeting Count Seebach, for the first time, at Paris after the Crimean War,

and when, by the by, there never was less prospect of a change in the Ministry of England. I was not aware until this moment of the important acquaintance I was making. I have not the slightest recollection of any observation I ever made to him; and I hope his Excellency will not be offended by my adding that I have not the slightest recollection of anything he ever said to me.

"I should think the Emperor of Russia and Prince Gortschakoff must have been a little surprised by being diplomatically informed of the casual remarks of a private member of Parliament.

"It proves, I think, that the duties of the Court of Saxony were not of an absorbing character.—Yours sincerely,

“(Signed) BEACONSFIELD.”

To this I wrote the following rejoinder :—

COUNT SEEBACH AND LORD BEACONSFIELD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE “DAILY NEWS.”

SIR,—The Philo-Turkish portion of “society” seem to think that Lord Beaconsfield’s short and evasive letter on the subject of Count Seebach’s long and important communication, addressed to him in the *Nord* of the 24th of June, conclusively refutes it, because he states that he met him “for the first time at Paris after the Crimean War;” and if this statement were true Count Seebach would stand convicted before all Europe not only of a wilful and gratuitous falsehood, but of having accused the Prime Minister of England of conduct which falls but little short of treason, and it would have been quite unnecessary for him to have said anything more than the words I have just quoted, and the very fact that he makes several further remarks which, on his representation of the case, were superfluous, is in itself suspicious. It is, however, utterly absurd to suppose that even the most mendacious and unscrupulous individual in the whole world would commit such an obvious blunder as to say that he was intimately acquainted with Lord Beaconsfield during the Crimean War, and that he was requested by him to make a most important communication to the Emperor of Russia, when, in point of fact, he never

met him till after the Crimean War was over, when the message in question would have been wholly irrelevant and utterly useless; and this is the more incredible since Count Seebach is a veteran and skilful diplomatist, who had very great influence both with the Czar and the Emperor of the French, and is about the last individual who would have committed an easily detected fault, which, in the words of Talleyrand, would have been "worse than a crime." I have no doubt whatever that Count Seebach will immediately produce ample evidence, from the most unimpeachable sources, that he knew Lord Beaconsfield most intimately during the Crimean War, and when this is established every unprejudiced person will believe that everything which Count Seebach states in the letter of the 23rd of June is at least substantially correct. It will be observed that Count Seebach's letter is not only extremely courteous, but even flattering to Lord Beaconsfield, for, strangely enough, the Count does not appear to consider that the statements he makes involve very grave charges against him; but appears, on the contrary, to think they are very much to his credit, and it is therefore the more surprising that Lord Beaconsfield's reply is couched in the most offensive, disdainful, and depreciatory terms.

Lord Beaconsfield says, sarcastically, "I was not aware till this moment of the important acquaintance I was making;" but if so he was probably the only public man in Europe who professed the most superficial knowledge of foreign politics who was ignorant of Count Seebach's position and influence. He then proceeds to say, "I have not the slightest recollection of any observation I ever made to him . . . and I have not the slightest recollection of anything he ever said to me;" as much as to say that Count Seebach, who was a highly important personage in the opinion of the two Emperors, was such an insignificant individual in the judgment of that much greater man, Mr. Disraeli, that what the Count said to him went in at one ear and out at the other. Lord Beaconsfield concludes by saying, "I should think the Emperor of Russia and Prince Gortschakoff must have been a little surprised by being diplomatically informed of the casual remarks of a private member of Parliament. It proves, I think, that the duties of the Court of Saxony were not of an absorbing character."

Now, in the first place, Count Seebach expressly stated that it was to Count Nesselrode, then Chancellor of the Russian Empire, and not to Prince Gortschakoff, who did not fill that office, that Lord

Beaconsfield's message was sent; and I very much doubt if his lordship has even yet read the letter which I sent him in the original French, which he has undertaken to answer like Alexandre Dumas, who wrote an account of a tour which he never made at all.

Then, again, as Lord Beaconsfield had been in office in 1852, it is a prevarication to say that he was a private individual, and it is clear that a message sent by the leader of the Opposition to the Czar during the Crimean War, that he expected to be in power immediately, and that he "did not doubt that he would establish an agreement with Russia by adopting principles diametrically opposed to those of Lord Palmerston, if necessary, in spite of France," cannot be fairly called "casual remarks of a private member of Parliament," and he would have scoffed at such a lame excuse if Count Seebach's letter had referred to Lord Hartington instead of to him. The Turcophiles, however, say that even if conclusive evidence can be produced to prove the substance of all Count Seebach has stated, it only amounts to a change of opinion as regards the proper policy of England towards Russia; but those who are careless or shallow enough to make such a remark fail to see the bearings of the case. It is obviously quite as allowable for Lord Beaconsfield to change his opinion in one direction as for Mr. Gladstone, who was in favour of the Crimean War, to alter his views in the opposite direction, and thus make that fair exchange of policies which is proverbially no robbery; but surely every one on reflection must see that, though Mr. Bright cordially disapproved of the Crimean War at the time, he would never have been guilty of so unpatriotic and unwise an act as to send a message to the Czar during the war, to say that if he became Minister of England he would reverse the policy of England, if necessary, in spite of France; whilst the boundless recklessness and egregious bungling of Lord Beaconsfield are conclusively established by the fact that he told the Turks before the Conference that England would not coerce them, and thus made the negotiations an inevitable failure, and the maintenance of peace absolutely impossible.

Suppose that before the battle of Inkerman was fought the Emperor of Russia contemplated making peace with us, it is obvious that if in the interval he received the message in question from the leader of the Opposition and expectant of power in England, he would undubitably determine to abandon the idea of agreeing to a peace on Lord Palmerston's hard terms when he was likely soon

to obtain much more advantageous conditions from the new Ministry, and thus the battle of Inkerman may have been fought, and the war prolonged, at an enormous cost of blood and treasure, in consequence of this mischievous and unjustifiable message. If it could be clearly proved that this supposed case actually occurred, there is hardly a man in England who would not hold that Lord Beaconsfield deserved at least perpetual ostracism from power; and if it did not take place, he is deserving of the severest censure for the results which might have ensued from his message.

The public will not fail to observe with astonishment that Lord Beaconsfield tardily treats this very grave charge affecting his personal honour and character, which is brought against him—not by an anonymous correspondent or an unknown or discredited individual, but by a distinguished foreign nobleman and diplomatist—with reckless and unbecoming levity, instead of promptly and categorically repelling such circumstantial, dishonouring, and compromising charges with indignation and scorn, and that he merely states that he does not recollect what he said to Count Seebach, which would not avail him in any court of law against the express, distinct, and positive assertions which the Count makes against him.

In conclusion, I wish to refer your readers to the very able and interesting article in the *World* on the subject, headed “A Lame Explanation.”—Your obedient servant,

J. G. T. SINCLAIR.

TRANSLATION OF COUNT SEEBACH'S REJOINDER TO LORD BEACONSFIELD'S REPLY.

TO THE EDITOR OF “THE NORD.”

SIR,—The contest in which Sir J. Tollemache Sinclair, member of the English Parliament, has engaged in the press with Lord Beaconsfield, obliges me to request you to publish the few lines by which, at the date of the 2nd inst., I authorised you to place at his disposal the original of the open letter, which I took the liberty of addressing to the noble lord and for which he asked you. Not having the honour of

personally knowing Sir T. Sinclair, I am so much the more deeply obliged for the sentiments which he has been so good as to testify towards me in his letter to the *Daily News*, republished by the *Nord* of the 9th inst., but my gratitude cannot go so far as to make me deviate from the line of conduct which I had marked out for myself after mature consideration. Neither to a greater or less extent will I take part in the suit for high treason which he has commenced against his adversary. Lord Beaconsfield is free to take refuge behind his feeble memory to confound it. His case fails; dates and men, all these little contrivances of which he has made use in the answer which he has deigned to make me through the medium of Sir Stafford Northcote and of Sir T. Sinclair, do not absolve him from the obligation to attempt a last effort in order to remember our conversations, if not as exactly as they live in my recollection and, perhaps, also *elsewhere*, but at least sufficiently to be able to lay his hand on his conscience to oppose to my clear and precise affirmations a denial quite as distinct and categorical. Even then, however, I would leave public opinion to speak, which will decide which of us two has had the less interest to falsify the truth. The incident in so far as it concerns me is then definitively terminated.

Accept, sir, the assurance of my distinguished consideration.

COUNT SEEBACH.

Château d'Unwürde, near Loeban, Saxony.

July 15, 1877.

A LAME EXPLANATION.

FROM THE "WORLD."

THE statements contained in the letter of Lord Beaconsfield, printed in the *Daily News* of Saturday last, in reply to Sir Tolle-mache Sinclair's quotations from the *Nord*, are of a truly surprising character. In the *Nord* of June 3rd there appeared a letter from Count Seebach, in which an account was given of a conversation held by him with Mr. Disraeli twenty years ago. According to this

narrative the then leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons drew up, for the benefit of the Saxon Minister in the French capital, the programme of an amicable concert to be established between England and Russia. This statement Lord Beaconsfield contradicts in a letter addressed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, saying, that while he recollects meeting Count Seebach in Paris he "was not aware of the important acquaintance he was making;" that "he has not the slightest recollection of any observation he ever made;" and that he thinks "the Emperor of Russia must have been a little surprised by being diplomatically informed of the casual remarks of a private Member of Parliament," uttered at a time "when there was no prospect of a change in the Ministry of England." Of course, in 1857, Mr. Disraeli was technically a private Member of Parliament, but he had been Chancellor of the Exchequer five years previously; he was the leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons, and his position was one of at least as great influence as Lord Hartington's now.

Secondly, it seems strange that Mr. Disraeli can have been ignorant of the "importance" of Count Seebach, who had married the daughter of Count Nesselrode, who was not merely well known in diplomatic circles, but who had been notoriously the representative of Russian interests during the Crimean War, and who was mainly instrumental in bringing about the preliminary negotiations for the Treaty of Paris.

Thirdly, as regards Lord Beaconsfield's remark on the apparent impossibility of the Conservatives coming into power in 1857, it is an impossibility which was certainly not recognized at the time. In that year Mr. Disraeli was engaged, and with a reasonable chance of success, in the attempt to form a Conservative coalition with the Peelites and the Liberal malcontents in opposition to Lord Palmerston, who had irritated and alienated the minds of many of his party by his supposed wish to prolong the war with Russia; and to such a coalition a speech made by Mr. Disraeli at the beginning of the Session of 1857 was manifestly intended to pave the way.

INTERVIEW OF AN ENGLISHMAN AND A
TURKISH PASHA.

(From Kinglake's "*Eothen*," now out of print.)

PASHA.—The Englishman is welcome; most blessed among hours is this the hour of his coming.

DRAGOMAN (*to the Traveller*).—The Pasha pays you his compliments.

TRAVELLER.—Give him my best compliments in return, and say I'm delighted to have the honour of seeing him.

DRAGOMAN (*to the Pasha*).—His Lordship, this Englishman, Lord of London, Scornor of Ireland, Suppressor of France, has quitted his government, and left his enemies to breathe for a moment, and has crossed the broad waters in strict disguise with a small, but eternally faithful retinue of followers, in order that he might look upon the bright countenance of the Pasha among Pashas—the Pasha of the everlasting Pashalik of Karaghoolookdoor.

TRAVELLER (*to the Dragoman*).—What on earth have you been saying about London? The Pasha will be taking me for a mere cockney. Have I not told you *always* to say that I am from a branch of the family of Mudcombe Park, and that I am to be a magistrate for the county of Bedfordshire, only I've not qualified; and that I should have been a deputy-lieutenant, if it had not been for the extraordinary conduct of Lord Mountpromise; and that I was a candidate for Goldborough at the last election, and that I should have won easy if my committee had not been

bought. I wish to heaven that, if you do say anything about me, you'd tell the simple truth.

DRAGOMAN is silent.

PASHA.—What says the friendly Lord of London? Is there aught that I can grant him within the Pashalik of Karaghoolookdoor.

DRAGOMAN (*growing sulky and literal*).—This friendly Englishman, this branch of Mudcombe, this head purveyor of Goldborough, this possible policeman of Bedfordshire, is recounting his achievements and the number of his titles.

PASHA.—The end of his honours is more distant than the ends of the earth, and the catalogue of his glorious deeds is brighter than the firmament of heaven!

DRAGOMAN (*to the Traveller*).—The Pasha congratulates your Excellency.

TRAVELLER.—About Goldborough? The deuce he does! but I want to get at his views in relation to the present state of the Ottoman Empire. Tell him the Houses of Parliament have met and that there has been a speech from the throne pledging England to preserve the integrity of the Sultan's dominions.

DRAGOMAN (*to the Pasha*).—This branch of Mudcombe, this possible policeman of Bedfordshire, informs your Highness that in England the talking houses have met, and that the integrity of the Sultan's dominions has been assured for ever and ever by a speech from the velvet chair.

PASHA.—Wonderful chair! wonderful houses! Whirr, whirr! all by wheels! Whiz, whiz! all by steam! Wonderful chair, wonderful houses, wonderful people! Whirr, whirr! all by wheels! Whiz, whiz! all by steam!

TRAVELLER (*to the Dragoman*).—What does the Pasha mean by that whizzing? He does not mean to say, does he, that our Government will ever abandon their pledges to the Sultan?

DRAGOMAN.—No, your Excellency, but he says the English talk by wheels and by steam.

TRAVELLER.—That's an exaggeration; but say that the English really have carried machinery to great perfection. Tell the Pasha

(he'll be struck with that) that, whenever we have any disturbances to put down, even at two or three hundred miles from London, we can send troops by the thousand to the scene of action in a few hours.

DRAGOMAN (*recovering his temper and freedom of speech*).—His Excellency, this Lord of Mudcombe, observes to your Highness that whenever the Irish or the French or the Indians rebel against the English, whole armies of soldiers and brigades of artillery are dropped into a mighty chasm, called Euston Square, and in the biting of a cartridge they arise up again in Manchester, or Dublin, or Paris, or Delhi, and utterly exterminate the enemies of England from the face of the earth.

PASHA.—I know it—I know all. The particulars have been faithfully related to me, and my mind comprehends locomotives. The armies of the English ride upon the vapours of boiling cauldrons, and their horses are flaming coals! Whirr, whirr! all by wheels. Whiz, whiz! all by steam!

TRAVELLER (*to his Dragoman*).—I wish to have the opinion of an unprejudiced Ottoman gentleman as to the prospects of our English commerce and manufactures; just ask the Pasha to give me his views on the subject.

PASHA (*after having received the communication from the Dragoman*).—The ships of the English swarm like flies; their printed calicoes cover the whole earth, and by the side of their swords the blades of Damascus are blades of grass. All India is but an item in the ledger books of the merchants, whose lumber rooms are filled with ancient thrones! Whirr, whirr! all by wheels; Whiz, whiz! all by steam!

DRAGOMAN.—The Pasha compliments the cutlery of England, and also the East India Company.

TRAVELLER.—The Pasha's right about the cutlery (I tried my scimitar with the common officers' swords (Wilkinson's?) belonging to our fellows at Malta, and they cut it like the leaf of a novel). Well (*to the Dragoman*), tell the Pasha I am exceedingly gratified to find that he entertains such a high opinion of our manufacturing energy, but I should like him to know, though

that we have got something in England besides that. These foreigners are always imagining that we have nothing but ships and railways and East India Companies. Do just tell the Pasha that our rural districts deserve his attention, and that even within the last two hundred years there has been an evident improvement in the culture of the turnip; and if he does not take any interest about that, at all events, you can explain that we have our virtues in the country, that we are a truth-telling people, and like the Osmanlees, are faithful in the performance of our promises. Oh, by the by, whilst you are about it, you may as well just say at the end, that the British yeoman is still, thank God! the British yeoman.

PASHA (*after hearing the Dragoman*).—It is true! it is true! Through all Feringhistan the English are foremost and best; for the Russians are drilled swine, and the Germans are sleeping babes, and the Italians are the servants of songs, and the French are the sons of newspapers, and the Greeks they are weavers of lies, but the English and the Osmanlees are brothers together in righteousness; for the Osmanlees believe in one only God, and cleave to the Koran and destroy idols, so do the English worship one God and abominate graven images, and tell the truth, and believe in a book; and though they drink the juice of the grape, yet to say that they worship their prophet as God, or to say that they are eaters of pork, these are lies—lies born of Greeks and nursed by Jews.

DRAGOMAN.—The Pasha compliments the English.

TRAVELLER (*rising*).—Well, I've had enough of this. Tell the Pasha I am greatly obliged to him for his hospitality, and still more for his kindness in furnishing me with horses and say that I must now be off.

PASHA (*after hearing the Dragoman, and standing up on his divan*).—Proud are the sires, and blessed are the dams of the horses that shall carry his Excellency to the end of his prosperous journey. May the saddle beneath him glide down to the gates of the happy city like a boat swimming in the third river of Paradise. May he sleep the sleep of a child when his friends are around him,

and while that his enemies are abroad, may his eyes flame red through the darkness more red than the eyes of ten tigers! Farewell.

DRAGOMAN.—The Pasha wishes your Excellency a pleasant journey.

So ends the visit.

SKETCH OF MANNERS IN THE EAST, BY THACKERAY.

ALL their humour, my dragoman tells me, is of this questionable sort; and a young Egyptian gentleman, son of a Pasha, whom I subsequently met at Malta, confirmed the statement, and gave a detail of the practices of private life which was anything but edifying. The great aim of woman, he said, in the much-maligned Orient, is to administer to the brutality of her lord; her merit is in knowing how to vary the beast's pleasures. He could give us no idea, he said, of the *wit* of the Egyptian women, and their skill in *double entendre*; nor, I presume, did we lose much by our ignorance. What I would urge, humbly, however, is this: Do not let us be led away by German writers and æsthetics, Semilas-soisms, Hahnahnisms, and the like. The life of the East is a life of brutes. The much maligned Orient, I am confident, has not been maligned near enough; for the good reason that none of us can tell the amount of horrible sensuality practised there.

Beyond the jack-pudding rascal and his audience, there was on the green a spot, on which was pointed out to me a mark, as of blood. That morning the blood had spouted from the neck of an Arnacoot soldier, who had been executed for murder. These Arnacoots are the curse and terror of the citizens. Their camps are without the city; but they are always brawling, or drunken, or murdering within, in spite of the rigid law which is applied to them, and which brings one or more of the scoundrels to death almost every week.

Some of our party had seen this fellow borne by the hotel the day before, in the midst of a crowd of soldiers who had apprehended him. The man was still formidable to his score of captors. His clothes had been torn off; his limbs were bound with cords; but he was struggling frantically to get free; and my informant described the figure and appearance of the naked, bound, writhing savage, as quite a model of beauty.

Walking in the street, this fellow had just before been struck by the looks of a woman who was passing, and laid hands on her. She ran away, and he pursued her. She ran into the police-barack, which was luckily hard by; but the Arnaoot was nothing daunted, and followed into the midst of the police. One of them tried to stop him. The Arnaoot pulled out a pistol, and shot the policeman dead. He cut down three or four more before he was secured. He knew his inevitable end must be death: that he could not seize upon the woman: that he could not hope to resist half a regiment of armed soldiers: yet his instinct of lust and murder was too strong; and so he had his head taken off quite calmly this morning, many of his comrades attending their brother's last moments. He cared not the least about dying; and knelt down and had his head off as coolly as if he were looking on at the same ceremony performed on another.

When the head was off, and the blood was spouting on the ground, a married woman, who had no children, came forward very eagerly out of the crowd to smear herself with it—the application of criminals' blood being considered a very favourable medicine for women afflicted with barrenness, so she indulged in this remedy.

But one of the Arnaoots standing near said, "What! you likes blood, do you?" (or words to that effect.) "Let's see how your's mixes with my comrade's." And thereupon, taking out a pistol, he shot the woman in the midst of the crowd and the guards who were attending the execution; was seized of course by the latter; and no doubt to-morrow morning will have *his* head off too. It would be a good chapter to write—the Death of the Arnaoot—but I shan't go. Seeing one man hanged is quite enough in the course of a life. *J'y ai été*, as the Frenchman said of hunting.

These Arnoots are the terror of the town. They seized hold of an Englishman the other day, and were very near pistolling him. Last week one of them murdered a shopkeeper at Boulak, who refused to sell him a water-melon at a price which he, the soldier, fixed upon it. So, for the matter of three-halfpence, he killed the shopkeeper; and had his own rascally head chopped off, universally regretted by his friends. Why, I wonder, does not his Highness the Pasha invite the Arnoots to a *déjeuner* at the Citadel, as he did the Mamelukes, and serve them up the same sort of breakfast? The walls are considerably heightened since Emin Bey and his horse leapt them, and it is probable that not one of them would escape.

This sort of pistol practice is common enough here, it would appear; and not among the Arnoots merely, but the higher orders. Thus, a short time since, one of his Highness's grandsons, whom I shall call Bluebeard Pasha (lest a revelation of the name of the said Pasha might interrupt our good relations with his country)—one of the young Pashas being backward rather in his education, and anxious to learn mathematics, and the elegant deportment of civilized life, sent to England for a tutor. I have heard he was a Cambridge man, and had learned both algebra and politeness under the Reverend Doctor Whizzle, of ——— College.

One day, when Mr. MacWhirter, B.A., was walking in Shoubra gardens, with his Highness the young Bluebeard Pasha, inducting him into the usages of polished society, and favouring him with reminiscences of Trumpington, there came up a poor fellah, who flung himself at the feet of young Bluebeard, and calling for justice in a loud and pathetic voice, and holding out a petition, besought his Highness to cast a gracious eye upon the same, and see that his slave had justice done him.

Bluebeard Pasha was so deeply engaged and interested by his respected tutor's conversation, that he told the poor fellah to go to the deuce, and resumed the discourse which his ill-timed outcry for justice had interrupted. But the unlucky wight of a fellah was pushed by his evil destiny, and thought he would make yet another application. So he took a short cut down one of the garden lanes,

and as the Prince and the Reverend Mr. MacWhirter, his tutor, came along, once more engaged in pleasant disquisition, behold the fellah was once more in their way, kneeling at the august Bluebeard's feet, yelling out for justice as before, and thrusting his petition into the royal face.

When the Prince's conversation was thus interrupted a second time, his royal patience and clemency were at an end. "Man," said he, "once before I bade thee not to pester me with thy clamour, and lo ! you have disobeyed me—take the consequences of disobedience to a Prince, and thy blood be upon thine own head." So saying, he drew out a pistol, and blew out the brains of that fellah, so that he never bawled out for justice any more.

The Reverend Mr. MacWhirter was astonished at this mode of proceeding : "Gracious Prince," said he, "we do not shoot an Undergraduate at Cambridge even for walking over a college grassplot. Let me suggest to your Royal Highness that this method of ridding yourself of a poor devil's importunities is such as we should consider abrupt and almost cruel in Europe. Let me beg you to moderate your royal impetuosity for the future ; and, as your Highness's tutor, entreat you to be a little less prodigal of your powder and shot."

"O Mollah !" said his Highness, here interrupting his governor's affectionate appeal, "you are good to talk about Trumpington and the Pons Asinorum, but if you interfere with the course of justice in any way, or prevent me from shooting any dog of an Arab who snarls at my heels, I have another pistol ; and, by the beard of the prophet, a bullet for you too !" So saying, he pulled out the weapon, with such a terrific and significant glance at the Reverend Mr. MacWhirter, that that gentleman wished himself back in his Combination Room again ; and is by this time, let us hope, safely housed there.

EXTRACT FROM "RIDE TO KHIVA."

(From Punch.)

INSTEAD of replying to so harmless a book as Captain Burnaby's, I subjoin extracts from the "Diary of my Ride to Khiva," from Mr. Burnand's clever *Punch* papers:—

"He thought he had better retain the horse with thankshi (*i.e.*, Tartar expression of gratitude). The horse will be of the greatest use to me. Note, crossed another river, or the same, the Oxus, I fancy.

"Met a Kirghiz man—a Kirghiz man is a sort of travelling butcher, who sells Kirghizzes (*i.e.*, Tartaric for carcasses)—the day after the one last mentioned.

"Met sixteen wolves to-day, all wrapped up in sheep's clothing to keep themselves warm. Tried Mr. Gladstone's name on them with excellent effect; have not seen them again.

"Wednesday.—Came up to fort number one. Found General Kauffman here taking care of number one. Gave Kauffman some lozenges for his voice. 'Kauff, man, no more,' said I, pleasantly, and he went into fits. I asked him if we should be stopped before we got to Khiva. He answered with considerable caution, and put his finger to his nose. The last thing I saw of the old General was his left eye, as he winked at us through a loop-hole in fort number one. Thermometer going down to twenty degrees below nothing.

"I was belated for one night and ran short of provisions, but—you know what a good legerdemainist I am—well, I made an omelette in my hat, drank a glass of Pommard (this sounds like something for the hair, but it isn't when properly pronounced) from the inexhaustible bottle, made an orange tree grow, took an orange for dessert, and went to sleep.

"12 mid-day.—Stopped to lunchski, as we call it in this country. The driver eats tallow candles and drinks wickski, a Russian spirit distilled from candle ends. A Russian never takes a bath, he always goes in for a dip. Came to a sign-post; examined it; found I had been for two days riding towards Persia. . . Met a Tartar gentleman on the road. He asked us to share his dinner with him, potski luckski, as they call it here. I hope to be dressed in kremlin, a peculiar sort of warm waterproof coat, and kopeck, a head-dress worn at night, when travelling through the snow and tied under the chin with a small moujik, a kind of leather thong with a silver clasp.

"Russian is spoken as read backwards, and takes some time to master.

"5.30. A.M.—Sleigh driver wrapped up in thick capes, five in number. Sleigh driver's boy up behind with buns to feed the wolves. This was a happy idea of mine, based upon early recollections of the Zoological Gardens. I never yet knew a wolf or a bear refuse a bun.

"One o'clock.—Time for lunchski preparations. Suddenly wolves appear within a mile of us. No lunchski—horrid thought! One o'clock must be the hour of the wolves' lunchski. Can the horse do it? The wolves! the wolves! Send cheque at once. This is my last appeal; forward it by my friend. If we can only give wolves a check.

10, night.—The Towers of Gladitzova in sight. Horse dropping! Children must be thrown over! Begun with sleigh-driver's boy. Sleigh-driver's boy suggests beginning with sleigh-driver. The wolves are within two hundred yards of us. It must be done! The sleigh-driver has five capes, a thick fur coat, and a whip. With the whip he can defend himself, and the wolves will be a long time before they can get through his capes, his boots, and at him. Wolves within one hundred yards. One wild cry—a struggle—it is done.

"3.30 P.M.—Distant mountains melted. First view of Khiva. See distinctly the name over the gate."

"PUNCH" ON ALLEGED RUSSIAN ATROCITIES.

Philo-Turk (triumphantly).—Aha! judicious and judicial *Mr. Punch*, what do you *now* think of the great atrocity question? Time for the St. James's Hall sentimentalists to shut up shop, eh?

Mr. Punch.—And why, my jubilant friend?

Philo-Turk.—Why? Hasn't Cossack cruelty quite put Bashi-Bazouk barbarity into the shade? Hasn't the Muscovite lamb proved himself a more sanguinary butcher than the Ottoman wolf? But, of course, *you* won't admit it. Party philanthropy is conveniently blind of one eye.

Mr. Punch (calmly).—As was shown when the accounts of the Bulgarian horrors were pooh-poohed as "coffee-house babble"—

Philo-Turk (eagerly).—Oh, that was before they were proved to be well-founded.

Mr. Punch.—Is the same desire to wait for proof shown in the same quarters now? Party spirit is always one-eyed, but it is the special business of *Mr. Punch* to keep both his eyes open.

Philo-Turk.—Then be so good as to cast them over these recent accounts of Russian atrocities, and tell me what you think of them.

Mr. Punch.—I have already done so. At the risk of raising your wrath, I must sum up my judgment, for the present, thus:—"Cases not parallel, and facts not proven." Nay, do not explode, and do not misunderstand me. If the Russians *have* rivalled the Turks in ruffianism, *Mr. Punch* will be the last to palliate or condone their unpardonable offence against humanity, honesty, and—policy.

My bâton falls with equal thwacks,
Whate'er their robes, on rascals' backs.

It has had occasion to fall heavily on Muscovite shoulders before now, and may again. But discrimination is not partiality. The incidental and unpremeditated horrors of a furious war do *not* afford a parallel to the deliberate brutalities of an inhuman rule. When it is shown that the Russian "atrocities" are parallel to the horrors of Bulgaria, not only in being bloody and bestial, but in being deliberate and unpunished—nay, *rewarded*—then *Mr. Punch* will have a word to say on the subject which even *PHILO-TURK* will not find feeble or apologetic. But until that is made clear to a candid judgment, *Mr. Punch* declines to greet every big-capitalled account of "Russian Atrocities" with a howl which smacks more of partisan triumph than humane horror.

Philo-Turk.—Pot and kettle, *Mr. Punch*—pot and kettle!

Mr. Punch.—Well, at any rate, "it was kettle began it;" and the Turkish kettle's denunciation of the Russian pot might come with better grace had it been preceded by recognition of his own yet deeper blackness.

Philo-Turk.—But at least you'll own the Russian has not a very clean record?

Mr. Punch.—He has not; and he is now suffering in public judgment for the blots on the pages of his past. It is the less necessary to make a case against him, as some seem so anxious to do. For that, plenty of materials are sure to be forthcoming when a semi-civilized power meets its hereditary enemy face to face, in defence, whether disinterestedly or not, of a subject race embittered and brutalized by centuries of oppression and outrage.

Philo-Turk.—But would the Russian make a better master of the Bulgarian than the Turk has made?

Mr. Punch.—In the long run probably he would—though, remembering Poland, and regarding popular opinion, it requires the courage of *Mr. Punch* to say so. The Russians are a growing and an improving people, sympathetic in race and religion with those they are fighting for. The Turk is effete, unimprovable, and an alien in religion and in race. But it is not a question of change of masters. It is because the action of Russia opens up to far-seeing men a prospect of emancipation beyond her own

purposes or desires, that lovers of freedom lean to her side in this particular issue. But if the self-appointed champion turn tyrant and butcher, be sure the butcher shall be denounced and the tyrant withstood.

Philo-Turk.—Ah, yes—when it is too late !

Mr. Punch.—The plausible reproach that raw haste is always hurling at the deliberation it mistakes for delay. To move in wild fear of danger before the summons of duty sounds is as unmanly, and may be as disastrous, as to lag when it sounds indeed.

Philo-Turk.—You think, then, it has not sounded yet ?

Mr. Punch.—It sounded one charge some time since ; but at the desire of those who are now so clamorous, was unhappily disregarded. At present it is silent. Trust *Mr. Punch* to catch the first notes of the alarum, and to echo it with all his vigour of lung and trumpet.

A FEW REMARKS ON THE ALLEGED RUSSIAN ATROCITIES.

WITH reference to the Polish atrocities, I have discussed the subject with sufficient fulness in the chapter headed "Poland from a Common Sense Point of View," and I have quoted the whole of what Mr. Gladstone has stated with reference to those with which Russia has been charged in Turkistan, and I need not, therefore, touch upon them here.

With regard to the alleged Russian atrocities during the present war, I have to remark that if one was not already accustomed to Turkish mendacity and recklessness, one would be startled by the audacity with which Aarifi Pasha pretends to have ascertained the exact number of Turks massacred by the Russians, for, whilst Mr. Baring could only estimate in thousands, the Pasha not only descends to hundreds or even tens, but even to one man, his figures being 4,763, to say nothing of those burnt in the mosque; but the *Daily Telegraph* of July 25th trumps even Aarifi Pasha, for it states "*the Bulgarian atrocities are as nothing compared with the desolation the Russians are causing wherever they make their appearance, or with the murderous slaughters of the old, young, and weak that follow in their footsteps.*"

The *Daily Telegraph*, which is well known as a sensational journal in the American style, conducted by Jewish proprietors, seems to think there is no bounds to the credulity of the public, and I would venture to suggest that even its imaginative powers are far exceeded by those of Dr. Kenealy, whose services would

be invaluable as an editor or correspondent with a fancy which can hardly be surpassed, since, while the *Daily Telegraph* only magnifies Aarifi Pasha's figures from 4,763 to the 20,000, which is the least number which can be deduced from Mr. Schuyler's report, the Doctor, as I have already stated, said that the English had massacred 4,000,000,000 of people, a number which would suffice to girdle the globe with about 180 parallel rows of human bodies, each touching the other, or a pillar 4,000 miles high, or 1,300 Mont Blancs piled on the top of each other; whilst, if the skulls were as thick and the hearts as hard as those of many of the Turcophiles, they would make the strongest road in the world, fit for the passage of the heaviest artillery.

Mr. Goschen said at Fishmongers' Hall, "Still less would he make a speech of blood and thunder (he might have added, 'of greased lightning'), because he was not a contributor to the *Daily Telegraph*" (so that whatever Egypt may be, Turkey is not a land of *Goschen*), and that newspaper, whose war correspondent probably well knew the meaning of Turkish backsheesh, should now assume the title of the "Munchausen Gazette," the "Derby Dilly Trumpeter," the "Anti-Gladstonian," or the "Blood and Thunder News."

If the Russian soldiery are so ferocious, it is very singular that the French never complained of Russian atrocities so far back as the French retreat from Moscow, and surely they have improved in humanity instead of degenerating since that time; on the other hand, the abominable and bestial cruelties of the Turcos in the Franco-German war are notorious, and it is probably on account of their unrivalled inhumanity that in the English Prayer-book we pray especially for Jews and Turks and name no other races. On the other hand, the Russophobes and Turcomaniacs in England apparently exclaim with Tom Hood's needlewoman in the "Song of a Shirt"—

" 'Tis oh, to have a slave
As well as the barbarous Turk,
Where woman has never a soul to save,
And tortured Christians work."

The first point which it is necessary for the Philo-Turks to establish is, that any atrocities were ever committed ; secondly, the extent and nature of these atrocities ; and lastly, that they were committed by the Russians and not by the Bulgarians ; for surely atrocities committed in revenge for previous massacres by the Bulgarians are less culpable than similar acts committed by the Russian soldiers, whose hearths and homes have not been destroyed by the Turks ; and the Russians cannot fairly have Bulgarian atrocities fathered upon them, any more than we should have been accountable during the Crimean War for any cruel acts performed by our French, Italian, or Turkish allies ; or than the French soldiers were held accountable for the horrible cruelties perpetrated by the Turcos on the German wounded in the Franco-German war.

The only accusation deserving of full credit is that contained in the telegram from the twenty representatives of the Press, dated Shumla, July 10th, 1877, in which "they declare they have seen with their own eyes, and questioned, at Rasgrad and at Shumla, children, women, and old men suffering from lance and sabre wounds, not to mention the shot wounds which might be attributed to the chances of legitimate conflict. These victims give horrible accounts of the treatment of fugitive Mussulmans by the Russian troops, and sometimes also by the Bulgarians. *According to their statements* the entire population of several villages have been massacred either on the roads or in the villages which were being pillaged. Every day more wounded people arrive. The undersigned declare that the women and children are most numerous among the victims, and that the wounds are lance wounds."

Now, the first reflection which occurs to one's mind is, that the Turks must be an arrant set of fools and cowards to have left their women and children in the lurch, instead of carrying them off, or, if that was impossible, remaining to protect them and share their fate, but this is only what one might expect from them, since the *Times* correspondent says, "After the battle in the Shipka Pass, the prisoners stated that the Pasha went away first,

and was soon followed by 10,000 men, all regulars; and that these positions, abandoned by the Turks, were so well fortified that the Russians could not help admiring their construction," so that a handful of really brave men might have held them against a much greater force than that of the Russians.

The newspaper correspondents in the first portion of their telegram say that the wounds were lance and *sabre* wounds, whilst at the close they say they are lance wounds, and this shows that they are not quite certain of their facts. One wonders also that they did not count, or at least approximately estimate, the victims; no one can form any idea whether only two men, two women, and two children were wounded, or whether there were tens, hundreds, thousands, or Dr. Kenealy would perhaps estimate them at millions, of victims.

The correspondents do not say whether the children were helpless babies, such as those the Turks toss on bayonets or rip out of their mothers' wombs, or were strong boys, such as those who may be observed in a woodcut of the *Illustrated London News* (of July 28) dragging up a Krupp gun to be used against the Russians; and of course it would be an atrocity if the Russian cavalry, by using the lance, compelled them to desist.

Referring to the Parliamentary Paper now before me, I find that Mr. Layard, our ambassador, the well-known thick and thin supporter of Turkey, whose appointment was characterised by the Turks as "a delicate attention," says that "the Porte states that above 1,000 Circassians were put to death, no quarter having been given to a force of Circassian cavalry that had been surprised during the night." I suppose, therefore, that Mr. Layard considers that the Turks have the sole right of killing their enemies in fair battle, whilst the Russians have the privilege of being killed. We then have the cloven foot of the "Daily Bellowgraph," confirming a report that from 1,000 to 1,500 of the inhabitants of Ardahan were massacred by the Russians, but Lord Derby says in his despatch, dated July 17, 1877, that the number killed was 800, and that they were killed, not by the Russians, but by the Lesghian troops in the Russian service.

The *Daily News* says: "It is not difficult to understand what are termed by the *Daily Telegraph* 'Russian atrocities.' The Turkish inhabitants of Bulgaria fall back on the advance of the Russians, carrying off, in a long train, not only their own flocks and herds, but the flocks and herds of their Bulgarian neighbours. Their retreating trains are surrounded by armed men to defend them. The Cossack cavalry, who scour the country, when they come up with these trains, call upon them to surrender their *impedimenta*. The armed Turks refuse, and then shots are exchanged, and a scrimmage ensues. Naturally, some of the women and children, who are in the waggons in the midst of the train, get hit; but—and I speak entirely without prejudice, and merely as an impartial looker-on—this seems to me to be the fault of the Turks, who, instead of surrendering their flocks and herds, and those of their neighbours that they have laid hands on, prefer to risk, not only their own lives, but those of their wives and children. If there is one rule of war more clearly established than another, it is, that the peaceful inhabitants of an invaded country must submit to the orders of the invaders, and that they must either refrain from hostile acts, or take the consequences of not refraining from them. This, the Germans, during the Franco-German war, had some difficulty in impressing upon the French peasantry. But, as the peasantry were intelligent enough to perceive the necessity of the distinction, they very soon honestly accepted it, and acted on it."

To show how the Turks deal with murderers, even when convicted and sentenced, I quote from the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, February 1, 1877:—"A French Consul having been assassinated by a subject of Abdul Medjid, the French embassy exacted the rigorous punishment of the culprit, who was apprehended and tried. The murderer was unanimously condemned to hard labour in perpetuity. Some days after, the secretary of the embassy, who had been assessor at the trial, making an excursion to Broussa, had the unexpected pleasure of meeting at the corner of the street a face which he recognised. It was that of the murderer, of whom the

penalty had been commuted, and whose hard labour consisted in going about freely wherever he chose. He had only killed a Ghiaour."

The *Times* states:—"Sir Arnold Kemball has telegraphed, 'Atrocities by Russians at Ardahan quite untrue,' and that part of the Russian forces at Bayazid were massacred after they had surrendered." Another *Times* correspondent says, "Here in a barn, covered with a little straw, we found the bodies of three people (Bulgarians)—a young fair-haired woman of about twenty to twenty-two, with a full round form and light golden hair in great masses all about her face and shoulders lying across the bodies of apparently two men, though it is possible there may have been more. It was an awful sight, and the story seemed self-evident. The men had been murdered first, and the woman, having first been ravished, had been thrown across their bodies. . . . The evidence convinced me that this massacre had been a cold-blooded, undeserved attack by the Bashi-Bazouks on the defenceless Bulgarians. To begin with, not one single Turkish corpse has been or apparently can be produced. . . . The General Selim Pasha said to the station-master, 'For God's sake, get those people away, for I cannot answer for my troops.' . . . It is painful to see the magnificent crops all ready for carting, left rotting in the fields for hundreds of miles. The terror is so great that they have not the heart to gather them in, besides which, every cart or waggon is away with fugitives."

It therefore appears that the Turcomaniacs in England have a far better opinion of the Turkish troops than that which is held by even the Turkish generals.

The Russian Ambassador writes to the *Times* to say that in the Schipka Pass the Turks, not being able to defend a position, hoisted the white flag. The Russians ceased firing and advanced, when they were received with a frightful and treacherous discharge of grape shot and musketry. The Turks then fled, and the Russians found a large heap of heads of their soldiers, who had been wounded, made prisoners, and then massacred and decapitated.

The correspondent of the *Times* with the Turkish army in Armenia writes:—"Of course, Turkish official accounts tell of the atrocities committed by the Russians, pillaging of villages, outrages on women, and slaying of children being freely attributed to the foe. I believe none of these things. I have now for the last week been following in the wake of the retiring Russian army, and can see no traces nor hear any reports of any such misdeeds. On the contrary, they appeared to have behaved with the greatest moderation and paid for everything they consumed. . . . I regret that now I have to place on record an act which reflects the greatest discredit on the Turkish commander. On the 3rd inst., two Karakapaks were seized by a Circassian patrol, they were taken up before the Muchir, quietly led to a secluded spot, and there by his orders shot and left to lie unburied on the bare hill-side. . . . I trust that all who did see the ghastly sight will place on record their detestation of the cowardly deed, so utterly opposed to all sense of justice, and so opposed to all military law. General Loris Melikoff said to me, 'Had we been at war with a civilized people, I would have written a letter to inform the authorities that I had left so many hundred wounded in such and such a village, and requested that their persons should be respected. But here it would be madness to trust them, and so I was obliged to retreat; otherwise, I assure you, I should have advanced, and by this time would have been before Erzeroum. In this way the Turks have a great advantage over us, which is totally one sided, for we, on the contrary, take as great care of Turkish wounded prisoners as of our own. For example, at *Ardahan* we found an hospital with 800 Turks. They were totally destitute of medical appliances, and, although my stores of bandages and medicines were insufficient for my own uses, I gave orders that everything should be divided impartially between the two nationalities.' "

The heroism of the Russian marine appears from the following circumstance, which also shows the utter worthlessness of the Turkish navy. The "*Vesta*," an ordinary trading steamer, with some mortars under the Russian Captain Basanoff, fought for five hours with a large Turkish ironclad with a twelve-inch cuirass, and

would probably have captured her if two other Turkish men-of-war had not come to the ironclad's assistance, when the "Vesta" escaped.

The *Stamboul*, Constantinople newspaper, of July 19th, calls attention to one flagrant case of fabrication (of Russian and Christian cruelties) which had appeared in the semi-official *Turquie* of the preceding day, and which was so badly put together as to bear internal evidence of falsehood; and these papers, for daring to deviate into truth, were soon after suspended by the Porte.

The *Times* correspondent at Constantinople writes:—"Atrocities-mongering goes on amongst otherwise perfectly honest men. They turn bewildered and disgusted from the mass of contradictory evidence presented to them, and, in despair, end in believing what naturally they are predisposed to believe, namely, pretty nearly everything that tells for their own party, and little or nothing that tells against it. Even official reports, written with the fullest sense of responsibility present or future, cannot always be trusted. Not that the writers, usually gentlemen, with a character and position at stake, have the deliberate intention to deceive, but either they approach the enquiry with a *parti pris*, or they have the sole or easiest access to sources of information from which they see only one side. Your readers will kindly remember that any Turkish atrocities must always arrive a week or so later than any Russian crimes, but in the provinces, where the officials control not merely telegrams but even letters of correspondents, none but Russian atrocities can be sent in any way, and the more of these the correspondent sends the higher the favour he enjoys, and the greater the facilities given him for moving from place to place and transmitting news. This had led in some instances to very ignoble bidding for official patronage and protection. I am told on perfectly trustworthy testimony of one correspondent (query, was this the correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph*?) who offered to send whatever the authorities liked. They might, if they so pleased, dictate his letters, if in return they would give him advantages not conceded to the rest of his professional brethren. Another correspondent stooped to the trick of altering a letter in-

tended for a London newspaper without the writer's knowledge, though of course with the connivance of the Turkish authorities, and presumably to curry favour with them. In this particular instance, the trick was detected through the mistake of taking into his confidence *a correspondent who happened to be a gentleman*; but how often it has been tried and succeeded in other instances there is no means of ascertaining."

The Karakapaks, who have committed some depredations in Armenia, are Mussulman bands living on Turkish territory, and for whose services the Russians pay only because they would fight against them. The Constantinople correspondent of the *Standard* attributes the alleged acts of cruelty and pillage to the Bulgarians and not to the Russians, whilst the correspondent of the *Cologne Gazette*, though that paper is ardently Turkophile, says, "The Russian soldier, in fact, is of a kindly disposition. He is under a discipline which of itself would restrain him from certain excesses. I have nowhere seen that Russian soldiers have given way to blamable excesses. As soon as the Russians enter into districts they establish order everywhere, and take the mosques under their special protection."

The *Times* correspondent with the Turkish army in Asia writes : "I do not know why some of the money collected in England for the relief of Turkish soldiers has not been diverted from the capacious maw of the European Turkish army to the far worse equipped 4th Army Corps (in Asia). Here the men have received no pay for two years, their rations are distributed with gross irregularity, and it is a very rare occurrence for the men ever to see meat. Thus on short commons, unable to purchase even the commonest necessaries of life, it is not to be wondered at that the unfortunate soldiers suffer terribly from sickness, and when once struck down, it is still less surprising that the death-rate is so high. I can only trust that, should the good people of England forward any sums of money to Erzeroum to be expended on behalf of the Turkish soldiers, they will annex as a condition *that it is on no account to pass through Turkish hands*."

"Last night a party of Circassians captured a Russian post bag,

containing some eighty private letters from officers present at the battle of Lewin. There is a great difference between the 5,000 killed and wounded of the Turkish dispatch, and the 790 of the Russian officers' letters. . . . Mr. Williams, who accompanied the staff of Reiss Ahmed Pasha, saw the Kurds busy opening the graves and despoiling the corpses of their clothes. A grave containing some Turkish bodies had been opened and the bodies disinterred. These were all clothed in uniform, showing that the Russians respect the bodies of their slain, and bury them with decency. On our (the Turkish) side, however, I regret to say that *both officers and men roam over the field*, stripping all the corpses, which are invariably buried naked. . . . The custom of despoiling the slain is openly sanctioned by authority."

A naval correspondent of the *Times* writes from Therapia : "I wish it to be understood that myself and two Europeans by whom I was accompanied failed to find the slightest trace of a massacre, either in our quarter or the other ; nor could the large bribe of a napoleon for any single corpse I could be shown purchase anybody who could earn it. I also went to the trouble with my interpreter of looking into every single waggon that was loading with refugees, and I spent nearly an hour with him cross-questioning them about it. Not a single man, woman, or child had a scratch to show, though naturally only too eager to do so."

Le Temps says : "The dead and wounded Russians who had fallen into their hands had been decapitated and mutilated. I saw yesterday the field of battle and the mutilated corpses. In spite of the general indignation, care is given to the Turkish wounded, and the Turkish ambulance of Kazanlyk has been scrupulously respected."

The *Times* says : "The Catholic Priests excite hatred (in Bosnia) against the members of the Orthodox Greek Church, and declare that the Mahometans are much nearer to them than the schismatical Slavs. They have succeeded, with the consent of the Turkish authorities, in organising a (Roman) Catholic legion, which has been provided with the uniform of the Nizam, and this evening this new levy has marched against the insurgents."

Mr. Layard is compelled to admit that "the captain of

H.M.S. 'Rapid' informs me that the Turks are withdrawing from the Dobrudscha. *Everything has been destroyed*, and the Christians are exposed to great outrages from Circassians and Tartars, *many being killed.*" Though *everything was wantonly destroyed, even their own property, by the Turks*, the Russians are subsequently accused of destroying what consequently did not exist. We have afterwards a telegram from Safvet Pasha (whose mendacity and incapacity were so great that he is now dismissed) to say that a Russian division, after burning some villages, "pitilessly killed *three* inoffensive women." There is no proof whatever of this fact, but the women may have been petroleuses or spies, or they may have fired at and killed Russian soldiers; and, after all, Turks who kill and torture women and children by the thousand should not be so squeamish about three women who were killed, but not tortured.

Our friend Safvet, who might appropriately be called "the Pasha of many Taels," a few days later narrates the awful and appalling fact that one inhabitant of a village, of which he does not even know the name, was killed in a skirmish, whilst five were taken prisoners, and that six other persons were afterwards slain, "whose corpses were afterwards subjected to horrible indignities;" but the Turks, instead of "tearing out the eyes" of corpses, pull them out of living men. Eight Turkish soldiers, he pretends, were afterwards beaten to death with sticks by the Russians, but this is not quite so painful or inhuman as the following fact, related by General Tchernayeff to M. Ristich:—

"The bodies of our wounded prisoners were found fastened to the ground by wooden pegs, their hands spread out, their feet and other parts of their bodies charred, their toes cut off, their stomachs mutilated by knife cuts, their countenances contracted by pain. The presence of the corpses of the Nizams prove that these atrocities are the work of regular troops."

The veracious Safvet (the same man who said at the Conference that he had not even seen the Andrassy Note, when it suited his purpose) adds that 1,500 families, which would be about 7,000 persons, from Soukhum Kale, who took refuge in the forests to

escape the barbarous treatment of the Russians, died of starvation. The Russians probably never knew of this emigration, nor where the people went; but they ought to be both omniscient, omnipresent, and omnipotent, and I suppose Safvet thinks they should have sent provisions for the 7,000 to the forests, and maintained them all till the conclusion of the war.

Safvet continues in another dispatch, when we have had a little time to digest the 7,000 victims, which was rather a large demand on our credulity, "Oustroudja and Kadisle have been plundered by the Cossacks, who massacred about thirty of the Mussulman inhabitants, without distinction of age or sex;" and subsequently, "some Cossacks . . . having come upon some Mussulmans . . . massacred them, without sparing the women and children." After the battues of the Turks in their Christian provinces, with all the delights of varied tortures, the slaughter of these probably imaginary victims, without any tortures, seems but tame.

Safvet should really get the *Daily Bellowgraph* correspondent to correct his telegrams, and, though they may not be true, they might at least be made consistent. On July 16th he says: "The inhabitants of Tems, near Tirnova, having taken refuge in the mosque at the approach of the enemy, were burnt alive within the walls. The enemy, having come upon 300 waggons filled with fugitive families, destroyed them with cannon shots, and then completed the work of extermination by massacring all, both men and women, that they could get hold of."

The reader will observe that the inhabitants were first of all burnt alive within the mosque; then they were apparently restored to life, I suppose, by a Mahometan miracle, and escaped in 300 waggons, which would probably suffice for the whole population before they had been burnt, and then the waggons, filled with fugitive families, were so cleverly destroyed by cannon shots that *all* of them remained to be afterwards massacred. This reminds me of an Irish story of a man who was accused of stealing a watch and, when placed on his defence, he said, first, he did not take it, and if he did he paid for it, and if he didn't it was of no value.

Vice-Consul Biliotte unmistakably intimates his opinion of the correspondent of a daily paper, in stating in reference to the reported death of the 1,500 families from starvation, "I had, a few days previously, heard the identical report, and *although my informant was an English officer*, on whose word all reliance could be placed, *still I did not feel justified, he being the correspondent of a daily paper, to communicate the news to your Excellency (Mr. Layard) before I received information on the subject also from other sources.*"

The Turkish commander at Utah Kilisse telegraphs :—"From the information received it has unhappily been ascertained that there were in the said church about ten corpses of Mussulmans and Christians, who had been killed some ten days before. . . . The Russians wounded the curé of the church, and, having put him in irons, wounded as he was, took him off with them."

This Turkish commander in some respects trumps even the practised Safvet, and his telegram is really creditable to a beginner in the art of fabrication. The Russians might possibly have killed some Mussulmans, but they never would have killed the Christians, nor wounded and carried off the curé.

The *Times* correspondent in Montenegro writes from Ostrog :—"Fort Rastrovatz, with a garrison of forty men, surrendered yesterday. The prisoners are well treated, and as soon as their fears of decapitation were quieted became very gay and contented, with no desire to return to the Turkish authorities. They are mostly Albanian Nizams, are unpaid, and were poorly fed."

The Turkish generals are such incapable and lazy dolts that the Sultan is obliged to employ as his commanders-in-chief renegade Christians—Omar Pasha in the Crimean war, and now Mehemet Pasha, a German.

The incautious Safvet on the 14th of July makes an admission which proves that the Montenegrins have never disgraced themselves to the full extent that some inventive writers have pretended. "*The Montenegrins who mutilated their prisoners always respected women and children.*" The mutilation of living prisoners here charged by Safvet is a wilful and malicious falsehood as is

shown by Consul Monson's reports, especially one in which he says, "*I am in a position to prove that the Turkish prisoners during their detention in Montenegro were treated with truly admirable humanity and generosity.*"

Having now gone through the Parliamentary paper, I shall proceed to quote from other authorities what they think of the so-called Russian atrocities.

As to the alleged Russian atrocities in Bulgaria, I quote the following observations from Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet:—"Among secondary, but still very weighty, reasons why we ought not to have left to the sole charge of Russia an European responsibility, was the high likelihood, to say the least, that in Bulgaria, at any rate, the operations of the war would be tainted with barbarity. It may have been observed that we have no trustworthy evidence to show that this contingency has been realised on the Russian side in the Armenian campaign; and, in that country, the war had not been preceded by any but the normal misconduct of the governing power. But, upon the south bank of the Danube, the land bristled with stinging and exasperating recollections. The Bulgarians are men, as I believe, of at any rate the average humanity of Christendom; but had they foregone every opportunity of retaliation after the frightful massacres of 1876, they would have been angels. For weeks past the Porte has published official accounts of cruelties inflicted on the Mahometan population; cruelties very far short of those which it had itself commanded and rewarded, but still utterly detestable. To these utterances, except by a few fanatics, little heed was given; for the world had learned, on conclusive evidence, that the arts of falsehood have received a portentous development in Turkey, and have become the very basis and mainspring, so to say, of Ottoman official speech. As late as on the 15th of July the correspondent of the *Daily News*—and the title is now one of just authority—declared his conviction that there had not then been a single case in Bulgaria of personal maltreatment of a Turkish civilian by a Russian soldier. I can hardly hope this is now the fact. While I have little fear that there has been, on the part of Russians, widely

extended cruelty, there must be among them, at least here and there, ruffians whom discipline will ill restrain; and we have also to bear in mind the diversity of races and civilizations in their army. The subject is one that calls for the closest attention. We have first to wait, as we waited last year, for a full exhibition of the facts; and then, without respect of persons, to estimate them as they deserve. Above all, we shall then have to observe, and honestly to appreciate, the conduct of the Russian Government in reference to proved barbarity. I have shown at large that the essence of the case of 1876 lies, not in the massacres themselves, but in the conduct of the Porte about the massacres; the falsehoods, the chicane, the mockery and perversion of justice, the denial of redress, the neglect and punishment of the good Mahometans, and finally the rewards and promotions of the bad, in pretty close proportions to their badness. If the Russian Government descends to the same guilt, I heartily hope it will be covered with the same, or more than the same infamy. But if it actively assists or boldly undertakes the detection of crime—it, above all, it inflicts prompt and condign punishment on the offenders, of whatever race or land they be—it will then have done all that such a woful case admits to clear its own character, and to vindicate the honour of Christian civilization.”

The correspondent of the *Graphic*, in describing the pillage at Sistova by the Bulgarians, adds:—“In justice to the Russian soldiery we should state that they took no part in these wanton outrages, but, on the contrary, immediately directed their efforts to stop the pillage.”

The *Illustrated London News* has a woodcut of the Russian General Zimmermann, who refused to accept the customary offer of bread and salt from the elders of Malchan, scolding the Bulgarians for destroying Turkish property, and of the Czar, with his own hands, distributing cigarettes to the Turkish prisoners.

From the *Daily News*:—“We do not blame Mr. Layard for telegraphing to Lord Derby a multitude of rumours, the truth of which he admits he has no means of ascertaining. One of the most prominent charges relates to the sinking of

some Turkish merchant vessels at Aidos and Amasra, and the cruel destruction of their defenceless, unresisting crews. According to the 'facts' as told in the dispatch to Musurus Pasha, torpedo launches had wantonly blown up three Turkish vessels without giving the sailors time or means to save their lives. The place, date, and circumstances of the affair were narrated, yet, according to our Consul-General at Odessa, the crews said to have perished were all landed on the Anatolian coast, or sent to Constantinople. . . . Our correspondent (with the Turkish army), who is near the scene of many of the alleged atrocities, and who is obviously no partisan of the former (the Russians and Bulgarians), chronicles no gross outrages committed by them. Their worst acts seem to be wrecking *the abandoned* Turkish quarters. He searched to little purpose in the reports for clear intimations as to the authority for the fouler charges. He found, as a rule, only vague, unsatisfactory references to 'trustworthy sources,' 'we hear,' 'it is stated,' or 'information was received.' . . . One of the few authorities whom he cites by name is the correspondent of a contemporary, which has been little distinguished by impartiality or accuracy of information. The reports, for the most part, are on hearsay and anonymous. The few telegrams from our Consuls do not speak of what they have seen. . . . Some of the charges are obviously unsusceptible of proof. . . . Moreover, 'the greater part of Turkey,' as Mr. Layard truly says, 'is in lamentable anarchy and disorder, and there is but little security for life and property.'

The *Times* says: "Our telegraphic intelligence contains an amazing list of the atrocities, which, according to the Porte, have been perpetrated by the Russians and Bulgarians. The report, which is signed by the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs, is a model of arithmetical explicitness. . . . The total number of the victims in one day's report is 4,763, besides those burnt in the mosque! The Porte can scarcely be surprised to hear that such a report does not quite comply with those troublesome rules of legal evidence which are found necessary in Western society. . . . After investigating for weeks the atrocities committed by the Turks,

Mr. Baring failed to come within sight of the statistical accuracy which Aarifi Pasha has reached in a few days, at a distance of 300 or 400 miles from the scenes of the infamies which he records. A little evidence would have been a valuable addition to his arithmetical exactness. . . . It is difficult to ascertain how the Porte could have gained so exact a knowledge of the massacres in other villages. Those places are in the hands of the Russians. All the Turkish officials must have been driven away, and it is hard to believe that the Cossacks would have furnished exact evidence of their own barbarities. The mystery is increased by the fact that these atrocities have not been described by the newspaper correspondents in Bulgaria, although these gentlemen have written some very unflattering accounts of the *acts of pillage committed by the Bulgarians and the Russians in the deserted houses of the Turks*. . . . It was not by vague reports or by the loose statements of Slavonic Committees that the indignation of this country was stirred against Turkey last year. Our own Consuls sent reports, which, although at first discredited as 'coffee-house babble,' turned out to be true. The American missionaries, the railway officials, and educated Bulgarians placed a mass of proofs before unofficial Englishmen and Sir Henry Elliott."

Although a British Consul has testified that the Turkish sailors whom the Turks asserted had been destroyed by the Russians are all alive and uninjured, the "West-end" are still incredulous, and they remind me of a story which O'Connell once told in the House of Commons. He said, "On one occasion I was counsel in Ireland for a man accused of murder. I produced but one witness, but that one witness would have secured the instant acquittal of the prisoner in any court in Europe; the witness was the man supposed to be murdered himself, yet the jury brought in a verdict of guilty," and this is precisely what the "West-end" are doing as regards Russia.

The disgraceful and insulting way in which Sir Arnold Kemball is treated by the Turks appears from the following paragraph from the *Times* correspondent:—"It is but a duty I owe to the English public that they should be informed of the very scant

courtesy our military *attaché* receives at the hands of the Turkish officers. Sir Arnold Kemball is too old a soldier, too tried a politician, and too deeply imbued with a sense of the extremely delicate nature of his mission, ever to let fall even a hint that he is dissatisfied with the treatment he receives; but it must, nevertheless, be galling to an officer of his position to be left without attendants, allowed to bivouack on the open ground, when even regimental officers carry tents, and to be not only kept in the dark as to the intentions of the commander-in-chief, but constantly misinformed as to the actual state of affairs. Attended by only his aide-de-camp and one Turkish orderly officer, Sir Arnold may be seen riding through the camp, making himself thoroughly acquainted with the real state of affairs; and, although attired in the uniform of a British general officer, he is rarely received with any marks of respect, and is still more rarely saluted by either officers or men; all day long in the saddle, at night sleeping on the bare ground, wrapped only in his cloak, sharing the rations of the Turkish soldier, and cheerfully putting up with privations that few of our generals would stand;" whilst as to their treatment of newspaper correspondents, I quote the Paris correspondent of the *Times*, who says, "Ahmed Ayud, the Turkish commander in Bulgaria, has expelled all the newspaper correspondents, and even the English and French military *attachés*, who have retired to Rasgrad;" and *Truth* informs us—

"The *Daily News* is coming to the front in its war correspondence. It has two correspondents with the Russian army in Bulgaria, each of whom has three aides-de-camp, who are themselves men of education, and able to collect news. Mr. Archibald Forbes, the well-known correspondent of the newspaper, crossed the Danube in the first boat. He wrote a telegraphic despatch of above 3,000 words, whilst standing in a swamp, which reached nearly up to his waist. This dispatch was carried over the river, and handed to a horseman, who rode with it to the nearest telegraph station. Besides these two principal correspondents, there are numerous others at all points where anything of interest is likely to occur. In Asia the *Daily News*

has four correspondents, and several in Turkey in Europe, who have to dodge about, and to conceal their occupation, because, were it known, they would immediately be turned out of the country. The Turkish authorities have taken it into their silly heads that they can bribe English newspapers to adopt the Turkish side, and to endorse Turkish lies, by only allowing the correspondents of pro-Turkish journals in the Empire. As the *Times* and the *Daily News* do not come under the category of such journals, the French viper, Blaque Bey, hunts down their correspondents, and when he does not dare to expel them, confiscates their telegrams and their letters. The details of the manœuvres of the correspondents of these two journals, by means of which they outwit the censorship of this renegade, would fill a volume. The system of the Turks is all the more foolish, because its consequence is, that no one believes a word of the telegrams and the letters published in pro-Turkish journals."

When the *Daily News* correspondent was ejected from Rustchuk, because the Turks do not approve of that journal, a Frenchman, who had resided some time in Turkey, was sent to the town, with directions to supply the place of the ejected one. So soon as the Turks learned what his mission was, he was arrested, taken to Constantinople, and imprisoned there. After a week of confinement, he managed to communicate with the French representative, who insisted upon his release. This was conceded with an ill grace, but he was ordered immediately to leave the country."

Colonel Brackenbury, the correspondent of the *Times*, M. Dick de Loulay, special correspondent of the *Monde Illustré* and *Moniteur Universel*, M. Lamothe, correspondent of the *Temps*, and M. Tellier, correspondent of the *Illustracion Espanole*, signed at Kesanlik, on July 21st, a declaration in the form of a Protocol, affirming that the Turkish regular troops had committed atrocities on the Russian wounded at the defence of the Shipka Pass on July 17th and 18th.

Colonel Wellesley says that he found twenty-seven wounded Mussulmans in a hospital in Biela carefully attended to by Russian

doctors and Russian ladies of the Red Cross. All these were found by the Russians in the neighbouring villages, and they one and all say *that they (the Mussulmans) were wounded by the Circassians* before the arrival of the Russians (*Daily News*, August 7th, 1877).

The *XIX. Siecle* of Paris says, "As for the atrocities of the Russians in Bulgaria, of which the English press make so great a noise, where the devil does it take them from? I am not aware of what the Russians may have done in Asia, at Ardahan, or at Bayazid; but I can affirm that on the banks of the Danube, from whence the Mussulmans—of whom the number is besides very limited—had in part emigrated, the Russians have respected those which remained and have treated as allies the Bulgarians and other Christians."

The *Times* correspondent further says, "When the *tirailleurs* came near the redoubt, pressing forward step by step, a large white flag was displayed, and signs were made by the Turks that they wished to surrender the redoubt without further fighting. At first the Russians doubted and hesitated to trust their enemy. But the white flag, which was advanced and waved, was so large a flag there could be no question as to its meaning. On that day, as on the day before, the gallant Major Liegnitz, of the Prussian staff, was with the skirmishers, not to fight, but to watch, and from his lips, confirming the story of the Russians, I have the following details. So confident were all in the evident purpose of the flag thus displayed, that he actually walked up to and entered into conversation with one of the Turks in the first line of skirmishers, and wished to go forward with those who passed on to receive the surrender of the fort, but was forbidden. As the men emerged from their cover as skirmishers and stood exposed and expectant, there came from the fort, first two or three shots, which might have been accidental, then one or two more, and, finally, at a given signal from both ends of the fort, a heavy volley, followed by a second. The *tirailleurs* recoiled for a few moments, but then recovered themselves and took the fort within a quarter of an hour. . . .

“This morning orders had been given for a renewal of the attempt by attacking the piece of road from both sides, and with the aid of artillery ; but a flag of truce came in from the Turks, and the officer who bore it was commissioned by the Pasha commanding to say that he could resist no longer, being in want of bread and ammunition, and would march his men to the Russian camp, there to lay down their arms if the Russians would promise not to attack. Strangely enough, the traitors of the day before were trusted again, and time was given them to execute their promise. But not a man showed himself ; and when General Gourko sent messengers up to ascertain the reason, it was found that these ‘gentlemen’ had pledged their military honour and broken their pledge. This and the abominable trick of the day before, worthy only of untutored savages, are enough to stamp with infamy the character of a nation whose Regular Army it was that did these things ; but how are the horrible deeds they had further committed to be described ? Can what we saw yesterday have been an ugly dream ? No ; it is only too terrible a reality. Let me only tell what the Staff saw as they rode up yesterday afternoon. Passing up the narrow winding road, with heaps of rough stones and boulders at every step, we came upon dead bodies of such as had fallen out of the power of the Turk. There they lay, with that expression fixed on their faces which came from their hearts at the moment when they fell. An officer told me of one case he had seen of a wounded Mussulman with smashed thigh lying on the ground. When the Russians came to give him help he writhed his body into a half-sitting position, then, with gnashing teeth and grin, like a savage animal, fired at and wounded an officer. In a moment Cossacks sprang forward and transfixed him with their lances, but the same savage expression of perfect rage and hatred remained on his face after death. His lips were drawn back over his teeth, his face wrinkled, his eyes, though dulled, yet wearing an expression of ferocity. But the dead killed in battle have often placid faces, for the warrior’s mind has turned to softer thoughts before nature fixed the last expression. Presently we are met by men carrying downwards on a stretcher the headless

body of an officer, and it begins to be told that this is not a solitary example. On the top of the pass the whole truth is told. The Turk, that 'gentleman' of English drawing-rooms, regularly enrolled in the army of the Sultan, well-dressed and well-fed on the savings of the Bulgarians and on English money—this creature, led by regular officers, has mutilated every Russian soldier that fell into his hands, dead or alive. . . .

"Returning towards the other, or eastern flank of the position, we pass a group of Turkish wounded—some fifty or so—whose wounds are being dressed and cared for as if that group of heads had never been seen. The men look afraid—as well they may, for they cannot believe that the Russians are less barbarous than themselves. They are most distinctly men of the Regular Army, well fed, well clad, driven by no pangs of hunger to commit crime, leaner and finer men than the little *tirailleurs*. But like most of their race whom one meets here, a retreating forehead and small cranium, with wandering eyes, give the impression of ferocity and cunning. A few paces further on is a circle of Russians—officers and men—gazing, fascinated, at a spectacle within. There, at last, are the bodies collected together for examination; all headless, some cut limb from limb, some treated in a manner which is universally regarded as the deepest insult that can be paid to the body of a man alive or dead. But were these men alive or dead when they were thus treated? With regard to some there may be a doubt, but with regard to others no doubt. Here was to be seen a body with wounded finger dressed and the rest cut off ruthlessly perhaps in struggling with the knife. There lay what was a man, in an attitude showing plainly that he had striven to save his throat; near him was another with the red cross on his arm having, perhaps, dressed the wounded finger of the first-named; one in the terrible exhibition lay with bared belly, slashed across with knives, and showing that blood had run from the wounds; another had been cut limb from limb. A young and well-shaped form, with clearer skin than the rest, had been beheaded and otherwise shamefully mutilated—but there was not a single wound of any description on his body produced by regular warfare.

These are only instances. The proof was all too plain. There lay men who had been wounded or unwounded prisoners in the hands of the Turkish 'gentlemen,' who had foully murdered and mutilated them, showing thus that they are savages as cruel as any in Africa or India. And but a few paces distant the Russian medical men were dressing the wounds of these savages, and soldiers standing round guarded them from all evil, even the righteous indignation which filled their own breasts. This was not a scene in a theatre. No one knew that a correspondent would be there, but the effect was such as no sensational tableau could produce. On the one side civilization, rough if you will, but still civilization based on the precepts of Christianity; on the other side barbarism and the worse than bestial ferocity of cruel men. What purpose could be served by such diabolical mischief? They would not hold out a day longer for it or obtain better terms. It was the ferocity with the slyness of the monkey or the idiot.

"In the few communications which the obstacles placed in my way have enabled me to make to you, I ask your readers to bear witness that I have at least endeavoured to be impartial. If there had ever been a doubt that my path was to be a thorny one, it was soon removed. The *Times* having taken an independent line in criticising the conduct of the evildoers here, was, with another English journal, on the black books of the authorities, and everything which a petty and childish system of persecution could devise was done to render the performance of their duties difficult, if not impossible, for the representatives of both newspapers. Telegrams were handed back days after receipt, because a word had been erased or altered, or because what should have been French was English, because the Turkish was incorrect, because they had been addressed to a private individual when they were intended as press communications, because they were addressed to editors when only communications to private persons were allowed (the regulations being altered every few days), because they were inexpedient, and because they had been stopped 'by order.'

"For a day or two before I left for the front (remember, at the

Bey's suggestion) there had been a very brisk business doing in Cossack atrocities. Humane man that he is, Tevfik's soul was moved at the inhuman doings of the Muscovs, and both he and his other self, Selim Effendi, were indignantly anxious that the English public should immediately have full details of all the butcheries and other foul doings which the different commanders, who were too busy to tell him anything about the fighting, found time to telegraph in harrowing fulness. I was informed that both gentlemen were grieved that I did not avail myself of their permission to telegraph these sad facts, but for reasons which even now appear to me sufficient I politely but firmly refused to do so. More than that, my last words on leaving to my deputy were, 'Remember, no Cossack atrocities unless you see and talk with the victims.' This was well known in Shumla, some of my colleagues having commented upon my scepticism in the matter. Now, will it be credited that, my back being turned, and my educated substitute being forcibly got out of the way, the telegram which I enclose was given to the elderly gentleman who had been so strongly approved as an agent for me by the Bey, with injunctions to attach my name to it and send it off to you immediately. They put their official seal on it, as you will see, and the good-natured old soul ran towards the telegraph office for fear it would be late. On the way, however, he felt a little nervous about forging my name, and called in upon a friend of mine to ask if he thought I should like it. The result of the interview was that he, to please the authorities, pretended to send it, but to please me did not, and here it is :—

" TO AUDITOR, 'TIMES,' LONDON.

" Bulgars in Balkans risen and murdered Jatva and Dobnitcha population. At Tchaily, near Rasgrad, 200 refugees from Sistova, Mussulmen, murdered by Russians and Bulgarians. At Ostrancha and Costova all Mussulmen killed, including women and children, refugees from Armoutton, all massacred. In town itself eleven women and ten children. Whole population of Uch Destin massacred by Bulgars. Russians took whole population of Beehpinar prisoners, violating the women.

" CONINGSBY.

When I wished to telegraph to you the fact that my deputy had

been arrested and my telegrams from the front had not reached you, the political agents blankly refused to allow me to communicate by telegraph at all; I might write. I did write a long letter—sixteen closely-worded pages, equal to two columns and a half; handed it in open, according to regulations, to be ‘glanced at.’ The same evening I received the following letter from Mr. Prior, special artist of the *Illustrated London News*:—

“Shumla, July 17, 1877.

“Dear Mr. —,—I have not the slightest objection to give you in writing the information that I saw — this evening reading and striking out passages from your letter to the *Times* at the house of Tefik Bey. If you open that letter, which is now sealed with Tefik Bey’s seal, you will find that very long passages have been struck out. As I tell you, I was asked ‘to be discreet,’ and consider that I am so in being loyal to you, as we have travelled together.

“I am, dear Mr. —, yours faithfully,

“MELTON PRIOR.

“Upon opening my letter upon its return to me officially sealed for the post, I found more than a fifth abstracted, cut away, and what was left had such extensive and thorough erasures that you would have thought I had taken leave of my wits to have sent you such an epistle. Every impartial criticism—in fact, everything which gave the letter any value—was so effectually inked out that it was impossible to read a word.

“Next I was credibly informed that my name had been attached to a sort of round robin or memorial to the world at large on the subject of the atrocities by Cossacks and Bulgarians, of which I had never even heard, the authorities well knowing that I was very dubious about such atrocities altogether, although I regret to say that since then I have had good evidence that some women and children have been wounded with lance thrusts; *but the victims who have come under my immediate notice admitted, under very sharp cross-examination, that the hurts were all got during the fight.* I hear of other cases at Rasgrad and elsewhere, but cannot speak for any but those at Shumla,” and *Truth* tells us that “this official whittling was performed by no less a personage

than the Hon. W. Drummond, censor of war correspondence in the Turkish service, and correspondent of more than one English journal !!!”

It is evident from the foregoing evidence from English, German, French, and other correspondents, that the humanity of the Russians is equal to their valour, and that no army of any nationality has ever conducted itself better; and few would have acted with the same noble and generous self-restraint under the provocation of the dastardly and ferocious cruelty of those human hyænas, the Turks.

Even if the accusations against the Russians were true, we should recollect that in the Peninsula, and especially at Badajoz, the conduct of our own troops was not always irreproachable, and we should not lose sight of our conduct in suppressing the Jamaica rebellion and the Indian Mutiny, as well as to the Dyaks of Borneo. With reference to the French, who have always claimed to be at the head of civilized nations, the late Colonel Sir John Cowell Stepney, M.P., who was in the Coldstream Guards, says in his published Diary:—“Were it not disgusting by its irreverence, it would have been amusing to see the *tricks they* (the French) *played with their own dead*, stowing them away in all conceivable places, enclosing them in large chests, placing them upright, in full uniform, in the recesses of houses and convents, tying them on to the top of windmills with their arms in their hands, pointed as if levelled at those who advanced, and worse than all, throwing them down wells. . . . While halting near the banks of the Alva, I found in a roofless house, which had been destroyed by the flames (by the French), a poor old man lying on his own threshold, shot through the body; a young woman, apparently *enceinte*, suspended by the neck to a beam, and a child of tender age lying at her feet with its throat cut. . . . Lord Wellington about this date wrote to Lord Liverpool as follows:—‘I am concerned to be obliged to add to this account, that their conduct (that of the French) throughout this retreat has been marked by a barbarity seldom equalled, and never surpassed.’ . . . The provost marshal

did his duty by hanging two British soldiers detected in the act of robbery."

The correspondent of the *Turcophile Cologne Gazette* writes from Kazanlik on the 21st July:—"Russian officers have related to me the acts of cruelty and atrocity committed by the Turks on the defenceless wounded. I must say that these deeds are perfectly true, since impartial correspondents, who have seen the corpses have entirely confirmed to me the assertions of the Russian officers."

The patriotic eagerness with which the Turks are ardently rushing to enlist in the Ottoman army is shown by the following letter in the *Times*, from "B.," dated from Ingatestone, Essex:—"I was in Jaffa on the 14th of July, and saw there 1,500 new recruits—the last reserve—who had been collected from the neighbouring towns and villages. *These men were driven to Jaffa manacled together in files of ten to twenty men. They daily curse the Sultan and his government.* A number of recruits escaped from their guards, but were recovered after a sharp fight, in which some were killed. . . ."

The Turcomaniacs, I may say on concluding this chapter, appear to say of the Turk what Montroud said of Talleyrand, "*Il est impossible de ne pas aimer cet homme : il a tous les vices.*"

SOME REMARKS ON BARON HENRY DE WORMS'
BOOK ON "ENGLAND'S POLICY IN THE EAST."
(Fourth Edition.)

THE French have a proverb that "in the kingdom of the blind the one-eyed are kings ;" and in the Cimmerian ignorance which prevails in Western Europe on the Eastern Question I suppose one must not give way too much to a feeling of astonishment that so flimsy and prejudiced a book as that of Baron de Worms should have been actually translated into French and German, should have reached a fourth edition in English of, I believe, about 1,500 copies in all, and should have been lauded by the Turcophile critics to the skies.

Baron de Worms, the rejected Tory candidate for a constituency which apparently has made a "Sandwich" permanently distasteful to him, since he did not solicit it again (though he told the constituency, joking on his own name, that trodden Worms would turn again), is, I suppose, an Englishman as well as a Jew, for he speaks of "a free country like *ours*," "*our* fleet," &c. ; but if so, he is precluded, I believe, by law, or at least by custom, from calling himself a baron without the permission of the Queen, which is seldom, if ever, given ; and one is curious to learn what right he can have to the particle "de" before his name, unless indeed he is the hereditary feudal superior of the town of Worms, which possesses nearly 15,000 inhabitants. *Truth* tells us that the price of a Roman dukedom is about £2,500, but I suppose baronies are quoted low, especially in these hard times ; and one wonders that Hebrew barons do not become as common as Frenchmen

decorated with the Legion of Honour. The eccentric Mr. Walrond, whose will was recently disputed, was a Spanish marquis, and I know of many other Englishmen who have foreign titles, but who content themselves with a simple Mr., and these mushroom financial barons without baronies should remember the lines which were current last season in London :—

Kings may grant titles,
Honour they can't ;
A title without honour
Is a Baron Grant.

His book is merely a dull pamphlet (for, to quote an old pun, he is not a *Jew d'esprit*) of 91 pages, of one single chapter, which, if it was printed in the same type as my work, would occupy about 60 pages. The remainder of the book, other 94 pages, is mere padding, consisting of the following undigested materials, pitchforked into the appendix apparently at random :—1. The Treaty of Paris. 2. The Andrassy Note. 3. The Berlin Memorandum. 4. Lord Derby's Despatches. 5. Colonel Sir H. Havelock on the Importance of Constantinople, with the latter half against Turkey omitted. 6. Table of the Population, Trade, &c., of each of the Powers Concerned in the Eastern Question. 7. Table showing the Religious Creed and Population of each of the Nationalities of the Ottoman Empire. There is, besides, a notice to this fourth edition of eleven lines, a coloured map, and what the author calls an index, but which is, in fact, a repetition of the marginal titles, whereas an index should be alphabetical.

In short, the book is a device for making the public pay a considerable sum for what in reality would be a Jew's bargain at the smallest coin in the realm ; and this Jew's harp does not give forth one single melodious note.

It would require the same number of pages which Mr. Worms has taken to expose the numerous errors in fact and statistics of this volume, and the utter fallacy of his borrowed and often-refuted arguments, and I have only time, space, and inclination to remark upon the more prominent ; indeed, to quote a well-

known saying, he seems to "have drawn upon his imagination for his facts, and upon his memory for his arguments."

This veracious and accurate author tells us that "our exports to the former country (Turkey) amounted last year to nearly £13,000,000, while to Russia they were only £3,100,000." Now the fact is, as appears by the "Annual Statement of the Trade of the United Kingdom with Foreign Countries for the Year 1876," which now lies before me, that the entire value of the exports of British, foreign, and colonial produce not only to Turkey properly so called, but to Wallachia and Moldavia, Egypt, Serbia, Tripoli, and Tunis also, was only £9,933,204, and to those parts of Turkey which are not tributary, but directly governed, only £6,379,962, or less than half what Mr. Worms pretends.

Again, our exports of British, foreign, and colonial products to Russia in the same year were no less than £8,635,655, being £2,255,693, or upwards of 35 per cent. more than to the directly-governed portion of Turkey, and nearly three times as much as this author, with astounding recklessness, in his blind, ignorant, and foolish hatred of Russia, pretends.

In a succeeding passage our author tells us that Montenegro was "encouraged to make war upon their Suzerain;" but as appears by the Blue-books on the Turkish Question, Austria and most of the Great Powers have never recognised the suzerainty of the Porte over the chivalrous Montenegrins, who have for centuries resisted this preposterous claim.

Our author next favours us with his advice, not gratis, but for the small sum of five shillings, which is the price of his work, and which is also the usual fee of similar quack doctors, but not of the Jew chiropodists, who, when you have only one corn, pretend to extract several, which they conceal in their hand, and then charge as many guineas as they can extort; and he asks us "whether we should not wage a second Crimean War with the same objects as the first, *the Bulgarian atrocities notwithstanding?* . . . That England should quietly look on while Russia is establishing herself in a position from which she may at any moment swoop

down upon our communications with India, would simply reduce our country to the position of a vassal of Russia, depending for its prosperity and comfort on the good pleasure of the Czar." These observations, the reader will observe, do not refer to the annexation of Constantinople, but to the establishment "of a species of police intervention in Turkey;" and if the Christians of Turkey were thus very inadequately protected from Turkish tyranny, England, it seems, may expect national bankruptcy, and our population will lose their roast beef and plum-pudding and other comforts. He adds, "England should make war against Russia directly the Russian troops cross the Danube." However, even our bungling Ministry have been wiser than our author, and have not converted the Danube into a Russian Rubicon at the instigation of this second Solomon.

Mr. Worms, after a tirade of abuse of the Russians, a little farther on, in one of his rare lucid moments, admits, "We know that the Russians as a nation do not yield to any in humane and philanthropic feelings."

We have afterwards an account of the conduct of the Russians in Poland, taken from the letters of the *Times* correspondent at Vienna, but these reports were merely from hearsay and chiefly from anonymous Polish sources, and are obviously grossly exaggerated, one illustration of which is that a magistrate rejoicing in the euphonious name of Swiderski says, "The Imperial troops, after killing four insurgents, whom we buried, murdering my daughter, and wounding my son-in-law, killed six servants of the household (their names are given). *The above were first castrated, and then twice stabbed with bayonets.*" Now, it is not likely that all the six servants were men, and it would therefore seem that the women-servants and the daughter were subjected to the operation which it has been hitherto supposed can only be inflicted on an Abelard, and not on an Heloise. It is a pity that Swiderski, when shooting with this remarkably long bow, did not add that one of the men-servants who was with child was ripped up, which would have given a novel and finishing touch to the picture.

Even Bashi-Bazouks usually kill the men first, and if they

have had insufficient sport they then violate and kill the women ; but Swiderski's (should it not be Swill-whisky, as he evidently sees double ?) Russians *began*, according to his account, with bayoneting the daughter, and only wounded the son-in-law. In the first clause of this cock-and-bull story Swiderski says, "The soldiers entered, killed my daughter with *two* bayonet stabs, wounded with *two* shots my son-in-law, and began to plunder." In the second clause he tells a totally different story, for the soldiers, instead of beginning by killing the daughter, first began by killing four insurgents, and at the end they killed six servants, whom he had forgotten in the first account, whilst the plundering is suppressed and the castration is added. It will be observed, too, that by a singular coincidence every one of the persons killed was *twice* stabbed with a bayonet, none of them having been stabbed more or less than twice ; and that whilst in the first clause the son-in-law is said to have been wounded with *two shots* (Swiderski is evidently partial to that number), the last clause says that he was *stabbed twice*.

Again, it is said the Russian soldiery *readily obeyed* the instructions they had received to bury the prisoners and the wounded with the dead, so that the Baron's authority—at the distance of about 350 miles as the crow flies from Vienna to Warsaw—knew not only everything that was done, but even the feelings and inclinations of the individual Russian soldiers. Like the Deity, he could read the heart.

The author shows his intimate acquaintance with the opinions and feelings of the Croatians, Bohemians, and Moravians by stating, contrary to the most convincing evidence, that they "have no sympathy with Russia ;" whilst nothing can possibly exceed the enthusiasm which they have openly displayed in favour of that country, as appears from the articles quoted by me from the regular *Times* correspondents, and not from anonymous writers to that or any other journal.

He then says, "The suggestion that she (Italy) would take advantage of a war between Russia and Austria to seize the Trientino can only be regarded as a libel on the honesty and

sagacity of her statesmen. . . . Such an attempt would be a piece of base treachery that would bring down upon the new Italian kingdom the reprobation of Europe."

I hold the very opposite opinion; and if Austria foolishly and selfishly attempts by force of arms to prevent Russia from enfranchising the Christian serfs of Turkey, after having nobly emancipated her own, I trust Italy will make common cause with Russia, in which case she would be justly entitled, if victorious, to insist, as a condition of peace, not only on obtaining the Trientino, but all the Italian-speaking portion of Austria, including 633,000 souls; and Austria would run considerable danger of being deprived of her German provinces by Germany, who would no doubt side with Russia, especially if that country offered her the whole or a portion of the German-speaking provinces of Russia.

I have now to remark that the author of this precious volume speaks "of the so-called atrocities" in Bulgaria. Well, I am not surprised at such a description of these massacres from a Jew, for after all they sink into as utter insignificance in comparison with the atrocities committed by the children of Israel on their invasion of Palestine as a day's shooting on Salisbury Plain would be in comparison to one on Lord Stamford and Warrington's best preserves; and as Gibbon informs us, the Jews massacred no less than 460,000 individuals in Cyprus and Cyrene alone, besides, probably a much greater number in Egypt, or in all most likely upwards of a million of persons. This beats the Turks hollow.

I come now to Mr. Worms' Table of Population, &c., and I have only had time to undertake the dreary task of verifying his statistics respecting Russia and Turkey. All of those which I have thought it worth while to cite, with three exceptions, are grossly inaccurate; and I have no doubt that if any one had leisure to examine the rest they would prove equally apocryphal.

I now give Mr. Worms' statistics, for which he cites no authority, with the correct figures, taken from the *Almanac de Gotha* of this year.

STATISTICAL TABLE.

1.—The Statistics of the Russian Empire, from the *Almanac de Gotha*, are placed above, those of Mr. Worms below.*

	Population.	Revenue.	Imports.	Exports.
	86,586,000	£76,688,400	£64,817,500	£59,372,500
	86,586,000	£71,347,250	£58,925,000	£53,975,000
Diff.	<u>Nil.</u>	<u>— £5,341,150</u>	<u>— £5,892,500</u>	<u>— £5,397,500</u>
	Public Debt.	Army in Time of Peace.	Army in Time of War.	Total Navy.
	£244,074,883	565,277	1,358,557	196
	£301,197,498	837,853	1,789,571	124
Diff.	<u>+ £57,122,615</u>	<u>+ 272,576</u>	<u>+ 431,014</u>	<u>— 72</u>

It will be observed that whilst the revenue, exports, imports, and navy are enormously underrated, the debt and army are prodigiously overrated. It is quite clear that the figures have been got up to injure Russia without any regard to correctness.

2.—Statistics of the Turkish Empire from the same source.

	Population.	Revenue.	Imports.	Exports.
	24,833,400	£19,106,352	£18,500,000	£10,000,000
	28,500,000	£21,494,640	£18,500,000	£10,000,000
Diff.	<u>+ 3,666,600</u>	<u>+ £2,388,288</u>	<u>Nil.</u>	<u>Nil.</u>
	Public Debt.	Army in Time of Peace.	Army in Time of War.	Total Navy.
	£197,159,022	157,667	586,100	165
	£200,954,420	154,376	629,736	97
Diff.	<u>+ £3,795,398</u>	<u>— 3,291</u>	<u>+ 43,636</u>	<u>— 68</u>

As anyone might have anticipated, the statistics are cooked to favour Turkey, as the others were contrived to injure Russia; and as there is a balance of no less than £8,000,000 against Turkey on the exports and imports—whilst Turkey does not, like England,

* The Rouble is taken at 2/9, which has been the average for the last ten years, whilst it varies in exchange from 2/ to 3/2 $\frac{3}{4}$.

buy any considerable amount of foreign bonds, &c.—or nearly one-half the whole, it is clear that she is on the road to financial ruin.

It would be a waste of my own and my readers' time to analyze the whole or even any considerable portion of these ludicrously inaccurate statistics, but I will select a few as specimens.

Mr. Worms estimates the Servians at 3,027,067 (no round numbers here), whilst the fact is, according to the *Almanac de Gotha*, there are only 1,871,800; he fixes the number of the Bulgarians at 4,800,000, whilst the same authority says 1,860,500; and the Greeks at 2,000,000, whilst Mr. Bianconi states that there are 6,600,000.

Mr. Worms appends to his book (for I cannot call his specious romance a work) some of the opinions which the press have given respecting it.

The *Morning Post* is most enthusiastic, for it calls the book "a perfect handbook to the question of the day, which should be in the hands of everybody. . . . Its pages contain not only valuable arguments and excellent suggestions, but are a perfect storehouse of information culled from books, diplomatic documents, and newspapers. . . . In a word, all who wish to make themselves masters of the political situation ought to study and keep by them this valuable and ably written compendium." Now I have already shown that the imagination can hardly conceive greater statistical inaccuracy than characterises this book; but as Jenkins, the oracle of the fashionable world, says that Mr. Worms has produced a "perfect" handbook in what is equal to 60 pages of my work, whilst with the utmost possible condensation I have been unable to do so in upwards of 500 pages, I may mention that the only individuals and works whose words he very briefly quotes are the following—Mr. Ashworth, Freeman, Lord Derby, Mr. Forster, Mr. Gladstone, the *Times*, Schuyler, Kauffman, Golovatchef, the *Nabat*,* Captain Burnaby, Mr. Lowe, Lord Palmerston, the Andrassy Note, the Berlin Memorandum, the Treaty of Paris, the *Pall Mall Gazette*, Mr. Cyrus Hamlin, the *Manchester*

* Query, the father of Jeroboam, who made Israel to sin, returned to earth in the shape of the "Wandering Jew."

Guardian, General Fadeef, Swiderski, and Sir H. Havelock, being 22 authorities in all, whilst I have quoted about 280 ; and the only additional names which are even mentioned in the text are Mr. Baker, Mr. Bright, Mr. Baring, Sir A. Buchanan, Count Beust, Count Schouvaloff, Sultan Mourad, Napoleon III., Lord Odo Russell, Lord Beaconsfield, the Pope, Consul Holmes, Dr. Cumming, Sir A. Loftus, and Sir H. Elliott, being 15 in all. The *Pall Mall Gazette*, after the intense appreciation of the *Post*, rather damns our author with faint praise ; but the *Globe*, which turned its coat some years ago, says "it is a work which fairly ranks high among the best that have appeared on the Eastern Question ;" whilst *Lloyd's Paper* talks of this pamphlet as "a solid volume ;" the *Hornet*, perhaps a descendant of those which drove two kings of the Amorites out of Palestine, calls it "a splendid defence of the policy of the Government, full of new and instructive information ;" and the *Whitehall Review* calls it "the most complete handbook and guide to the Eastern Question." If this is true, the Russians, whatever they may think of their friends, are most fortunate in having the feeblest opponent who could possibly be found, and the blows our author administers are as little injurious to them as those which are administered by clowns at a fair with bladders full of wind. In short, as in a recent song, our author seems to sing, "I'll strike you with a feather ;" indeed, the blows are scarcely so hard as those which a better-selected feather than his goose-quill might inflict.

O ye descendants of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, if this trumpery book is all you can produce in support of that Anti-Christian cause to which you have always entertained such inveterate and uncompromising hostility, the Pro-Christian and Russophile party have nothing whatever to fear ; and O ye already quoted incapable, ignorant, prejudiced, and pretentious critics, go to school and learn geography and statistics before you presume to discuss the Eastern Question again ! As far as I am concerned, as you have praised this Worms' England's Policy, I hope you will abuse my Defence of Russia, for I regard "your praise as censure, and your censure praise." I can imagine

that when a work so ridiculously puffed as that which I am criticizing appeared in Russia, the Czar must have trembled, and been inclined to sue for terms, fearing that if he performed so base and immoral an act as freeing the Christians in Turkey, for which no vermifuge would avail, like Herod, he might be eaten with Worms till he died, and that after death he would be sent to that place where their Worms die not, and their fire is not quenched.

LORD R. MONTAGU'S "FOREIGN POLICY AND THE EASTERN QUESTION."

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU, after being a considerable time in labour, has been confined of a work called "Foreign Policy and the Eastern Question." Until his book appeared the public was not aware that "*thirty-eight generations of Christians have quarrelled and hated and rustled off into eternity.*" Surely a large majority of Christians do not quarrel, but agree to differ, and do not hate each other, especially those of their own creed, though they may look with pity or contempt on those who hold opposite opinions to their own. Hitherto one was under the impression that the majority of Christians die noiselessly, but where Lord Robert or his friends have been present, it appears that in the great majority of instances there has been a rustling noise which I wish he had more particularly described.

We are then told that "Russia claims to found the great empire of the Slavonic race which spreads from the Elbe almost to the Himalayas and from the *gelid* sea of the north to the sultry Persian Gulf—a Pan-Slavonic Empire of 550,000,000 souls, with its centre in Constantinople."

Now, the fact is that the Russian Government has never been in favour of Pan-Slavism, nor of conquests towards what Lord Robert has christened the *gelid* sea, and which perhaps, on account of the number of a transparent fish he has seen there, he calls jelly-ed.

As to figures, Lord Robert has completely trumped Baron Henry de Worms in portentous ignorance and exaggeration, for

a Pan-Slavonic Empire would include, as he will find on looking at Haydn's "Dictionary of Dates," page 663, only 90,365,633 Slavonians in Europe, besides some in Asia, whilst this master of the long bow estimates them at 550,000,000, or about half the population of the globe; in fact, if we add the population of Japan, Siam, Burmah, the Chinese Empire, and India to Lord Robert's imaginary Slavonic Empire, and deduct the total, which is about 1,238,000,000, from the entire population of the globe, which is 1,228,000,000, there will remain for the other races, populations, and nations of Europe, and for the whole of Asia, Africa, America, and Australasia, 10,000,000 *less than nothing!*

We are next informed that the Pope ought to be the "supreme interpreter of the moral law" between nations, and "from his decision there can be no appeal." I should doubt if the Slavonic or Chinese Empires, when they have swallowed up the other nations of the world, would be willing to accept the Pope as supreme judge, but if they did, after the world had been thus divided, his duties would be comparatively easy.

I trust the reader, if he is not already asleep, will lend me his ears, or rather his eyes and understanding, while I quote the following, which I promise him shall be one of the last specimens of Lord Robert's bathos and rhodomontade:—

"Events never happen, they are done (*sic*). [The reader who has paid 14s. for this unique work will, perhaps, consider himself done.] Events are the effects of mind. [The fire of London, for instance, may have been caused by the operation of the mind of the reigning Pope brooding over the heretical state of England.] It is a change of maxims which produces a new course of conduct. [This seems rather a truism, for if our opinions are changed, it is probable our course will be altered; for instance, when Lord Robert Montagu became convinced of the errors of Conservatism and Protestantism, he very naturally crossed the floor of the House and became a pervert.] National sympathies, expressed though they be in the droning of platforms and twaddle of quidnuncs, have nothing to do with that which is done."

Until the world was enlightened by Lord Robert, we had supposed that national sympathies and antipathies had a great deal to do with events. For instance, when Belgium was fighting for its independence against Holland, France illustrated the truth of this paradoxical statement by sending an army to help the Belgians, and now Russia is incurring a colossal debt and sacrificing tens of thousands of lives to liberate the Christians of Turkey from the intolerable yoke of the Ottomans. I quite admit, however, that if Lord Robert means himself as one of the individuals alluded to in the "droning of platforms and twaddle of quidnuncs," what he said or wrote would "have nothing to do with what is done;" on the contrary, what is done would most certainly be the very reverse of what he recommended.

Here comes an enigma almost as inexplicable as the Sphinx: "The secret will and the veiled thoughts of a few men unsuspected in their aims and unknown as to their power, are the causes of every historical movement. There is a multitude throughout all nations, who form a secret band of diplomatists and warriors, and who are strictly united in carrying out the subversive aims which these men in secret devise." This momentous sentence—this Socratic utterance—contains an original discovery made by Lord Robert, on which the fate not only of England, but of the world depends. How strange that 658 members sitting on the same benches of the House of Commons have, in their blindness, not even yet discovered in the person of Lord Robert a guide, a prophet, and the saviour of society.

Lord Robert can fathom the secret will, and unmask the veiled thoughts of those who are at the same time "a few men," and "a multitude," and "a secret band" of diplomatists and warriors who are banded together to carry out their subversive schemes. The world has hitherto doubted whether secrets of any kind known to several men can be kept inviolate, and one would like to know whether it is through spiritualism or by what other means that Lord Robert has obtained exclusive information, so "important, if true." I would fain hope that, in pity towards his countrymen, though they are heretics in his opinion, he will reveal

the names of some of the "multitude of diplomatists and warriors" who are the wire pullers of society. We had thought in our ignorance that such men as Napoleon, Bismarck, Peel, and Gladstone had some trifling influence on the course of events; but it appears we are mistaken, and it is hard, ungenerous, and unpatriotic to keep us in ignorance of the volcano on which we are standing, the pitfall from which Lord Robert alone can save us.

Is it really possible that the author of this ultramontane and foolish rhapsody can suppose that any sane man will give fourteen shillings for such trash? If there was in England, as in France, a *conseil de famille* in his case, and I was a member, I have no doubt as to the course I should pursue. His book reminds me of an amusing passage in a work of the late witty Captain Marryat, called "How to Write a Fashionable Novel." Arthur Ansard is forced to write to pay his tailor, and his friend Barnstaple assists him thus: "The Honourable Augustus Bouverie no sooner perceived himself alone than he felt the dark shades of melancholy ascending and brooding over his mind, enveloping his throbbing heart in their—their adamantine chains. Yielding to this overwhelming force, he thus exclaimed, 'Such is life! We require but one flower and we are offered noisome thousands; refused that we wish, we live in loathing of that not worthy to be received. Mourners from our cradle to our grave, we utter the shrill cry at our birth, and we sink into oblivion with the faint wail of terror. Why then should we ever commit the folly to be happy? ("Arthur, hang me, that is a poser!") Conviction astonishes and torments; destiny prescribes and falsifies; attraction drives us away, humiliation supports our energies. Thus do we recede into the present and shudder at the elysium of posterity.' 'Arthur, I have written all this down, but I cannot understand, upon my soul, one word of it.' Barnstaple: 'If you had understood one syllable, that syllable I should have erased.' "

In the case of Lord Robert's book there is no fear that from such a cause any syllable would require to be erased.

“THE JEWS THE IMPLACABLE FOES OF THE
CHRISTIANS.”

CAPEFIGUE tells us that Napoleon complained that the English press did him more harm than all the armies of Europe; and most unfortunately, by reckless puffing, by unprecedented mendacity, an unlimited command of money, and by other unscrupulous means, the Jews have contrived (often under changed or assumed names of Christian sound) to monopolise a very large portion of the newspapers, not only of England but of Europe. These Jews are wolves in sheep's clothing. Roman Catholics, Greeks, and professors of other religions do not degrade themselves by owning and editing newspapers ostensibly not only Christian but Protestant; but the “Wandering Jew” will do any mortal thing for a consideration.

As it is quite evident that the nucleus of the Turcophile party and its most rabid element consists of the race of Shylock, and that it will be no fault of theirs if the British nation is not hounded on to a dangerous and disgraceful war, without allies, with our oldest and best ally, Russia, in aid of the unspeakable Turks, on the pretence, not of justice—for what are justice and mercy to Shylocks?—but of imaginary British interests, I now proceed, lance in rest and vizor up, to tilt at the irrepressible Jews past and present.

Now that morally I draw the sword against them I fling away my scabbard; I pass the Rubicon, and burn my ships *vestigia nulla retrorsum*; and, as I shall give them no quarter, I ask and expect none in return.

I have already in another chapter severely criticised Baron Henry De Worms' book on (the Jews' notion of) "England's Policy in the East," which simply means a war with Russia to avenge the real or fancied injuries of the Jewish race, on the convenient principle that we should find the blood and money—or, rather, borrow the latter from these monopolist usurers,—and that they should reap all the profit on the footing of heads I win, tails you lose. Mr. Worms, in his book, which palms off on the reader mosaic gold instead of the sterling metal, but which is perhaps after all "worth a Jew's eye," tells us that there are three millions of Jews in Russia; and he complains that only a very small number are allowed to settle in St. Petersburg—that they are not allowed to own land, and of various other grievances. The baron is apparently fond of round numbers, for he has added nearly a quarter of a million, or ten per cent., to the real numbers of the Jews in the Russian empire; but to people accustomed to usury at 100 to 200 per cent., as appears from the authority I have already quoted to be the case in Turkey, a trifling exaggeration of a quarter of a million is hardly worth mentioning.

As the whole number of Jews throughout the world, according to Balbi, is only six millions, I must say I heartily condole with Russia in having nearly half that unsocial and undesirable race in their, in this respect, unfortunate empire, for the fair share with which they might expect to be afflicted, in proportion to the population of the globe, would be only about 400,000, so that they have more than seven times as much as their just Jewish burden; whilst in Turkey in Europe, where, our author tells us, the Jews receive "the contemptuous toleration of the Turk"—like *Maw-Worms*, they apparently like to be despised—out of a population of 8,477,214, only 75,165 are Jews; so that it seems that where they say they are oppressed they have increased so as to form one twenty-seventh of the Russian population, and where they are leniently treated they form only 1 in 113; consequently either oppression suits them better than toleration, or the story of their oppression is false.

I certainly do not wonder that Russia, seeing that the Jewish flood mounts so high, under present circumstances does not afford that nationality any further encouragement, and that they especially admit but few money-lenders into St. Petersburg to ruin their upper classes, and prevent them from acquiring land, lest, as in the case of England in the time of Roman Catholicism, an enormous proportion of the land falls into their hands, and the poor peasantry are financially bled to death.

To enable the reader to judge what sort of a people the Jews really are, I will now give a slight sketch of their career from the earliest period to the present time.

In reading Genesis, one is surprised to observe that Abraham, with more discretion than courage, told King Abimelech that Sarah was his sister and not his wife (and Isaac adopted the same course), the result being that the king took Sarah as his wife, Abraham thus ensuring his own dishonour. Then we have the story of Jacob taking advantage of his brother's hunger to extort from him his birthright, and afterwards, with his mother's assistance, defrauding him of his blessing. Jacob then cheated his father-in-law out of his sheep, and went off with his household gods. He, however, does not seem to have been a connoisseur in the female sex, since when Laban brought Leah, who apparently was ill-favoured and had sore eyes, to Jacob as his wife, he did not find out that she was not the attractive Rachel till next morning, and Rachel seems to have been very accommodating and free from jealousy, since she handed over Bilhah to Jacob as his concubine, whilst Leah bribed him to be with her by a present of her son's mandrakes.

We have afterwards an abominable act of cruelty and treachery committed by Jacob's sons, Simeon and Levi, towards the Hivites. Shechem had seduced Dinah, daughter of Jacob, and though he was willing to marry her, they induced the Hivites to circumcise themselves, and when they were sore, they killed them all ruthlessly and stole all their goods.

Reuben seduced his father's concubine, and Judah had two sons by his daughter-in-law.

All the sons of Jacob, except Reuben, wished to slay Joseph, but their Israelitish avarice prevailing over their blood-thirstiness, they sold him into slavery in Egypt. As to Joseph, he does not seem to have been remarkable for affection for his old father—who was only distant a four days' journey (I have travelled the distance myself on a camel in that time), and who was evidently devotedly attached to him—since for twenty years he never sent to inquire after him, or even told him that he was alive, and left his blind father a prey to the most agonizing grief.

When the years of famine came in Egypt, Joseph, like a true Shylock, took the whole of the money of the Egyptians, then their cattle, and lastly their lands; and this is hardly compensated by his conduct in the affair of Potiphar's wife, who very likely was not tempting, and perhaps was even repulsive.

We now come to the blessing bestowed on his sons by Jacob, in the course of which he compliments Issachar by telling him that he is “a strong ass,” whilst “Dan shall be a serpent in the way, an adder in the path;” and one cannot resist the evidence which points to the conclusion that there must have been an enormous number of marriages between the tribes of Issachar and Dan and the tribe of Judah; and one is at a loss to guess which of these alliances was most frequent, in other words, whether the asinine or serpentine types most prevail among the Jews.

The Israelites, who are always complaining of oppression, do not seem to have been so badly off in Egypt, since at the time of the Exodus they took away “flocks and herds, even very much cattle,” and the good-natured Egyptians were silly enough to lend them “jewels of silver and jewels of gold, and raiment,” which the Israelites wilfully stole, and we are afterwards told that they wished to return, and regretted not the dry bread and hard fare, but “wept for the flesh-pots of Egypt,” and Dathan and Abiram spoke of Egypt as a land flowing with milk and honey.

I come now to consider some of the enactments of the cere-

monial law by which the "Peculiar People" are still bound. If a man is lame, blind, or mutilated in a particular way, from no fault of his own, he is excluded from the congregation. If money is lent to a poor person, no interest is to be charged. Unless one is much mistaken, the Jews entirely disregard this precept. The sacrifices were to be performed by Aaron and his sons, morning and evening, *for ever*. This is not done by the Jews either in Jerusalem or anywhere else, though neither Turkish or English law prevent it, so I suppose the present century in their opinion is beyond the period meant as "*for ever*." Then, the males were to go up to Jerusalem so many times a year, but even the wealthiest and strongest of the Jews seldom if ever go there.

The Jews are commanded to eat no fat, and of course no lard, dripping, or gravy, and to carry out this injunction it would be necessary for the rich Jews to dismiss their French cooks and have cooks of their own persuasion.

Moses, we are told, sprinkled Aaron and his sons with oil and blood, which must have had rather an unpleasant appearance, and I propose to visit a synagogue to see if this is still done.

Aaron, who made a golden calf, and induced the Israelites to dance before it stark naked, seems to our modern ideas rather an unsuitable choice for a High Priest, and certainly if the Archbishop of Canterbury was to act in the same way, he would not only lose his archbishopric, but would be driven for ever with ignominy from the Church.

The Israelites are further told that a garment or a house may be infected with leprosy, and if after being closed for seven days the leprous spots had spread they were to destroy the garment or house. Do they observe this regulation?

Then the 10th, 15th, and 23rd days of the seventh month were to be kept *for ever* as sabbaths, and there was to be a sabbatical year, but this law does not seem to suit the present generation of Jews, nor the regulation that they should not wear dresses containing a mixture of linen and woollen, and to put fringes of blue ribbon on their garments *for ever*.

When the Jews plant fruit trees, the fruit for the first three years is to be considered uncircumcised, and shall not be eaten in the fourth year; and this being so, anyone might go down to any Jewish country seat, and have an abundant supply of delicious fruit. The Jews are again told to cut boughs from trees, and dwell in booths seven days; but I have never observed any of them following out this precept.

In the seventh year they were not only not to sow or prune the vineyard, but the grapes were to be for the stranger, so that any poor person who requires the grape cure can easily try it gratuitously; and I hope, unless the grapes are sour, they will send me some in return for my writing this laudatory chapter.

The Israelites are further prohibited from lending money on usury, that is at interest. How then do they justify the fact that they are the most notorious usurers in the world?

The Israelites, however, are allowed to eat locusts, beetles, and grasshoppers, and John the Baptist seems to have been particularly fond of the first of these. As there seems to be a redundant and miserable population of Jews in Russia, the Czar might humanely export a large number to America to grow fat on the Colorado beetles, which are inexhaustible, and the farmers there would certainly make them welcome for that purpose at any rate.

In Numbers viii. we learn that all the gold and silver offered by about two and a-half millions of Israelites to the Lord at the dedication of the altar by Moses was only £510, or less than one-fifth of a farthing each, so that they can hardly be considered to have been then very liberal or pious.

When the Israelites, under Moses, conquered the Midianites—one of whom Moses had married—without the loss of one man, he ordered them, after slaughtering all the adults, to kill all the male children and all the women who were not virgins, which was done.

It appears that the Israelites in the wilderness did not pay much respect to the Mosaic law, since, from Joshua v. 2, none of the Israelites who were born during the forty years they

wandered in the wilderness were circumcised ; but Joshua caused this painful and dangerous operation to be performed on the whole of the males.

In the appalling history of the Israelites, as related in the Old Testament, we learn that in a very brief period they destroyed no less than thirty-one nations with their kings, exterminating men, women, and children, and even destroying the houses, which they might have occupied themselves, and in many cases even the cattle and sheep, and the very fruits of the earth.

Their barbarities, however, were not perpetrated solely on the ancient inhabitants of the land, who had never done them any wrong, but even on their own countrymen, for we read that the Gileadites killed 42,000 flying Ephraimites, merely because they said, "Ye Gileadites are fugitives of Ephraim among the Ephraimites and among the Manassites."

And, again, to quote only one more among innumerable examples, we are told that a certain Levite took a concubine, who was a woman of bad character, whom he, however, valued apparently all the more, and went after her when she had deserted him to bring her home from her father's house, where she was. They seem to have had a very pleasant time of it at the residence of the concubine's father, who invited them to "lodge here that thine heart may be merry." The Levite having taken a lodging in Gibeah, "the men of that city" beset the house, desiring to commit an unnatural crime on the Levite ; and as not one of the men of the city is excepted, this vice must have been very general, not to say universal, in Israel. To avoid this outrage the man of the house obligingly offered his virgin daughter and the concubine of his guest as prostitutes, "but the men would not hearken to him ;" so the Levite took his concubine and with cowardly cruelty brought her forth unto them, "and they knew her and abused her all the night until the morning." When the man came to his house he showed his affection for his concubine and his humanity thus : "he took a knife and laid hold on his concubine and divided her, together with her bones, into twelve pieces, and sent her unto all the coasts of Israel." When she was immoral

of her own accord he appreciated her; when he compelled her to submit to violation, he killed her! The children of Benjamin having been summoned by the other tribes of Israel to deliver the people of Gibeah to be all put to death (for a rape which time would not have permitted them all to perpetrate between night and the time "when the day began to spring"), and who were numerous enough to send 700 *chosen* men to battle left-handed besides, one would suppose, a much larger force of chosen men who were, as is usual, right-handed, and those who were not chosen, and having refused to permit so excessive a punishment, no less than 400,000 exactly, without any odd numbers, came up to do battle against 26,700 Benjamites, which appears at first sight rather an unnecessary force—like using a hammer to break an egg. However, the Benjamites, at the end of the first day's battle, gained a complete victory, and destroyed "down to the ground" of the Israelites that day twenty and two thousand men. The second day Benjamin destroyed, "down to the ground" eighteen thousand men; all these "drew the sword," so that I suppose others, such as camp followers, were destroyed who did not draw the sword. Thus in two days the Benjamites had killed 40,000 men exactly, besides camp followers, &c., without any odd fractions of a thousand, being half as many again as their total numbers.

The third day the children of Israel at last were victorious over the plucky Benjamites, and killed no less than 25,000 men, whilst 600 fled into the wilderness; consequently they could only have lost, at the utmost, 1,000 men in fighting against and killing 40,000 men on the two first days. Not content with the pretty severe lesson they had given the Benjamites, "*the men of Israel turned again upon the children of Benjamin, and smote them with the edge of the sword, as well the men of every city, as the beast, and all that came to hand; also they set on fire all the cities that they came to.*" As the Israelites found that there came none to the camp to massacre the Benjamites from Jabesh-Gilead, they utterly destroyed the whole of the inhabitants of that city, saving only 400 virgins; but for some inexpli-

cable reason, though they thought themselves bound to exterminate all the other Benjamites, they saved the 600, who were on the rock Rimmon, and advised them to commit another rape of the Sabines on the daughters of Shiloh to get wives, which the men accordingly did, and almost the whole of the Israelites were continually relapsing into the idolatrous worship of Baal and other gods, so that in the time of Ahab the Lord said, "*I have left me seven thousand in Israel, all the knees which have not bowed down unto Baal, and every mouth which hath not kissed him.*"

Time and space will not permit me to make many further remarks on this part of Jewish history, but one cannot forget the unnatural conduct of Jephthah, in murdering his innocent daughter on account of a foolish and wicked vow, which it was a sin—not to violate, but to perform; the treacherous conduct of Jael, the wife of Heber the Kenite, who murdered Sisera, the guest, whom it was her duty to protect if she chose to receive him; the dastardly murder of King Eglon by Ehud, one of their judges; that of David, who caused Uriah to be slain, and then married Bathsheba, the widow of a Hittite, contrary to the Mosaic law; and that of Solomon (who also married a stranger, the daughter of Pharaoh, King of Egypt), of whose wisdom we find few traces in any of the books which are attributed to him, which should contain 3,000 proverbs and 1,005 songs,* and who strangely enough wondered at "the way of a man with a maid," since with doubtful wisdom he encumbered himself with a harem of 700 wives and 300 concubines, mostly strangers, not one of whom apparently was a maid, or why did he enter-

* It is strange that chapter x. of Proverbs begins with the words, "The Proverbs of Solomon," as if the preceding nine chapters were not by him, though they contain those most generally read. Chapter xxx., again, contains the words of Agur, the son of Jakeh. Chapters xxv. to xxx. are proverbs of Solomon, which were not copied out till the reign of Hezekiah; and chapter xxxi. contains the words of King Lemuel, who must have been a heathen monarch. It is remarkable that Solomon says, "All the brethren of the poor do hate him, how much more do his friends go far from him?" so that apparently charity and family affection did not exist among the Israelites. We are told, too, that "the plowing of the wicked is sin," and it is no doubt well that we

tain this wonder? and as his duty of marriage to each wife was not diminished, his obligations exceeded the labours of Hercules.

Abijah mercilessly slew half a million of the Israelites, which is about two hundred times the number of English slain at the famous battle of Waterloo; and Pekah, the King of Israel, returned the compliment by slaying 120,000 of the men of Judah.

I now propose to consider the conduct of the Jews to our Saviour, from a Jewish point of view. All dispassionate persons, including those who reject Christianity, must admit that the life of Christ, even if He is considered as a mere man, is the noblest that has ever illustrated humanity. He went about doing good, healing all manner of diseases, and uttering the most original and sublime precepts of morality and religion which have ever been uttered; and even the Jews themselves were so impressed by His unparalleled merits that when He rode into Jerusalem "a very great multitude spread their garments in the way, others cut down branches from the trees and strawed them in the way. *And the multitudes* that went before and that followed, cried, Hosanna to the Son of David, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord! Hosanna in the highest. And when He was come unto Jerusalem *all the city was moved*, saying, Who is this? And the *multitude said*, This is Jesus the prophet of Nazareth of Galilee." And we are further told that *all Jerusalem and all Judæa* went out to John the Baptist, and were baptized confessing their sins, and yet John told them that Christ was the Messiah. They must, then, have believed him, or else, if John falsely asserted that Christ was the Messiah, why

should be informed that, "Where no wood is there the fire goeth out," and that "the earth is disquieted for an odious woman when she is married." It appears that Solomon had the worst possible opinion of the Jews, for he says, Eccles. vii. 27, 28, "Behold, this have I found, saith the preacher, counting one by one, to find out the account: which yet my soul seeketh, but I find not: one man among a thousand have I found; but a woman among all those have I not found." A race of men which contains only one good man in a thousand, and not a single good woman in its entire female population, must indeed be at the very bottom of the scale of humanity.

were they baptized by him? So that it is false to say that the Jews never recognized Christ as the Messiah.

No doubt afterwards Christ irritated the Jews by telling them that they had made the Temple "a den of thieves," reminding them that the prophets, whom they professed to venerate, had been sanctified by the process of killing and stoning. He also exposed the spurious religious pretences of the Pharisees and scribes who "devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers. . . Ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made ye make him tenfold more a child of hell than yourselves. . . Ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men, for ye neither go in yourselves nor suffer ye them that are entering to go in. . . Ye fools and blind. . . Ye blind guides which strain at a gnat and swallow a camel. . . Ye are like unto whited sepulchres, . . full of dead men's bones, and all uncleanness. . . Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can you escape from the damnation of hell?" In fact, their chances of eternal salvation seem infinitesimally small, since the Book of Revelation says that only 12,000 of the Tribe of Judah were "sealed."

The Jews, irritated at these and other home truths, bribed Judas Iscariot to betray Jesus, and this villain treacherously did so with a kiss; they then capture Him at night for fear of the people, and on bringing Him before Caiaphas, the High Priest, for judgment, they suborned a number of witnesses to swear falsely against Him, but none of them agreed together, and nothing was proved. Caiaphas then, with an utter disregard of what in civilised countries is considered fair play, adjures Christ to say whether He is the Christ, and on His stating this to be the fact He is sentenced to death, and then spit upon and buffeted. Now supposing that, according to the opinion of the Jews, He was not the Messiah, at least He was a benevolent and irreproachable man, far superior even to Howard the Philanthropist, who would not have been executed in any other country than Judæa, if he, for instance, had imagined himself, as others have done, to be the Christ; especially if, as in the case of Jesus,

He never obtruded His claims to the Messiahship, but only mentioned them when urged to do so.

That the trial of Jesus was not only a mockery of justice, but even a violation of the Draconian Jewish law, appears from what Mr. Innes, in his "Trial of Jesus Christ," in the *Contemporary Review*, remarks:—"We read in the oral law the saying of Eleazar, the son of Azarias, that 'the Sanhedrin, which so often as once in seven years condemns a man to death, is a slaughterhouse.'" Mishna treatise Mackboth.

Yet the Jews not only condemned but executed Jesus for doing good, and two thieves for mere stealing, in one day. The oral law which existed in the time of Caiaphas is precisely the same as that which was afterwards, about A.D. 200, reduced to writing in the Mishna. Dupin, the great French advocate, says that "Annas was not a magistrate, and certainly that would add to the irregularity of interrogating the accused." The Mishna says, "The latter (capital trials) are commenced only in the day time, and must also be concluded during the day. . . . They may be concluded on that day if there is a sentence of acquittal, but *must* be postponed to a second day if there is a condemnation. And for this reason capital trials are not held on the day before a Sabbath or feast-day." The crucifixion of Jesus took place, as has scarcely ever been doubted, on the Friday, the day before a Sabbath, which was also a high-day, and the meeting of the Council took place on the same Friday morning. Such a meeting on such a day was forbidden. . . . In no case was such a rule so absolutely necessary to justice as when the accused, arrested after nightfall, had been put upon his trial by daybreak, without the least opportunity of summoning witnesses for his defence. One of the strangest sights the world has ever seen must have been the adjuration or solemn address to the witnesses who came to speak against the life of Jesus, by the magistrate, who had, no doubt with perfect sincerity, held it expedient that one man should die for the people—(they had got Barabbas, the robber, to execute, but preferred the luxury of murdering Christ). The evidence is overwhelming that at repeated meetings of what the Fourth

Gospel even calls a Council, and which may have been formal meetings of the acting committee of that body, the suppression, and, if need be, the death of Jesus, had been resolved on. As to the lawfulness of the High Priest's adjuration to Jesus, and the consequent sentence to death, Maimonides says, "Our law condemns no one to death upon his own confession;" and Bartenora states, "It is a fundamental principle with us that no one can damage himself by what he says in judgment."

Christ is then brought before Pilate, the Roman Governor, who acquitted Him, saying, "I am innocent of the blood of this just person: see ye to it," but wickedly and weakly handed Him over to the cruel and bloodthirsty Jews, who said, "His blood be on us and on our children;" and it has been and will be on them till they repent of their atrocious conduct to the being whom the Christians look upon as God, and whom they cannot deny (for even Mahomet acknowledges the fact) to have been at least the holiest and best of men. The Jews then scourged, insulted, and tormented Him, spat on Him, put a crown of thorns on his head, made Him, while fainting with pain, bear the cross till He broke down under its weight, crucified Him, and mocked Him even in his last agonies. Can it be wondered at that there is a gulf which can never be bridged between the Jew and the Christian?

It may be alleged, however, that the generations of Jews who succeeded that which crucified Jesus were less unjust and inhuman; but the lion can no more change his skin or the leopard his spots than the Jews can lose their distinguishing characteristics both of appearance and disposition; and even to this day the hook nose, the shambling gait, and the peculiar accent of the race are unmistakable.

If a colony of negroes had been introduced into England a thousand years ago, and had continuously intermarried, as the Jews have done at the present day, they would not have changed an iota, but would have had the same black skin, woolly hair, and thick lips. Neither has the Jewish type or the gipsies, who are supposed by some to be the lost ten tribes of Israel, altered, which may be seen in one of *Punch's* recent woodcuts of two vendors of

"Old clo'," who congratulate themselves that through the war, though many thousands may be killed and wounded, old clothes will be cheap. Gibbon's imperishable work on the "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," moreover, shows us that the Jews during the Middle Ages, so far from amending and becoming humanized, became immeasurably worse; and from this splendid monument of learning and genius I extract the following passages:—

"The Jews, who under the Assyrian and Persian monarchies had languished for many ages the most despised portion of their slaves, emerged from obscurity under the successors of Alexander The sullen obstinacy with which they maintained their peculiar rites and unsocial manners seemed to mark them out a distinct species of men, who boldly professed or who faintly disguised their implacable hatred to the rest of mankind.

"Nota.—Dum Assyrios penes Medosque et Persas Oriens fuit despectissima pars serventium.—*Tacit. Hist.* v. 8.

Tradidit arcano quæcunque volumine Moses,
Non monstrare vias eadem nisi sacra colenti;
Quæsitos ad fontes solos deducere verpas.

"The letter of this law is not to be found in the present volume of Moses. But the wise, the humane Maimonides openly teaches that if an idolator fall into the water a Jew ought not to save him from instant death.

"The former (the Sadducees), selected from the most opulent and distinguished ranks of society, were strictly attached to the literal sense of the law of Moses, and they proudly rejected the immortality of the soul as an opinion that received no countenance from the divine book. . . . The doctrine of the immortality of the soul is omitted in the law of Moses.

"From the reign of Nero to that of Antoninus Pius, the Jews discovered a fierce impatience of the dominion of Rome, which repeatedly broke out in the most furious massacres and insurrections. *Humanity is shocked at the recital of the horrid cruelties which they committed in the cities of Egypt, of Cyrus, and of*

Cyrene, where they dwelt in treacherous friendship with the unsuspecting natives; and we are tempted to applaud the severe retaliation which was exercised by the arms of the legions against these fanatics, whose dire and credulous superstition seemed to render them the implacable enemies, not only of the Roman government, but of human kind. The blind superstition, the abject slavery of those unfortunate exiles (the Jews) must excite the contempt of a philosophic emperor, but they deserved the friendship of Julian by their implacable hatred of the Christian name. The barren synagogue abhorred and envied the fecundity of the rebellious church; the power of the Jews was not equal to their malice, but their gravest rabbis approved the private murder of an apostate.

“Their (the Jews’) obstinacy converted his (Mahomet’s) friendship into implacable hatred, with which he pursued that unfortunate people to the last moment of his life, and in the double character of an apostle and a conqueror his persecution was extended to both worlds. The Kamoka (a Jewish tribe) dwelt at Medina under the protection of the city. He seized the occasion of an accidental tumult, and summoned them to embrace his religion or contend with him in battle. ‘Alas!’ replied the trembling Jews, ‘we are ignorant of the use of arms, but we persevere in the faith and worship of our fathers; why wilt thou reduce us to the necessity of a just defence?’ The unequal conflict was terminated in fifteen days, and it was with extreme reluctance that Mahomet yielded to the importunity of his allies and consented to spare the lives of the captives. But their riches were confiscated, their arms became more effectual in the hands of the Mussulmans, and a wretched colony of 700 exiles were driven with their wives and children to implore a refuge on the confines of Syria. . . The Jews had excited and joined the war of the Koreish. No sooner had the natives retired from the ditch than Mahomet, without laying aside his armour, marched on the same day to extirpate the hostile race of the children of Koraidha (Jews). After a resistance of twenty days they surrendered at discretion. They trusted to the intercession of their old allies of

Medina; they could not be ignorant that fanaticism obliterates feelings of humanity. A venerable elder to whose judgment they appealed pronounced the sentence of their death; 700 Jews were dragged in chains to the market place of the city, they descended alive into the grave prepared for their execution and burial, and the apostle beheld with an inflexible eye the slaughter of his helpless enemies. Their sheep and camels were inherited by the Mussulmans; 300 cuirasses, 500 pikes, 1,000 lances composed the most useful portion of the spoil. . . . The chief of the tribe at Chaibar (a Jew) was tortured in the presence of Mahomet to force a confession of his hidden treasures.

"If the justice of Tarik protected the Christians, his gratitude and policy rewarded the Jews, to whose secret or open aid he was indebted for his most important acquisitions. Persecuted by the King and synod of Spain, who had often pressed the alternative of banishment or baptism, that outcast nation embraced the moment of revenge; the comparison of their past and present state was the pledge of their fidelity, *and the alliance between the disciples of Moses and of Mahomet was maintained till the final era of their common expulsion.*

[No wonder, then, that when the Spaniards banished the Moors they got rid of the Jews also.]

"In Cyrene they (the Jews) massacred 220,000 Greeks; in Cyprus 240,000; in Egypt a very great multitude. Many of these unhappy victims were *sawn asunder*, according to precedent, to which David had given the sanction of his example. The victorious Jews devoured the flesh, licked up the blood, and twisted the entrails like a girdle round their bodies (see Dion Cassius, l. 68, p. 1145)."

No wonder, after Gibbon's account of the Jews, that race has always been either despised or hated in all ages and by all nations and all religions, except, perhaps, the modern Greeks, for reasons which it is not difficult to divine.

The massacres of Cyrene and Cyprus, perpetrated by the Jews, included 460,000 victims, besides a very great multitude in Egypt; probably, therefore, they murdered about a million

of human beings, or a greater number than the rest of the human race have ever killed of their unsocial and vindictive race. In comparison with these atrocities those of the Turks even sink into insignificance, for including the massacres during the Greek war of independence at Chios and elsewhere, those of Damascus and Syria, the Bulgarian atrocities, and all the other abominations of the Turks, do not amount either in number or in horror to the conduct of these Shylocks and Fagins, who devoured the flesh and drank the blood of 460,000 Greeks, besides their Egyptian victims, and made girdles of their entrails!

It may be said that I have related events which took place many centuries ago; but that the Jews retain in recent times the same savage ferocity which formerly distinguished them, appears by the following fact, which took place on 21st April, 1821.

“One of the principal causes which hastened the ruin of the Turkish Empire was the murder of Gregory, Patriarch of Constantinople, a revered prelate 80 years of age, who was seized on Easter Monday as he was descending from the altar where he had been celebrating divine service, and hanged at the gate of his archiepiscopal palace, amidst the ferocious cries of a vast crowd of Mussulmans. The blameless life and exemplary character of this prelate, the proof of fidelity to the government which he had recently given by his proclamation against the insurgents, the courage he evinced at his last moments, while they were unable to move his enemies, enshrined his memory in the hearts of his grateful countrymen. . . . After hanging for three hours the body was cut down, *and delivered to a few abandoned Jews, by whom it was dragged through the streets and thrown into the sea.*”

When the Turks defeated the Greeks at Navacta and killed 4,000, the historian tells us: “A band of Jews who had no part in the action, 600 in number, followed in the rear of the victors merely for the pleasure of beating out the brains of the Christians with their clubs. One of them boasted that he had in this manner dispatched 68 victims.” Remembering this and other

atrocious circumstances, the Jews need hardly be surprised that the Christians of Turkey have shown some hostility to these persistent allies of the Turk.

With reference to the present generation of Jews (with whom we mix like oil with vinegar), it is a great satisfaction to me to see by the *Almanac de Gotha* that in the United Kingdom we have only about 46,000 Jews, and this may partly account for our prosperity, whilst the special prevalence of the Jewish element may account for the comparative poverty of the Russian Empire.

I see by an Indian paper, in an address soliciting subscriptions to a fund exclusively for the Turkish wounded, that the Mussulmans of India are quite aware of the close ties which unite Jews and Turks, who, it will be observed, are specially bracketed together in our English Prayer-book (like the lion and the lion's provider, the jackal) as the only races whose transcendent wickedness requires special mention in our prayers, for they say, "Followers of Moses, you are bound by the holiest of ties to the sufferers we seek to relieve."

The Russophobe Jews, however, do not appear to observe that if they succeeded in entrapping us into a war with Russia, as the Jews are included in the Russian conscription, thousands of their countrymen would be killed, and the cost of the war would involve increased taxes, which their co-religionists, who they say are now in the lowest depths of poverty, could hardly bear.

A well-known story may be thus adapted to the present state of affairs. A Russophobe Jew meets a Russophile bishop of his acquaintance, and says to him, "Do you know the difference between a bishop and an ass?" "No," says the bishop; upon which Mr. Howard Guelph Plantagenet, *alias* Mr. Judas Iscariot, answers, "The one wears a cross on his breast, the other on his back." "Good," says the bishop; "but do you know the difference between a Turkomaniac Jew and an ass?" "No," says the Jew. "Nor I either," replies the bishop to the discomfited Hebrew.

Everyone who has read the [report of the Select Com

mittee on Foreign Loans* knows of what untold millions we are robbed by Jews who bring out rotten loans, and other public companies, then rig the market, and wriggle out themselves, and the cement in the edifice of their fortunes is moistened with the tears of the plundered widow and orphan. We all know the villainous mock auctions and knocks-out which are chiefly carried out by Jews. At the former incautious people are deluded into buying spurious articles by sham competition and outrageous lying, whilst the latter are managed in this way: The widow of a clergyman, officer, or professional man, is compelled from poverty to sell her furniture, which may have cost say £1,000. On the day of sale the room is crowded with dirty Jew brokers, smelling most abominably, and of the rudest manners, who hustle and annoy intending purchasers, especially ladies, and if necessary bid far more than the value of articles for which honest persons offer, so as to choke them off. By these and other means they then buy up the whole for perhaps £100 to £200, and then they have a real auction at the nearest public-house, where the articles fetch perhaps £500 to £600, and the difference is divided amongst these scoundrels, to the prejudice of the poor widow. The genial and unrivalled Dickens, in the whole of his delightful works, has drawn, as far as I am aware, but one portrait of a Jew, namely Fagin in "Oliver Twist," and he is far more repulsive than Shylock; in fact, I do not remember one favourable sketch of a Jew in the whole compass of my reading of English literature. Fagin, it will be observed, trained young Gentiles (not Jews) for the gallows, and taught thieving, robbery, and murder as a regular profession or trade. Whilst he contrived, "put up," or "resetted" crimes of various kinds, and was a receiver of stolen goods, he took the utmost care to keep his own carcass out of all danger, using the criminals he had trained, and others whom he ferreted out, like cats' paws to get the chesnuts, of which he took an exorbitant

* The Jews in England always persuaded our gullible statesmen to let them bring out British loans at enormous commissions, whilst in France loans are raised by free competition much cheaper than from financiers.

share, out of the fire. The reader of "Oliver Twist" cannot help feeling a much stronger aversion to Fagin than to Bill Sykes; and it is an inexpressible relief when Fagin is caught, in spite of all his cunning, and meets with the fate he so richly deserves. If there were no Jew receivers of stolen goods, and no Jew resetters or planners of robberies, there would be far less crime. Most of the few eminent men they have produced looked with contempt on Judaism; for instance, Spinoza, who, after endeavouring to bribe him into an apparent and dishonest compliance with Judaism, they excommunicated, and Heine, who, in 1829, in the sketches styled "The Town of Lucca," called them (the Jews) "the people of original sin,' who came out of Egypt, the land of crocodiles and priestcraft, and brought with them, besides their skin diseases and their stolen gold and silver vessels, a so-called positive religion and so-called Church." In short, I think I have established that the Jews are not, and never have been, worthy of our esteem and regard, and that they are the eternal and implacable enemies of the Christian; consequently, it would be madness to follow their advice to go to war with Russia, but wisdom always to take the opposite course to that which they recommend.

The position of the Jews in the East is shown in the following extracts from a letter in the *Daily News* of October 13th, 1876:—

"But if there is anything in the eyes of a Turk more mean, more contemptible, more degrading, than the appellation of 'Giaour,'* it is that of 'Jahoudi'† (a Jew). And with all respect to English Israelites, who have nothing in common with the Eastern Jews but religion, and who are as dissimilar from a Balata Jahoudi as a Magyar is from a Tartar, it will be admitted by every one who knows anything of the East, that there is no occupation sufficiently dishonourable, and no work so unspeakably demeaning, that a Jew will not

* Which means an infidel or miscreant, so that a Jahoudi is worse than a miscreant.

† Query, Dean Swift's "Yahco."

undertake in Turkey for the sake of 'filthy lucre.' In fact, you have only to walk through the streets of Constantinople in order to understand what are the callings toward which Jews tend by predilection. And even in that classic city of mire there is nothing that can compare with the Jewish quarter of Balata, which, in spite of the well-known hoarding of its inhabitants, is retained in such a condition as to have been almost depopulated during the last visitation of cholera.

"We have lately heard of the proceedings instituted in English courts of law against certain members of the Jewish body, who can scarcely have acted under their approved leaders in their shameful dealings with inexperienced undergraduates and other young noblemen. Still these ravenous depredations—degrading, unscrupulous, and contemptible as they are—bear no comparison to the systematic manner in which the ignorant Rouman peasantry are enticed into drinking on credit, are encouraged to run themselves into fearful debts, and are actually made slaves, body and soul, to a professional and well-organized class of Jewish usurers, who cover the land as locusts, and who thus exercise on entire provinces a power more supreme than that of the central Government.

"In fact, the British Protectorate, in spite of the repeated application of the Ionians, persistently refused to the Jews in Corfu and the other islands those civil rights which they obtained *ipso facto* by the union of the Ionian islands to Greece. Indeed, the Jews of Corfu were amongst the most enthusiastic supporters of the Union, and as a token of their gratification at being raised to a civil status, which was denied them by the English, they spontaneously decided upon sending a contingent of volunteers to the Greek army."

That the Jews are a most undesirable element in the population appears from the following extract from Mr. Mackenzie Wallace's "Russia":—

"Of all the colonists of this region (The Steppe), the least prosperous are the Jews. . . . These Jewish colonies were founded as an experiment to see whether the Israelite could be

weaned from his traditionary pursuits and transferred to what some economists call the productive section of society. The experiment has failed, and the cause of the failure is not difficult to find. One has merely to look at these men of gaunt visage and shambling gait, with their loopholed slippers and black threadbare coats reaching down to their ankles, to understand that they are not in their proper sphere. Their houses are in a most dilapidated condition, and their villages remind one of the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the Prophet. A great part of the land is left uncultivated or let to colonists of a different race. *What little revenue they have is derived chiefly from trade of a more or less clandestine nature.*" In short, you might as well attempt to make pigeons out of hawks as industrious farmers out of Jews.

As the first Christians were Jews, and as all Christians receive the Old Testament, from which the Jews think it is evident that Jesus was not the Messiah, they consider our estrangement from the true fold of Judaism as wilful and culpable, and hate us with all the rancour which true believers usually feel towards apostates.

The Jews are divided into two principal sections—the Talmudists, who accept the oral law and all the additional absurdities which have been engrafted by the rabbins on the Old Testament; and the congregation of British Jews, formed in 1840 and 1841 by certain families of Spanish and German Jews for uniting two sections of the community, diminishing the influence of Talmudism, and simplifying the rituals—recognizing the Mosaic Scriptures as the only authority for faith and practice, and rejecting the oral law or Talmudic rabbins as not binding on the consciences of reformed Jews. In short, the bulk of the Israelites are a species of Jewish Catholics, and the Reformers are a species of Old Catholics or Protestants.

The Americans have the same dislike to the Jews as the Roumanians and Servians, as will be seen by the following extract from the *New York Times*:—

"The topic of the day is whether Jews ought to be excluded

that the managers of the Grand Union, by their treatment of Mr. Seligman, have made themselves liable to a fine of 1,500 dols. and imprisonment for a year under the provisions of the Civil Rights Bill, passed in 1875 for the protection of the coloured people."

In 1852 there was a violent outbreak against the Jews in Stockholm, and, in fact, when any Christian is in the hands of the Jews, we give them up as hopelessly lost as the Canaanitish nations whom they exterminated.

The Jews were banished from England from A.D. 1290 till 1650, and I never read that we were the worse for their absence, so that Shakespeare's typical Shylock must have been drawn with his usual masterly skill from imagination and reading.

Stow tells us that "every Jew money-lender was compelled to wear a plate on his breast signifying his trade, or to quit the realm;" and as cabmen and omnibus conductors are obliged to wear badges, I see no reason why usurers, whose trade is as noxious as that of the other is beneficial, should not be subjected to the same regulation.

If a man falls into the hands of a Christian money-lender, he contents himself usually with bleeding him, as it were, in a single vein, while the Jew, who is *hostis Gentili generis*, bleeds every vein and artery, and leaves you penniless, like a squeezed orange, or like the stock-meat which a cook makes into a transparent jelly by pressing out the whole of the juice, so that even the dogs will not eat the tasteless fibre which remains. Whilst with the Christian your debt might increase in an arithmetical progression, the Jew would make it increase in the same time in a geometrical progression, so that in an incredibly short time, if you were to become ultimately a millionaire, not a shilling would remain. It is a crying sin and shame that when a youth comes up from a happy home to the university or the army, these Jewish harpies are allowed to go and tempt him by displaying jewelry at two or three hundred per cent. profit to Mr. Verdant Green, who at last—partly to get rid of importunity, as he thinks he must take something, having allowed the Jew to expend so much time in

showing his mosaic treasures, and partly to gratify a sister or a sweetheart—on the verbal, but not written assurance, that he is to have an indefinite time to pay, consents to purchase something, or else he backs a bill to save a friend from ruin and disgrace, and then his own fate is sealed, and Shylock treats him with no more mercy than a spider does a poor fly whom it has caught within its toils.*

I might say something further on Jewish mock auctions and “knocks out” by which widows and orphans are robbed.

It is very strange, if the Jews really believe in their religion, that they do not kill the paschal lamb and perform the various ceremonies of the Mosaic law, nearly all of which they totally neglect; and the leading representative of the Jewish community gave an entertainment to a Royal personage the other day, when the sanctity of the Jewish Sabbath was wholly disregarded.

If the wealthy Jews of London are so passionately fond of that howling wilderness which they call the promised land, and which is so cleverly described in “Eöthen,” why do they not go and build houses and live there, at least for part of the year? and why do not they spend the evening of their days in Jerusalem? Not one of them, however, does so, and few Jews ever visit Palestine; whilst those who do seldom, if ever, return there.

The rich Jews throughout the world could easily afford to buy up Palestine from the Turks and to rebuild the city and the temple in greater splendour than ever; but they prefer whining by deputy at the Jews’ wailing place at Jerusalem, groaning in England over their imaginary grievances and waiting on Providence, instead of helping themselves.

The Jews, however, are perhaps as useful in relieving us of our money as leeches are in depleting us of our blood.†

Even in England the Jews were not allowed to sit in Parliament till 1860, and the *World* says that the Queen refused to make

* It is about as easy to extract sunbeams from cucumbers as mercy to Gentile from a Jew.

† Eianconi says the Jews lend money at 200 and 300 per cent. interest.

Baron Rothschild a peer ; whilst a Jewish M.P. told me that he and his family received notice to quit their lodgings at a watering-place because they were Jews.

Tacitus says of the Jewish character :—“Between themselves an invincible fidelity, a charity always active ; against the rest of the world, an indomitable hatred.”

In order to excite prejudice in the minds of the British public against the down-trodden Christians of Turkey, the Government, with their usual Philo-Turkish unfairness, have, *apropos de bottles*, issued a Blue Book containing indeed 30 pages with reference to the recent alleged and much exaggerated ill-treatment of the Jews in Roumania, but also 329 pages relating to accusations against the Servians and Roumanians, going back to 1867, the object being to attempt to show that the Christians of Bulgaria, Bosnia, and Herzegovina are not fitted for freedom, since they would, it is asserted but not proved, ill-treat that part of the population which consists of people of other races and religions, and more especially the Jews.

I have to remark that, contrary to the usual practice, the despatches and other statements of the Roumanian Ministers are not translated, and as French is about as unintelligible as Chinese to the great majority of the English population and of the members of both Houses of Parliament, this places their Jewish accusers at an enormous and unfair advantage, to redress which I will now translate some of these despatches.

I shall commence by quoting three important, lucid, and able despatches from Vice-Consul St. John, which completely take the wind out of the sails of the Judomaniacs.

Vice-Consul St. John to Earl Granville.—(Received May, 14).

(Extract.)

Jassy, April 29, 1873.

HAVING now resided several months at Jassy, where the Jews of this country may be said to have established their headquarters, I have the honour to report to your lordship that I have made myself acquainted with the condition of the Jews in Moldavia, but more especially of those inhabiting this town.

Being fertile in resources, it is supposed that they will have sufficient time between this and next year to adopt other means for earning a livelihood.

The coming law has caused a good deal of dissatisfaction among the land-owners, as many of them have concluded profitable contracts with the Jews for the sale of spirits.

Although the prohibition includes all aliens as well as Jews, and is obviously directed towards the latter, I have to report to your lordship that during my experience in this town not a single case of persecution has come to my knowledge, and that my Austrian colleague, having 40,000 fellow-subjects of the Jewish persuasion in Jassy alone, whose interests it is his duty to look after, has repeatedly stated to me that no complaint of that nature has ever been brought before him.

Many persons who have spoken to me on the subject, and who are amicably disposed towards the Jews, have expressed their regrets that the Jewish Alliance should not have turned their attention to civilizing their co-religionists, rather than to so readily giving credence to a number of false or exaggerated reports that were so widely spread at the beginning of last year, and which I have since ascertained to have originated in this town, and to have been circulated throughout Europe and the United States by means of pamphlets written in the Hebrew language.

The marked antipathy existing in this town towards the Jews arises not so much on account of the difference of religion as from their persistency in not conforming to civilized habits and dress, and more particularly from their palpable want of cleanliness—a fact which any one may easily ascertain by passing a few hours at Jassy.]

Vice-Consul St. John to Lord Granville.

July 31, 1872.

Having now passed several months in the Principalities, I

have had ample opportunities for hearing the Jewish question discussed by the most competent persons, and the more the facts of the case are brought to light, the more convinced am I that persecution in the sense conveyed by Sir Francis Goldsmid's speech in the House of Commons does not exist and never has existed in these Principalities, at all events not under the last three Governments.

It may appear bold in me to make such assertion, in the face of everything that has been said on that subject in the House of Commons, but I beg to assure your lordship that the same views are entertained by all my colleagues, and that they are reporting to their respective Governments in the same sense.

The question has often been put to me, "Why, if the Jews find themselves systematically persecuted, do they continue to avail themselves of every possible stratagem to elude the vigilance of the functionaries at the frontiers in order to settle in these Principalities by thousands?"

The number of Jews said to have taken up their abode in the Moldo-Wallachian Principalities is about 300,000, out of which 40,000 only are descendants of Jews who have inhabited the country for generations back; the remainder is composed of immigrants and their children from Galicia and Russia.

The antipathy which is often found to exist against the Jews in other countries is, perhaps, aggravated in this, on account, probably, of the overwhelming numbers to be found in certain towns, such as Jassy, where out of 70,000 inhabitants 40,000 are Jews; as also by reason of their enterprise, industry, perseverance, and parsimony, in contrast with the apathy and extravagance of the owner of the soil.

Mr. St. John to the Earl of Derby.—(Received March 31).

Belgrade, March 20, 1877.

My Lord,—I have the honour to report that M. Ristitch, the Servian Minister for Foreign Affairs, in reply to my question with

regard to the future condition of the Jews in this country, informed me that Servian subjects of that persuasion were on the same footing, and enjoyed the same privileges, both civil and political, as the Servians; with the restriction, however, of not being permitted to establish themselves permanently in the rural districts, or in any town except Belgrade.

On my putting the same question to Prince Milan, and receiving a similar reply, I asked him what the objection was to the native-born Jews enjoying the same liberties as their Christian fellow-subjects. His Highness said that a strong feeling existed against them among merchants and shopkeepers, who were under the impression that were every privilege accorded the Jews, an encouragement would be given to those of Poland and Roumania to settle in this country, whereby the native Christian trader would be driven out of the field, and the peasantry, by the establishment of public-houses and usury, utterly demoralised.

From Vice-Consul St. John's dispatches, it thus appears that nearly half the filthy Jewish population of Jassy are vagabond foreigners, whose increase the Principalities have as much right to restrain as the Californians and Australians to stem the flood of Chinese immigration.

It is certainly singular that persecution seems to add so enormously to the numbers of the Jewish inundation, for whilst in 1830 the Principality of Moldavia was only subjected to the infliction of 10,000 Jews, she was burdened with 200,000 in 1873, which, though Jews breed like rabbits, must have been chiefly caused by immigration of foreign Jews to enjoy the sweets of alleged intolerance.

As the Jews "have succeeded in monopolising every trade or calling by which money can be turned," of course the Christians should be duly grateful, and quite willing to be their hewers of wood and drawers of water. The immigration, it will be observed, is stated by Mr. St. John to be from Galicia as well as

the right which they claim in Roumania before becoming Roumanians in fact.

“The Government and the nation have then the right and the duty to interest themselves in the progress of this foreign population which lives in the midst of us, and which grows incessantly by the emigration of the Jews of Galicia and of Podolia, neighbouring provinces of ancient Poland.

“There is no question of religious persecution, for if it was so the Israelites would meet with obstacles or restrictions in the exercise of their religion, which is not the case. Their synagogues would not be freely built at the side of Christian churches; their religious teaching, the publication of their holy books, would be equally forbidden.

“If the Rabbinate, if religious instruction, if the establishments of education, and of beneficence, are much less advanced among the Jews than among the Christian, that is in consequence of the little initiative and the backward state of culture of the great majority of the Israelites, especially those beyond Milcov. For the little progress that the Israelites of Moldavia have made in these last few years in these branches of religious and moral improvement, they are indebted to the Roumanian Government, and permit me to say, to me also, to me especially, who during the three occasions on which I have had the honour to be put at the head of the Ministry of the Interior, at the risk even of compromising myself before my countrymen, and *I must say against the will and the prejudices of the majority of the Israelites, I have worked with perseverance to enlighten their young men, and to assimilate them to the other inhabitants of Roumania. I will not enlarge further on my labours. I prefer leaving the accompanying documents, which have been addressed to me by the most influential Israelites of Jassy and Bucharest—their names must be known to the Israelite Alliance of Paris.*

“By reading these documents the Marquis of La Valette will be convinced, I think, that even the most enlightened Israelites complain of the ignorance and the prejudices of the great majority of their co-religionists, and that that is the most serious

all those who take a serious interest in their country, have occupied themselves with the imperious necessity to prevent the victimisation of the Rouman people by a foreign people—by the Jews. . . . I am animated by no sentiment of hatred against the Jews. As far as the laws of the country permit, I exert myself to enable them to partake the advantages of industrial liberty, and as a proof here are my ordinances (letter D) which even in villages grant a temporary domicile to different categories of Israelitish workmen, such as machinists, distillers, masons, cabinet makers, tailors, shoemakers. To go further, contrary to the express laws and the interest of my country, would be to compromise public security; for the Rouman population, not finding in the Government the protection and the defence which it has a right to expect, might have recourse to extreme measures of which the Jewish publicans would be the first victims. . . . The Israelites enjoy the most absolute liberty of conscience and religion; they have obtained many civil rights; they can exercise several professions which were formerly interdicted to them; they can be professors and doctors, and as such become State functionaries; they can also be druggists and lithographers, which was formerly forbidden to them. By the communal law, several categories of Jews, and in particular those who have passed through the schools or the army, have acquired communal rights. In short, the Israelites enjoy to-day several constitutional rights. Respect for their domiciles and their person, the right of instruction paid by the State, liberty of conscience and of meeting, as well as that of the press, they possess on the same footing as the Roumans."

In proof of M. Cogalniceano's statements as to his kindness to the Jews, I quote, first, part of a letter of the President of the Israelite community at Bucharest to M. Cogalniceano, dated 5th May, 1869:—

"The native Israelitish community created, by the establishment of a 'gabelle,' or tax on the sale of meat, funds which have served for the foundation of primary schools, where 450 boys and 180 girls study the Hebrew, Roumanian, and German

“Already more than 1,000 young Israelites enjoyed the advantages of a moral education ; and the study of the language and the history of Roumania was followed with zeal and assiduity, beside the careful study of the Hebrew religion in five primary Rouman and Israelitish schools, which were founded under the auspices and by the benevolent protection of your excellency.

“The Israelitish children began to assimilate by language and manners to their Rouman brothers of the Christian rite, and marched rapidly in the path of progress. Already the Israelite hospital was enlarged ; from day to day the number of beds was raised to 130 ; the sick Israelites and all Roumania found there an asylum ; and the sanitary state of all the country was equally progressive. The servants of our religion had their future assured, pensions were granted to their widows,” &c.

I think it is now clearly proved that M. Cogalniceano was fully justified in all that he states in his dispatch as to his equitable and benevolent conduct towards the Jews of Roumania.

As another illustration of the barbarous condition of the Jews, I cite the following sentence from a letter of M. Bratiano, one of the Ministers of Roumania, to the Mayor of Jassy, dated May 24th, 1867 :—

“I yesterday visited the Jewish hospital. It is in a most deplorable state—want of space and cleanliness, and the crowding of the patients to the extent of putting two in a bed ; infection, and, in short, a state of things endangering the public health of the town of Jassy. I therefore require you, Mr. Mayor, to take urgent measures to remedy these evils, and to see that the sick are placed in spacious and well-ventilated rooms, sufficient for their number, and also that the necessary care be taken to avoid the spreading of epidemic diseases.”

Perhaps, however, to enforce sanitary regulations on the Jews is considered by them to be persecution, just as a bath is considered a severe punishment by a casual pauper in a workhouse. That the Jews are really subjected to much worse persecutions

by their dear masters, the Mahometans, than those from which they pretend they suffer at the hands of the Christians, appears from (Inclosure in No. 90) the following portion of a letter from M. Manuel to Sir F. Goldsmid, dated Universal Israelite Alliance, Paris, August 19th, 1867 :—

“SIR,—The acts of violence committed against the Israelites of Zliten, in the Regency of Tripoli, as to which your attention has doubtless been directed, have given occasion for an inquiry, commenced in pursuance of instructions which the Consuls-General of France and England have received from their Governments. This inquiry, the results of which are perhaps known to you, terminates with the conclusion, which the consuls have agreed to, to demand from the local government the following redress :—

“1. The punishment of the Cadi of Zliten and his assessors, who have excited the fanaticism of the Mussulmans against the Israelites.

“2. Punishment of the guilty as soon as they shall have been discovered.

“3. Reconstruction of the Israelite Synagogue, at the expense of the district of Zliten.

“4. Indemnity for the Bibles destroyed.

“5. Protection of the Israelite cemetery against the interference of the Mussulmans.

“6. Setting apart a special guard for the defence of the Israelites.

“The Turkish Government has done us the honour to communicate to us the dispatch by which it demands itself the punishment of the guilty and the restoration of the damage caused to the Israelites, in order to prevent by these measures the repetition of such acts of fanaticism. But the Pasha of Tripoli does not seem so well disposed to our co-religionists, and these cannot regain safety if the offences of which they have been victims remain unpunished.

“We hear from Tetuan, in Morocco, that a pasha has arrived with 500 men to protect the town from the brigands. But this

pasha seems very ill-disposed towards the Israelites. He forbade them passing through a gate of the town which leads to a cemetery visited daily by men and women. This gate has been open to the Israelites since the occupation of the country by the Spaniards. Besides, Israelitish men and women who have been struck in the by-ways of the town by Moors have in vain complained to the pasha to obtain redress for these acts of violence. It would appear as if this pasha wishes to accomplish the revival of a fanaticism which has been dormant for years, thanks to the protection given to the Israelites by the representatives of the European Governments." The Jewish and other Turcomanic enemies of the cause of the Christians of Turkey do not even allege such severe persecution as M. Manuel describes, on the part of either the Roumanians or Servians.

M. Matitsch, another of the Servian Ministers, says of the Jews, "The Israelites of Servia, persisting in their ancient tradition, continue unfortunately to cause the rest of the population to feel strongly that, far from wishing to assimilate themselves to it, they only seek to isolate themselves, morally and materially.

"It is thus that, in the days of trial of a nation, they have hastened to abandon their country, only to return when the danger had disappeared. Latterly, again, on the occasion of the bombardment of Belgrade, they have given proof of the same disposition, notwithstanding that the origin of this deplorable conflict must be attributed to the care which the Servian authorities took to cause the inviolability of the domicile of an Israelite, his lodger, to be respected by his Mussulman landlord.

"The Israelites hasten to leave the country as soon as they have amassed some fortune. There are some even who, having quitted Belgrade before the bombardment of 1862, and fixed their domicile in a neighbouring foreign town, persist still in residing abroad, whilst passing every day at Belgrade to look after their commercial and other affairs.

"Their excessive aversion to military service, to which all Servian citizens are bound, wounds the sentiment of their country-

which they come refuses in many cases to let them repass the frontier. That being so, we must seek for a means of avoiding this evil. We must continue in some way to constrain to a useful labour those whom we cannot drive from our country unless they can themselves find means to quit it. One of these means would be, in my opinion, the establishment of agricultural colonies. . . ."

The Prince of Roumania stated to Consul Green that he had received a telegram from M. Ion Bratiano, stating that the reported persecution of the Jews was quite false; that hygienic measures had been taken to prevent a new outbreak of cholera; and that police regulations had been applied to the foreign vagabonds investing the country; but that these measures had been carried out with even more care than had been the case at Bucharest. With respect to the necessity for steps being taken in the interest of the public health in the Jewish quarters of Jassy, his Highness observed that he could himself bear witness, as he had seen single rooms in which ten families were living in a state of filth of which it was impossible to form an idea from any description.

M. Golesco, after complaining to Consul Green of the vagrancy of the Jews, attributing the evil to their having Austrian passports—although, as he observed to him, passports were not required in Roumania—said that the greatest evil the Jews had to complain of was the tyranny of their own elders, who subject them to heavy taxation; and that the Government was about taking measures, as it was its duty to do, to put a stop to these abuses. Mr. Green could not help thinking, while M. Golesco was speaking in this sense, of the well-grounded fears of M. Halfon, and no doubt of all the upper classes of Jews, that the Government would invent some means of insuring their docility. It would not be difficult to obtain by intimidation the signatures of any amount of poor Jews accusing their richer brethren of oppression and fraud.

M. Boeres stated to the same Consul, "Son Excellence M. le Ministre est aussi très-mal informé quand il croit que les

Juifs n'ont pas chez nous le droit de fabriquer des spiritueux, de tenir des cabarets ou de vendre des liqueurs.

"Ils exercent tous ces droits. Le fait est facile à constater. Leurs fabricateurs de spiritueux sont nombreuses dans le pays, et même aux environs de la capitale. Il en est de même des cabarets, qu'ils ont dans toutes les villes.

"Ce qui leur a été défendu, par une récente loi sur les spiritueux, c'est le droit de tenir cabaret et de vendre des liqueurs dans les communes rurales et sur les grandes routes.

"Mais cette disposition, que n'est du reste que le renouvellement d'une ancienne coutume, est une simple mesure d'hygiène et de police rurale. Ce n'est pas chez nous, les premiers, qu'elle a été prescrite; nous avons imité en cela, comme en bien d'autres choses, des nations bien plus civilisées et plus expérimentées que nous. Une pareille disposition, et dans des termes encore plus restrictifs, a existé en Prusse, dans le Wurtemberg, dans le Grand-Duché de Bade jusqu'en l'année 1869. Des dispositions restrictives dans les même sens existent encore aujourd'hui en Russie."

I conclude my quotations with the following dispatch from Vice-Consul St. John :—

Bucharest, August 21, 1872.

My Lord,—In a conversation which I had some months ago with Mr. Peixotto, the American Consul-General, on the subject of the Jews in this country, and the evils occasioned by their overwhelming numbers, I suggested to him that, as he had their welfare so much at heart, he should propose some scheme for their emigration to the United States. It occurred to me that, if the Jews of this country possessed all those habits of industry, thriftiness, and order, which he never ceases to attribute to them, they would doubtless prove a useful community in America, and would at the same time be rescued from that persecution at the hands of the Christians which he so persistently makes it his business to proclaim to the world.

Mr. Peixotto, at the time, expressed no opinion, but from what has now taken place it is evident that he has considered and adopted the idea, as, in a recent report by the Roumanian Minister for Foreign Affairs to the Council of Ministers, a letter is stated to have been received from the American Consul-General inquiring what assistance would be offered here were such a scheme set on foot.

In their report to Prince Charles the Council of Ministers recommended to his Highness that the proposal should be brought before the Assembly on its meeting, and that free passports should be supplied to poor Jews who may desire to emigrate.

It is, however, doubted by those most competent to judge whether many Jews would avail themselves of the opportunity to emigrate even should the joint action of the Government here and of benevolent societies in America and elsewhere enable them to do so.

Should the facility for emigration offered by such a scheme be insufficient to induce the Jewish population to avail themselves of the opportunity, it would go far to refute the accusations brought by Mr. Peixotto against the authorities in this country.

I have, &c.

(Signed) C. L. ST. JOHN.

I have now sufficiently proved that though there may have been rare and insignificant acts of persecution performed by the Roumanians and Servians on the Jews, these have been usually occasioned by their own misconduct, the filthiness of their persons and dwellings, their unsatiable avarice and usury, and the demoralization caused by their selling intoxicating liquors contrary to law; and it appears that, so to speak, a box on the ears received by a Jew from a Servian or Roumanian Christian is less endurable than being knocked down and stunned by his dear friends the Mussulmans at Tripoli and Morocco.

In one respect, however, they have scrupulously observed a line of conduct which is warmly approved by Christ, for every stranger who has had recourse to them invariably exclaims, "I was a stranger, and ye took me in."

OPINIONS ON TURKEY BY TRAVELLERS OF
VARIOUS NATIONALITIES.

M. DE LAMARTINE says :—

“The Turks, by the inherent and irreclaimable viciousness of their administration and of their habits, are incapable of governing their present territory in Europe and Asia, or either of them. They have depopulated the countries which owned their sway, and have destroyed themselves by the slow suicide of their government.”—*Travels in the East*, p. 752.

“The Ottoman empire is no empire at all ; it is a misshapen agglomeration of different races without cohesion between them, with mingled interests, without a language, without laws, without religion, without unity or stability of power. You see the breath of life which animated it—namely, religious fanaticism—is extinct. You see that its fatal and blinded administration has devoured the race of conquerors ; and that Turkey is perishing for want of Turks.”

Mr. J. L. Stephens, the American traveller, who was in that region in 1835, describes the city of Constantinople in these words :—

“We float around the walls of the seraglio, enter the Golden Horn, and before us, with its thousand mosques, and its myriad of minarets, their golden points glittering in the sun, is the Roman city of Constantinople, the Thracian Byzantium, the Stamboul of the Turks ; the city which more than all others excites the imagination and interests the feelings ; once dividing with Rome the empire of the world ; built by a Christian Emperor, and consecrated as a Christian city ; ‘a burning and a shining light’ in a season of universal darkness, all at once lost to the civilized world, falling into the hands of a strange and fanatical people, the gloomy followers of a successful soldier ; a city which for nearly four centuries has sat with its gates closed in sullen distrust and haughty defiance of strangers, which once sent forth large and terrible armies, burning, slaying, and destroying, shaking the hearts of princes and people—

now lying, like a sullen giant, huge, unwieldy, and helpless, ready to fall into the hands of the first invader, and dragging out a precarious and ignoble existence, but by the mercy or policy of the great Christian powers."—*Incidents of Travels in Turkey*, p. 54.

We will take next the opinion of Mr. Eliot Warburton, as able and accomplished a man as ever visited the East :—

"Sultan Mahmoud was one of the five great men who have been the instruments of signalising our age. He ventured on the glorious attempt which few have survived, and none have ever lived to see accomplished—that of regenerating a corrupt people. *The attempt failed utterly, as regarded the creation of new powers and capacities: the old were destroyed, but there was no reproductive principle in the Turkish character.* . . . They are a gallant people, yet, those Osmanlis; and, though they feel that their empire is drawing to a close, and are prepared for the fulfilment of one of those strange old prophecies, like that which prepared the Yncas for the subjugation of *their* country, they will doubtless die fearlessly in defence of those walls so fearlessly won by their fierce ancestors."—*Crescent and the Cross*, p. 390.

Mr. Walsh says :—

"There is more of human life wasted and less supplied (in Turkey) than in any other country. . . . *We see every day life going out in the fairest portion of Europe, and the human race threatened with extinction in a soil and climate capable of supporting the most abundant population.*"—*Kings of the East*, pp. 2—11.

Under this head, we give the opinion of Mr. Thackeray :—

"The Government of the Ottoman Porte seems to be as rotten, as wrinkled, and as feeble as the old eunuch I saw crawling about it in the sun."—*Notes of a Journey from Cornhill to Grand Cairo*.

Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, in a speech delivered at a banquet given to him at Constantinople in 1852, deploras "*the corruption which eats into the very foundations of society, and a combination of force, fraud, and intrigue which obstruct the march of progress, and poison the very atmosphere in which they prevail.*"

M. Guizot says :—

"Christian Europe has reason to desire that no private ambition may hasten the downfall of those dilapidated Mussulman states that are languishing and falling into ruin at her gates. . . . Providence, however, has issued visible decrees, and we have a right to be pre-conscious of these, and to hold ourselves

in readiness to acknowledge them. The Turks will go out of Europe. The Christian faith and Christian civilisation will not give up their expansive energy. . . . It is an act of prudence as well as of moral sense for all Christian states to pay great regard to this in their policy, and not to place themselves in direct and permanent conflict with facts which will infallibly one day come to pass, and which, when they do come to pass, will be a triumph for humanity."—Guizot's "*Life of Peel*," p. 152.

M. de Tocqueville, writing to Mr. Senior, says :—

"What say you of our friends the Turks? Was it worth while to spend so much money and to shed so much blood in order to retain in Europe savages who are ill-disguised as civilised men?"—*Life*, vol. ii., p. 414.

Mr. Spencer says :—

"A welcome sight to the traveller, in these provinces, *who may travel from sea to sea, from the Danube to Constantinople, without beholding the slightest mark of improvement either in the aspect of the country or the industry of the inhabitants.* About ten years ago, I traversed nearly the same route from Constantinople to the Danube. The country was without roads, as it is now, and several of the bridges that then existed have been carried away by the flood, or fallen from decay, without either the inhabitants or the Government attempting to replace them. . . . It is not alone the absence of any change for the better that so forcibly arrests the attention of the traveller, as the deep settled gloom that characterises country, town, village, people, wherever the Osmanli rules."—Vol. ii., pp. 361—2.

Mr. Crowe says :—

"This Asia Minor is, indeed, the greatest disgrace of the Turk, the chief accusation that raises itself against the Ottoman. It is a land capable of the greatest fertility and production, traversed by numbers of rivers—a blessing so rare in so southern a clime. It abounds in ports and minerals. It commands two seas, lies between north, and south, and west, and offers itself as the great channel of communication between the different parts of the globe. There is no country in the world with so many of the elements and capabilities of prosperity. Yet for centuries it has been a desert, a land of oppressors and poverty, spoliation and torture, the very charnel-house of the human kind, counting ten millions of Turks, who can neither thrive nor live industrious themselves, nor allow others to do so. Talk of Turkey in Europe, and of the state of the Christian *rayahs* under the Turks—they are ten times more happy, and the country some hundred times more prosperous and rich, with the small element of a Christian population, even oppressed by the Turks, than can be found in the land which the Turks may be said to have all to themselves. . . ."—*The Greek and the Turk*, pp. 175, 176.

No less explicit is the language of Mr. Bayle St. John, also a traveller in Turkey, in his work entitled, "The Turks in Europe."

"We have but to cast a glance over the vast provinces which stretch from the banks of the Danube to the limits of constitutional Greece, to see the natural results of the system I have described, carried on by a people so brutal and barbarous as the Turks. These provinces do not contain one quarter of the population they are capable of supporting, and, unlike other countries, the plains are almost desert, whilst the mountains and a few large cities contain the chief part of the inhabitants. Wherever there is a centre of Turkish authority established, a wilderness is at once created around. The greater proportion of the Bulgarian population is dispersed in villages far from the high roads, and a wholesome terror, as I have hinted in a previous chapter, is from time to time struck into them by invasions of armed tax-gatherers. Nothing can be more melancholy than a journey southward from the Danube towards Constantinople. The Bulgarians are naturally a mild and good people, but, as is well known, they have more than once been goaded by excessive oppression into rebellion.

... If we traverse the Balkan range, and enter upon the vast plains of Thrace, the deserts become naturally more dismal than ever. We are approaching the capital. Adrianople is surrounded by vast expanses covered with cemeteries, and the whole country between the city and Constantinople seems as if it had been just visited by a pestilence. It consists of a vast undulating plain, entirely denuded of trees, and cut up by numerous streams of water, which were once bordered by flourishing towns and fields. Now and then a miserable hamlet occurs; but there are places in which during twelve hours of hard marching there is not a house visible, not a tree, not a shrub."—P. 154.

We will next produce a French witness, M. Blanqui, who was sent by Louis Philippe on a mission to Bulgaria and Constantinople in 1841, and who published his observations in 1845, in a work entitled "*Voyage en Bulgarie*":—

"From Adrianople to Constantinople is a distance of about fifty leagues. The vast space between the two cities is entirely destitute of trees, and presents the aspect of a long, wide, undulating plain, traversed by more than thirty watercourses. . . .

"There is something more tristful in the unparalleled journey between these two capital cities. This is the countless number of cemeteries one finds in places where every sign of human habitation has disappeared. What signify these cemeteries? When were they formed? Why do they exist in their entirety, while one cannot find the slightest trace of the towns and villages which stocked them with so many dead? . . .

"But there are things even more sad than these cemeteries without villages

—I mean villages without inhabitants. I saw a good many such between Adrianople and Constantinople: the houses were open to wind and rain, the roofs had fallen in, the domestic hearth was empty. Lizards, rats, screech-owls, bats, had taken the place of human beings, destroyed by plague or by poverty, or dispersed by emigration; and these villages were surrounded by fertile lands, and everywhere flowed rivulets and brooks, and the sky overhead was pure and serene; and if, now and then, a tree existed near a fountain, it was so grand and so beautiful, that fifty men on horseback might shelter themselves in its shades. *What then, has transformed these fertile countries of Thrace into desolated steppes? What but Mussulman barbarity? The mosque alone stands erect in the midst of the ruin which it has caused. The only living creatures we saw were birds of prey.* . . .

“The desert extends to the very ramparts of Constantinople. As we approached the capital we expected to find some sign of road-making; there was none. The Turks have everything *to begin.*”

The Earl of Carlisle visited Turkey just before the Crimean war, and his verdict as to the condition of the country is summed up in the following emphatic words:—

“When you leave the partial splendours of the capital and the great State establishments, what is it you find over this broad surface of a land which nature and climate have favoured beyond all others, once the home of all art and all civilisation? Look yourself; ask those who live there; deserted villages, uncultivated plains, banditti-haunted mountains, torpid laws, a corrupted administration, a disappearing people.”—*Diary in Turkish and Greek Waters*, p. 184.

Mr. Spencer says:—

“With every desire to amend the condition of the rayah, the evil still remains—religious prejudice and caste—to frustrate the intentions of the most just and equitable Government, and must continue, so long as the laws are administered by a fanatic, ignorant Mussulman. The traveller is daily reminded of this in his intercourse with Turk and rayah—in the one he sees an overbearing ignorance, and in the other a humiliating degradation. In obedience to the old Mahometan laws, a rayah is restricted from using certain colours when he paints his house or decorates his person. He is not permitted to enter a town on horseback, if it is the residence of a Turkish dignitary. Should he meet with one during his route, he must descend till he passes, or escape by another direction. The meanest Turk holds the power to send him on an errand, or make him carry a package. If struck by one he dares not resent the injury; and should he by chance meet a Turkish lady, he is not allowed to look at her, since it is possible he may blight her good fortune with the evil eye. It is true

the higher class of rayahs, such as merchants and traders, inhabitants of towns, aware of their newly-acquired rights, do not humiliate themselves in the presence of a Mussulman; but the poor rayah of the village and the commune, ignorant of the privileges which have been accorded to him, still obeys, and, like a good Christian, if he is struck on the right cheek turns the left; and should he be sufficiently daring to assert his rights and refuse the homage required by the privileged class, the whip of the oppressor quickly reminds him that his emancipation is nominal so long as the Turk remains in authority."—*Spencer*, i. 244.

Mr. Crowe says:—

"Very little experience will suffice to show the traveller the immense difficulties in the way of the most liberal Turkish minister to elevate the Christian to anything like even fair tolerance. Row up the Golden Horn to visit the old Christian quarter of the Fanar. You will find oppression and forced humiliation stamped upon every house. Even that of the Patriarch, so powerful and so much talked of, is a dingy, diminutive prison, built of stone, indeed, for security, but craving pardon, by its air and its architecture of meanness, for daring to use so costly a material. The little church—the only church of the Christian within its walls—is equally begrimed, equally humble. The very population walk with a bowed expression; and this feeling of self-degradation, of which the European cannot divest himself in any part of Constantinople, becomes in the Fanar so painful that one is obliged to rush out of it. In doing so, and emerging from the gates, you enter, unawares perhaps, the Turkish suburb of Eyoub, famous for the mosque in which all the descendants of Mahomet gird them with the sword. If you dare approach that mosque, you will be stoned. You must sneak through the bye-lanes around, and steal a furtive peep. Curiosity more indiscreet might cost you your life."—*The Greek and the Turk*, pp. 183—9.

The Rev. Horatio Southgate thus describes what he himself witnessed in the streets of Constantinople long after the pretended "Reform" had commenced:—

"On the morning of the Paschal, after the public prayer was ended, it belonged to the soldiers to carry back the mats which had served them in their devotions, to the place whence they were taken. Instead, however, of performing the labour themselves, they dispersed through the crowds, and singling out the *rayahs* who happened to be there, compelled them to take the mats upon their shoulders and bear them. I saw one Armenian seized. He was a young man of respectable appearance, and refused when arrested to perform the scandalous task. Immediately some twenty soldiers set upon him, and attempted to beat him into submission. He resisted manfully for a few

minutes, while they, standing in a circle round him, kicked him from side to side, like a football. He offered to hire a porter to carry the burden, but they persisted in imposing the contumely upon him, and he walked away under his burden, sobbing with shame and vexation. *We know that the insult was forced upon him because he was a Christian.* I witnessed other scenes of a similar kind during the following days of the festival. *They filled me with the deepest indignation, but the oppression of rayahs became afterwards so familiar a sight to me, that the first effects gradually ceased.* It is only now, when looking back on those scenes from the favoured home of Christianity, that I feel a return of the first glow of indignation, and mourn, as I then sincerely mourned, over the desolate heritage of Zion in the land where she held her earliest and broadest sway.”—*Travels in Turkey and Persia*, by Rev. Horatio Southgate, vol. i., pp. 113, 114.

The Author of “*Eöthen*” observed the same thing of Damascus.

“Until about a year or two years before the time of my going there, Damascus had kept up so much of the old bigot zeal against Christians, or rather against Europeans, that no one dressed as a Frank could have dared to show himself in the streets; but the firmness and temper of Mr. Farren, who hoisted his flag in the city as Consul-General for the district, had soon put an end to all intolerance of Englishmen. . . . In the principal streets there is a path for foot-passengers raised a foot or two above the bridle-road. Until the arrival of the British Consul-General, none but a Mussulman had been allowed to walk upon the upper way. Mr. Farren would not, of course, suffer that the humiliation of any such exclusion should be submitted to by an Englishman, and I always walked on the raised path as free and unmolested as if I had been in Pall Mall. The old usage was, however, maintained with as much strictness as ever against the Christian rayahs and Jews. Not one of these could have set his foot on the privileged path without endangering his life. I was walking one day, I remember, along the raised path, ‘the path of the faithful,’ when a Christian rayah from the bridle-road below saluted me with such earnestness, and craved so anxiously to speak and be spoken to, that he soon brought me to a halt. He had nothing to tell except only the glory and exaltation with which he saw a fellow-Christian stand level with the imperious Mussulmans. . . . His lips only whispered, and tremulously, but his flashing eyes spoke out their triumph more fiercely: ‘I, too, am a Christian; my foes are the foes of the English. We are all one people, and Christ is our King.’”—*Eöthen*, p. 238.

Dr. Aiton says:—

“In the large cities, such as Smyrna and Constantinople, the Christians enjoy a certain amount of protection from the *surveillance* which is usually exercised over them; but in the main streets of these cities fifty times have the

Mussulmans spit at us, merely because we were Nazarenes ; and in Palestine and other remote provinces we enjoyed the distinction of being stoned and hooted by a rabble of Mahometans at our heels, merely because we were 'Haji,' i.e., pilgrims."—*The Drying up of the Euphrates*, p. 64.

Similar is Miss Martineau's records of her own experience :—

"At Nablous the bigotry of the people is so great that till of late years no Christian was permitted to set foot within the gates. Ibrahim Pasha punished the place severely, and made the people so desperately afraid of him that they observed his commands pretty much as if he had power in Syria still. One of his commands was, that Christians should not be ill-treated ; so we entered Nablous, and rode through it to our encampment on the other side. During our passage I had three slaps in the face from millet-stalks and other things thrown at me ; and whichever way we looked the people were grinning, thrusting out their tongues, and pretending to spit."—*Eastern Life, Present and Past*, p. 529.

"It was near Lizan," says Mr. Layard, "that occurred one of the most terrible incidents of the massacre, and an active mountaineer offering to lead me to the spot, I followed him up the mountain. Emerging from the gardens, we found ourselves at the foot of an almost perpendicular detritus of loose stones, terminated, about one thousand feet above us, by a wall of lofty rocks. Up this ascent we toiled for above an hour, sometimes clinging to small shrubs, whose roots scarcely reached the scanty soil below, at others crawling on our hands and knees ; crossing the gullies to secure a footing, or carried down by the stones which we put in motion as we advanced. We soon saw evidences of the slaughter. At first a solitary skull rolling down with the rubbish ; then heaps of blanched bones, further up fragments of rotten garments. As we advanced, these remains became more frequent—skeletons, almost entire, still hung to the dwarf shrubs. I was soon compelled to renounce an attempt to count them. As we approached the wall of rock, the declivity became covered with bones, mingled with the long plaited tresses of the women, shreds of discoloured linen and well-worn shoes. There were skulls of all ages, from the child unborn to the toothless old man. We could not avoid treading on the bones, as we advanced, and rolling them with the loose stones into the valley below. 'This is nothing,' exclaimed my guide, who observed me gazing with wonder on these miserable heaps ; 'they are but the remains of those who were thrown from above, or sought to escape the sword by jumping from the rocks.'"—*Researches in Nineveh*, vol. i.

Well, Mr. Layard paid a second visit to the same region, and this is the description he gives of how the persecuted Nestorians fared under the shadow of their Turkish protectors :—

"Their church was in ruins—around were the charred remains of the burnt

cottages, and the neglected orchards overgrown with weeds. A body of Turkish troops had lately visited the village, and had destroyed the little that had been restored since the Kurdish invasions. The same taxes had been collected three times—and even four times over. The relations of those who had run away to escape from these exactions had been compelled to pay for the fugitives. *The chief had been thrown, with his arms tied behind his back, on a heap of burning straw, and compelled to disclose where a little money that had been saved by the villagers had been buried. The priest had been torn from the altar, and beaten before his congregation. Men showed me the marks of torture on their body, and of iron fetters round their limbs. For the sake of wringing a few piastres from this poverty-stricken people, all these deeds of violence had been committed by officers sent by the Porte to protect the Christian subjects of the Sultan, whom they pretended to have released from the misrule of the Kurdish chiefs.*

Take another passage from the same work :—

“The Nestorian community had greater wrongs to complain of than their Patriarch. The Turkish Government, so far from fulfilling the pledges given to the British Embassy, had sent officers to the mountains, who had grievously ill-treated and oppressed the Christian inhabitants. The taxes which the Porte had promised to remit for three years, in consideration of the losses sustained by the unfortunate Nestorians during the massacres, had not been, it is true, levied for that time, but had now been collected altogether, whole districts being thus reduced to the greatest misery and want. Every manner of cruelty and torture had been used to compel the suffering Christians to yield up the little property they had concealed from the rapacity of the Turkish authorities. The pasture and arable lands around their villages had been taken away from them and given to their Kurdish tyrants.”

Mr. Crowe says again :—

“The question that naturally arises here is, What becomes of the female progeny of the poor in Constantinople? To this one is sorry to have to reply that the very poor in Constantinople have no progeny, because they can have no women. We know not exactly the number of females in the Turkish capital, which makes up a population of seven or eight hundred thousand; but the number, whatever it is, is very unfairly and unnaturally divided; for, whilst the harem of the rich teems with women, there are none in the lowest classes of the population, and but few even in the class above it. A wife is expensive in any country, but in Turkey more than anywhere else, inasmuch as a Turkish wife is not fit for or capable of labour of any kind. She could not sweep a room; she durst not go to market. She must have a slave to perform those menial offices. And there is besides the expense of decorating, covering, and immuring a wife—another necessity of Mahometanism. No labouring man, then—not even an artisan—can afford a wife. What is the consequence?

Concubinage? But there are no women. - I will not pursue this subject into any more of its horrid developments, further than to observe that the lower orders of a Turkish city do not reproduce their kind—they die out on dung-hills.”—*The Greek and the Turk*, pp. 208, 209.

Mr. McCulloch says :—

“Such is the Government which the great powers of Christendom, including, we are sorry to say, England, profess themselves desirous to maintain in all its integrity! We hardly, however, think that it is destined to a much longer endurance; and, happily, into whatever hands it may fall, there cannot be so much as the shadow of a doubt that the overthrow of the Turkish Government and power will be productive of the greatest possible advantage to the interests of humanity.”—*Geographical Dictionary*.

Consul Saunders, under date of Prevesa, April 13th, 1853, writes :—

“The rural population, oppressed by fiscal exactions, and subjected to intolerable acts of violence and injustice, cannot be expected to entertain any but the most rancorous feelings towards their persecutors. The inhabitants of the greater part of these villages being, moreover, exclusively Christians, and seeing no other prospect of relief open to them, are continually thronging the foreign Consulates with a view to seek some friendly intervention.”—Part i., p. 378.

Vice-Consul Baratti writes, Scutari, June 1st, 1853 :—

“All the desperate characters have raised their heads again, and acts of rapine and robbery are very frequent at the expense of the Christian. *Omar Pasha, the Governor of this province, is a Mussulman, and sees with perfect indifference all these excesses.* The Christians, who are exposed to the vengeance of their enemies, live in a continual state of alarm.”—P. 379.

Consul Neale writes, Turnour, June 28th, 1853 :—

That “the Christian population of Bulgaria are opposed to any foreign occupation,” and that, “were it not for the recurrence of these wanton and cold-blooded murders, and the consequent total insecurity of life, the Bulgarians would ask for arms to resist an invasion of the country.”—P. 381.

Here are some further extracts from the letters of Consul Saunders, March, 1854 :—

“Among other cases brought forward was one where a mother had her son and daughter bound before her eyes and menaced with frightful tortures, boiling oil being prepared to pour upon them for this purpose, unless a large sum of money, which the family was supposed to possess, were immediately con-

signed; while the unfortunate mother, producing every species of valuable which she could collect, was with difficulty enabled to satisfy the rapacity of these ruffians, who eventually decamped with a large booty. It should be observed that the parties concerned in the outrages are mostly wealthy Mussulman proprietors, who scruple not to commit every species of atrocity on such occasions."—P. 127.

"From the details so obtained, I learn that the town of Paramithia, and a considerable number of Christian villages of that and the adjacent districts, have been plundered, and in many instances burnt to the ground, by the Mussulman Albanians, under the command of certain chiefs, whose names are known; that churches and monasteries have been pillaged and laid waste; women and children carried away captive; a vast amount of cattle and other property conveyed to distant parts; and many individuals, particularly old men, helpless infants, and females, tortured and slain in a manner too brutal to describe."—P. 152.

Here is a description, by an eye-witness, of the way in which the Turks treated our poor wounded soldiers, who had been shedding their blood to maintain the independence and integrity of the Ottoman empire. It is from a little book entitled "*Experiences of an English Sister of Mercy*," published in 1863:—

"Having access to windows commanding two wharves, we often saw the sick and wounded from Balaclava brought on shore. This was indeed a piteous spectacle—a long file of stretchers, each with a gaunt soldier, clothed in his tattered grey coat, lying helpless (and very often senseless) upon it, being borne by noisy, careless Turks, who really appeared to resort to little expedients in order to increase the sufferings of the soldier, such as placing the taller of the four bearers at the feet rather than the head; when about to rest, allowing the framework to fall with a jerk; or lifting it up unevenly, and thus rolling off the bleeding burden. On one occasion a wounded man was brought in, and two of the bearers had rested their poles on the ground while the other two still retained theirs, thus causing the patient to lie on his head and shoulders. On releasing him we found that he had fainted: a few moments longer would probably have placed him beyond recovery. On another occasion the Turkish bearers, while jesting among themselves, threw a sick man off the stretcher, cutting his face, and giving him a severe shock. When able to speak, his first words were, 'Those frightful men have murdered me.' He did not live long after, though the fall would not have killed a man in health."

Dr. Sandwith, in his volume entitled "*Siege of Kars*," after referring to a firman published in 1854, promising legal equality before the courts to the Christians, says:—

"Since then I have been nearly two years in the provinces, both in

European and Asiatic Turkey, and have seen Christians frequently wronged, but have never heard of their evidence being taken. Each pasha, when questioned concerning this firman, declares he knows nothing of it; no firman of the kind has ever been officially communicated to him. He must act according to his instructions; he cannot take cognisance of firmans conveyed through European consuls."—Pp. 165—7.

As an example of the way in which the feelings of the Sultan's Christian subjects were rudely trampled on by Mussulman intolerance, he gives the following faithful translation of a *teskere*, or permit of burial, given by the Cadi of Mardin in the spring of 1855, to a Christian applying for it. He has given and does give, adds Dr. Sandwith, scores of the like kind to all the Giaours in his jurisdiction.

"We certify to the priests of the Church of Mary, that the impure, putrefied, stinking carcase of Saideh, damned this day, may be concealed under ground.

"A.H. 1271.—Rejib.

(Sealed)

"(March 29th, 1855.)

EL SAID MEHURRED FAIZI."

"What impression does the East produce on you?' said one gentleman to me.

"I have had time,' I said, 'only to look at the exterior. I see a capital, the streets of which are impassable to wheels, and scarcely to be traversed on foot; I see a country without a road; I see a palace of the Sultan's on every promontory of the Bosphorus; I see vast tracts of unoccupied land, and more dogs than human beings; these appearances are not favourable to the Government or the people.'

"If you have the misfortune,' he answered, 'as I have had, to live among Turks for between two and three years, your opinions will be still less favourable. In government and religion Turkey is a detritus. All that gave her strength, all that gave her consistency, is gone; what remains is crumbling into powder. The worst parts of her detestable religion—hatred of improvement and hatred of the unbeliever; the worst parts of her detestable government—violence, extortion, treachery, and fraud—are all that she has retained. Never was there a country that more required to be conquered. Our support merely delays her submission to that violent remedy.'

"You think, then,' I said, 'that it must come to that?'

"I can see,' he answered, 'no other solution. The Turk is utterly unimprovable. He hates change, and therefore he hates civilisation; he hates Europeans, he hates and fears all that they propose. There is not a word in the *hatti-i-humayoon* that does not disgust, or irritate, or alarm him. Nothing but force will oblige him to give it even the appearance of execution. And

what is the value of apparent reforms in a people without an aristocracy, without a middle class, without a public opinion, without the means of communication, without newspapers, without even a post-office; accustomed for four hundred years to plunder and oppress rayahs, and to be oppressed and plundered by sultans, pashas, cadis, and janissaries?"—Pp. 27, 28.

"He gave a frightful account of the misgovernment of Turkish Armenia. . . . The amount of tyranny may be inferred from the depopulation. You see vast districts without an inhabitant, in which are the traces of a large and a civilised people, great works for irrigation now in ruins, and constant remains of deserted towns. There is a city near the frontier, with high walls and large stone houses, now absolutely uninhabited; it had once sixty thousand inhabitants."—Pp. 838—9.

"I do not believe that the Turks are more idle, wasteful, improvident, and brutal now than they were four hundred years ago. But it is only within the last fifty years that the effects of these qualities have shown themselves fully. When they first swarmed over Asia Minor, Roumelia, and Bulgaria, they seized on a country very populous and of enormous wealth. For three hundred and fifty years they kept on consuming that wealth, and wearing out that population. If a Turk wanted a house or a garden, he turned out a rayah; if he wanted money, he put a bullet into a handkerchief, tied it into a knot, and sent it to the nearest opulent Greek or Armenian. At last, having lived for three centuries and a half on their capital of things and of man, having reduced that rich and well-peopled country to the desert which you now see it, they find themselves poor. They cannot dig, to beg they are ashamed. They use the most mischievous means to prevent large families; they kill their female children, the conscription takes off the males, and they disappear. The only memorial of what fifty years ago was a popular Turkish village is a crowded burial-ground now unused.

"As a medical man," said Y., "I, and perhaps, *I only*, know what crimes are committed in the Turkish part of Smyrna, which looks so gay and smiling, as its picturesque houses, enbosomed in gardens of planes and cypresses, rise up the hill. I avoid as much as I can the Turkish houses, that I may not be cognizant of them. Sometimes it is a young second wife who is poisoned by the elder one; sometimes a female child, whom the father will not bring up; sometimes a male killed by the mother to spite the father. Infanticide is rather the rule than the exception. No inquiry is made, no notice is taken by the police."—Pp. 211—12.

"A friend well acquainted with the whole of Turkey said to Mr. Senior as he was leaving Constantinople, 'You are going to Smyrna and to Greece. When you are at Smyrna visit Ephesus; you will ride through fifty miles of the most fertile soil, blest with the finest climate in the world. You will not see an inhabitant nor a cultivated field. This is Turkey. In Greece or in the Principalities you will find comparative numbers, wealth, and population.

They have been misgoverned; they have been the seat of war; but they have thrown off the Turk."—P. 148.

Letter to the Rev. Ernest Hawkins :—

"Few of you in England know the real horrors of this country. You will see what I mean when I tell you my intention of getting a number of tracts in Turkish written or lithographed, to be distributed by a Turk on the bridges, &c. The tract is to consist of such passages as the history of Sodom and Gomorrah. What can we hope to do with this people? One Englishman, who has to do with multitudes of them, reckons those who are innocent of this hideous vice at one or two in a hundred. A Turkish teacher told a European that those who are guiltless as to that are two in a thousand."

"But all these combined will not fully account for the fact that the Turks are rapidly becoming extinct. . . . The evil lies far deeper. It is one, however, which cannot be laid bare. The hideous, revolting profligacy of all classes, and almost every individual in every class, is the main cause of the diminution. This is a canker which has eaten into the very vitals of society. It is one, however, which has taken so loathsome a form that no pen dares describe the immoral state of Turkish society. It must be abandoned to vague generalities, for happily the imagination cannot picture the abominations which are fast exterminating the whole Turkish race. . . . I have the evidence now before me of persons at present resident in Turkey, as well as of English officers high in the civil service, whose duties have made them acquainted with the real state of society in Turkey; and in addition to these, I have a voluminous report addressed to me by a distinguished foreigner, formerly a colonel in the Turkish service, and from the varied offices he has filled in that country, of all men one of the most competent witnesses. I have all this evidence before me, but it is so disgusting and obscene that I dare not make use of it. The satires of Juvenal and Petronius Arbiter are decorous in comparison. Students may remember how rabbinical writers describe the sins of the Ammonites and other inhabitants of the land of Canaan, who for their revolting sins were driven out by the children of Israel. That description gives but a partial picture of what is the present state of Turkish society. The Cities of the Plain were destroyed for sins which are the common, normal, every-day practice of this people."—*The Christians of Turkey*, pp. 62—4.

But in the following July the explosion did indeed take place in the fearful atrocities in Syria, by which a hundred and fifty towns and villages were destroyed, ten thousand people were massacred, seventy thousand reduced to starvation, and property destroyed or plundered to the estimated value of four or five millions sterling. The Druses were the immediate agents in the

work of horror, but there is the clearest evidence to prove that the Turkish officials, civil and military, not only did not attempt to repress the wholesale murder and pillage going on under their eyes in the Lebanon and at Damascus—that not only did they connive at them openly and obviously—but that they instigated and encouraged them.

“At Hasbeya on the 6th many of the soldiers were seen leaving; then the unfortunate people, when it was too late, saw clearly how treacherously they had been deceived. They rushed into the outer court and entreated to be let out. The signal was given, the gates thrown open, and in rushed the Druses, armed with any weapon they could seize, and then commenced an indiscriminate slaughter of all the males. Some, indeed, made their way through the door to the outer gate, only to be seized by the Turkish soldiery. Nor were these passive only in the transaction. Many Christians whom I have examined have sworn to me that they saw the soldiers themselves taking part in the slaughter; and the subsequent behaviour of these brutal troops to the women was savage in the extreme. From the wounds I have seen, both on the living and the dead, it would appear that they went to work with the most systematic cruelty—ten, twelve, and fourteen deep cuts on the body of one person is not unfrequent. Some of the wounds show that they were made with blunt instruments. In short, everything was used which came to hand, and, according to the nature of the weapon, hands and limbs were cut off, or brains dashed out, or bodies mangled.

“Of all the men in the Serai, some forty or fifty only escaped. Women the Druses did not slaughter, nor, for the most part, I believe, ill-use; that was left for Turks and Moslems to do, and they did it.

“Little boys of four and five years old were not safe. These would be seized from the mother and dashed on the ground, or torn to pieces before her face; or, if her grasp was too tight, they would kill it on her lap, and in some cases, to save further trouble, mother and child were cut down together. Many women have assured me that the Turkish soldiers have taken their children one leg in each hand and torn them in two.”

At Sidon, on the 1st of June, the Christians were attacked in similar manner by the Bashi-Bazouks and other Moslems:—

“For several days the slaughter continued. No Christian outside the town was in safety. If a man, or a male child, he was cut down; if a woman, she was sure to be brutally ill-used.

“On the morning of the 21st the Druses collected round the town. One of their leaders came to the Serai and desired to speak with the Governor. A conversation was carried on in a low voice by means of an interpreter, for the

Turk did not know Arabic. At last a question was asked to which they heard the Governor give the answer 'Hepsi'—('Ab' in Turkish)—i.e., 'all.' Thereupon the Druse disappeared, but in a few moments the gate was thrown open and in rushed the fiends, cutting down and slaughtering every male, the soldiers co-operating. . . . I have good reason to believe, after a careful comparison of all the accounts, that from 1,100 to 1,200 males actually perished in that one day. . . . I myself can testify that the accounts are not much exaggerated. I travelled over most of the open country before the war was over, and came to Deir-el-Kamar a few days after the massacre. Almost every house was burnt and the streets crowded with dead bodies, most of them stripped and mutilated in every possible way. My road led through the town, and through some of the streets my horse could not even pass, for the bodies were literally piled up. Most of those I examined had many wounds, and in each case was the right hand either entirely or nearly cut off; the poor wretch, in default of weapons, having instinctively raised his arm to parry the blow aimed at him. I saw little children of not more than three or four years old stretched on the ground, and old men with grey beards."

The horrible occurrences which have been detailed above were to be surpassed in a few days at Damascus. The outbreak, which the Governor, Ahmed Pasha, made not the least attempt to check, occurred on the 9th of July. The whole Christian quarter was ruthlessly plundered and burnt to the ground; 2,000 dead bodies lay unburied amid the ruins, and 20,000 houseless wanderers, whose only crime was that they were followers of Christ, were left to live on charity and ask for justice at the hands of Europe.

"Hitherto the taxes have been paid in kind, a method which always gives the gatherer much power to extort bribes, since he can refuse to value the present standing corn until half of it be spoiled. But Turkish tax-farmers do not confine themselves to such dry paths of cheating.

"The following is an instance of what constantly occurs:—Two men agreed to keep a flock between them—the one in summer on the mountains, the other in winter on the plain. The tax-gatherer compels the first to pay for the whole, promising that he will ask nothing of the other; he then goes to the second, and, with a similar promise, forces him likewise to pay for all. In like manner the Christian can be compelled to pay twice over for exemption from the army, if the tax-gatherer declare his first receipt forged."

"Since writing the above, we have found these and other stories related at length in Mrs. Walker's 'Through Macedonia to the Albanian Lakes.' She also says, 'The Christians of Ochrida complain bitterly of the murders of their co-religionists which have taken place in that neighbourhood within the last three years. No less than thirty lives have been sacrificed, but in no single

instance have the assassins been brought to justice' (page 211). An American missionary told us that near Eski-Sagra, in Bulgaria, where he was stationed, from seventy to one hundred Christians were killed annually by Mussulmans without inquiry being made."—P. 76.

Miss Irby, after describing their visit to a school at the Monastery of Gratchanitzza, says :—

"Before leaving the schoolroom, we ventured a very earnest remonstrance as to the mode in which the pupils had greeted us. At our entrance they had literally fallen down at our feet, and that with a sort of grovelling action, which, if not revolting, would have been ludicrous. We asked how in the world they came to suppose we should wish to be thus received. Their teacher answered, 'The Turks taught it us; their dignitaries require us Christians to prostrate ourselves before them.'

"The Christian community of Novi-Bazar is at the mercy of the Mussulmans. They enter houses both by day and night, take what they choose, and behave as they will. Raise an arm or speak a word, and you bring on yourself death or the loss of a limb. Make a representation to the authorities, and you are ruined by the revenge of those of whom you have dared to complain."

Captain Warren says :—

"It is not the Christians alone of Syria that the Turk oppresses: the Arab Moslem is, if not equally, yet most hardly used. Many a time have the Arab Moslems said to me, 'When will you take this country and rid us of our oppressors? anything is better than their rule.' For the Turk has no affinity of race or language to connect him with, or give him a right to rule, the Arab. He has no power of sympathising with the Semitic races, and his religion is but in name. The Arab, if I may use such an expression, is a Moslem by nature; the Turk cannot become a Moslem by art.

"He is sent to Palestine to govern bad. He is given but a small salary and is obliged to squeeze the people in order to pay his own officials and to live, to recoup himself for what he has paid for his appointment in the past, and to carry away with him something for the future wherewith he may buy a higher appointment, or purchase immunity for the consequences of his evil deeds, should complaints be made against his rule.

"The Turk can never govern Palestine well; and until he departs the country must remain half desert, half prison; for it is his policy to leave it so. He wants it to continue impoverished, so that it may not tempt the cupidity of stronger nations. This was brought home to me once, when, in conversation with an eminent Turk, I was pressing the advantages of a bridge across the Jordan and other matters. He answered me warmly, 'We want no discoveries; we want no attention paid to Palestine; we want no roads. Leave the place alone. If it becomes rich, we shall lose it; if it remains poor, it will continue

in our hands. God be praised.' In vain I urged that if the country were well governed there would be no occasion for taking it from Turkey. His idea was, 'If we make it valuable, you will want it. Let us keep it in poverty.' Well, he tries to keep it in poverty, and succeeds to some extent in reality, and to a great extent in appearance. . . .

"The fruit-trees are taxed, even from the day on which they are planted, year by year, though they may not be productive for a long time to come; so that, if a man plants a thousand fig-trees or olives, he pays nearly ten pounds sterling per annum for years before they yield him any profit. For what purpose can such a system be put in force, except for retarding cultivation, and keeping back the country? It certainly cannot be for the purpose of getting a revenue, for with such a law few will plant.

"The people are treated with equal cruelty in regard to the gathering in of their corn. When they have thrashed and winnowed, they leave it heaped up on the floor for the government inspector to see and take his share; and often it happens that a large portion is decayed or destroyed before he arrives."—*Underground Jerusalem*, pp. 449—54.

"Unexplored Syria" is the title of a work published by Captain Burton, who was for a considerable time British Consul at Damascus.

"Captain Burton," says the reviewer in the *Times*, "is eminently conscientious and accurate in his observations, and he tells us quite enough to confirm us in the idea that the administration of Syria, as of other Turkish provinces, is execrable. So mercilessly have the villagers been oppressed and fleeced by the tax-gatherers, that for a hundred and fifty years past there has been a steady exodus from the more settled districts to the remote settlements that look towards the Euphrates desert. We have the statement that in the last five years of Raschid Pasha's administration no less than seventeen mountain villages were depopulated, while in a single autumn between seven hundred and eight hundred families had taken their flight to the eastward."

"We can hardly wonder," says Captain Burton, "at the exodus when we are told that nearly half the settlements of the Jaydur district, the ancient Jhirra—eleven out of twenty-four—have been within twelve months ruined by the usurer and the tax-gatherer. . . . It is hardly necessary to dwell on the short-sighted and miserable management which drives an industrious peasantry from its hearths and homes to distant settlements, where defence is much more easy than offence, and where, as Cromwell said of Pease Burn, ten men to hinder are better than a hundred to make their way. This upon a small scale is a specimen of the system which keeps down to a million and a half the population of a province which, though not larger than Lancashire and Yorkshire united, in the days of Strabo and Josephus supported its ten millions and more."—Pp. 179—181.

Mr. Henry C. Barkley is a gentleman who has been engaged for many years in connection with railway work in Turkey. In his work recently published, entitled, "Between the Danube and Black Sea," he records principally his experiences in Bulgaria. Of the Bulgarians he speaks in terms of commendation as a quiet, industrious, honest people; but, like all other travellers, he testifies to the cruel and oppressive character of Turkish rule. He says:—

"The Bulgarians, and also the Turkish villagers, are loud in their complaints of the injustice and tyranny of the Turkish officials. All—from the governor-general to the hangman—think it right and just, when on a journey, to quarter themselves on the peasants, without ever thinking of paying; and at the same time they demand the services of their host and his family, and the best of everything there is to be had. The largest and most prosperous of the villages are built as far as possible from the main roads leading to and from the fortified towns, such as Widdin, Rustchuk, Shumla, &c. If they are on the line of march, the troops live on them at free quarters, their carts and beasts are seized for transport services, and the owners themselves forced to accompany them as drivers, and are obliged to find food for themselves and fodder for the cattle, for all of which they receive no recompense.

"To assist in the construction of the line which passed by the village, I caused a road to be made across the marsh, and a wooden bridge thrown over the brook. The first night after the bridge was completed it was cut down; and, on making inquiries about it, a Turk told me that, rather than live with this easy access to the road, the inhabitants, both Turks and Bulgars, would burn their houses and migrate to some spot where Turkish officials, Turkish troops, and, above all, Turkish *zaptiehs*, could not so easily get at them. 'Above all, *zaptiehs*,' for they are the constant and never-ending curse of all the villages, whether Turkish or Bulgar. They are recruited from the very lowest and most ruffianly of the Turks. Many, if not most of them, have been brigands, and all are robbers. Their pay (even when they get it) is not sufficient to support them, and therefore they depend on their *position* to secure the comforts of life. They *live* on the peasants, and all they have, from their pipe to their horse, has been robbed from them. Over and over again I have seen every woman and girl of an entire Christian village disappear as if by magic at the approach of a *zaptieh*; and when he enters the village all the men stand staring about, watching to see what may take place, like a flock of sheep when a strange dog comes among them."—Preface, pp. vi.—viii.

"The Pasha of Varna had some time before this sent orders to a distant village for a supply of wood. Five *arabas*, each with a Bulgar driver, arrived at dusk, just as the storm commenced. They inquired where they should deliver the wood, but no one knew exactly where the woodstack had better be

made, and the pasha's servants, fearing if it were discharged at the wrong place that they should have to remove it themselves, determined to do nothing till the morning. The arabas were therefore escorted into a large barrack-yard surrounded with high walls, and there locked in for the night. The cries and shouts for help from the five men were disregarded, and no further notice was taken of them till the next morning, when they were found huddled together in the snow, all dead. No matter; they were Bulgar dogs, and it was Kismet! No one was punished; the wood was not paid for; but payment for the keep of the wretched bullocks was extorted from the friends of the dead men when they came to fetch them away a month later."

Mr. Evans says:—

"A village will occasionally band together to defend themselves from these extortioners. Thereupon the tithe-farmer applies to the civil power, protesting that if he does not get the full amount from the village, he will be unable in his turn to pay the Government. The zaptiehs, the factotums of the Turkish officials, are immediately quartered on the villagers, and live on them, insult their wives, and ill-treat their children. With the aid of these gentry, all kinds of personal tortures are applied to the recalcitrant. In the heat of summer men are stripped naked and tied to a tree, smeared over with honey or other sweetstuff, and left to the tender mercies of the insect world. For winter extortion it is found convenient to bind people to stakes, and leave them barefooted to be frostbitten: or at other times they are shoved into a pigstye, and cold water poured on them. A favourite plan is to drive a party of rayahs up a tree, or into a chamber, and then smoke them with green wood. Instances are recorded of Bosniac peasants being buried up to their heads in earth, and left to repent at leisure. I will quote a single instance of these practices, communicated by the Princess Julia of Servia to the author of '*Servia and the Servians*':—'A poor woman, frantic with agony, burst into the palace of the princess at Belgrade. She had been assessed by the Turkish authorities of a village in Bosnia of a sum which she had no means of paying. . . . *She was smoked.* This failed of extracting the gold. She begged for a remission, and stated her inability to pay. In answer, she was tossed into the river Drina, and after her were thrown her two infant children—one of four years old, the other of two. Before her eyes, notwithstanding her frantic efforts to save them, her children perished. Half-drowned and insensible, she was dragged to land by a Servian peasant. She made her way to Belgrade, believing, from the character of the princess for humanity, that she would aid her. Of course, to do so was out of the question.'

And now we close with the testimony of the last traveller who has visited Turkey—Sir George Campbell:—

"When," he says, "we come to political rights and trusts, then I say that

at this moment, and now perhaps more than at any previous period of Turkish history, the Christians are placed in a humiliating and enthralled position, which has no parallel in the world. Think of a system under which no Christian can bear arms in any capacity, not even the bâton of a policeman, nor exercise any executive authority, even the pettiest; under which not only the whole army, but the whole executive administration—the whole police down to the village watchmen—are all of the dominant Mahometan minority, while the Christian majority are entirely and without exception a subject people! Compare this state of things with the liberal government of the Mogul Emperors in India, where the Hindoos were employed in thousands and tens of thousands, both in the army and the civil administration, where many of the chief ministers were Hindoos, and where one of the Emperors even went so far as to appoint a Hindoo General to be Governor of Mahometan Cabul. Compare it with the every-day and uncoerced practices of native States in India at this day. There is hardly a Hindoo State which has not many Mahometans in its higher offices, and hardly a Mahometan State which has not many Hindoos in similar offices."

PROFESSOR MARTENS ON THE EASTERN QUESTION.

Extract from an article in the "Revue de Droit International," by M. F. Martens, Professor of the University of St. Petersburg.—In 1829 "the Emperor Nicholas instituted a secret committee, under the presidency of Prince Kotschoubey, and composed of the highest functionaries of the Empire, to study the position of Turkey, and to fix the conduct of Russia in case the Porte ceased to exist. In the sitting of September 4th, 1829, Count Nesselrode read the memorandum stating 'that the preservation of this Empire (Ottoman) was more useful than injurious to the true interests of Russia, and that no state of things which one could substitute for it could counterbalance for us the advantage of having a feeble state as neighbour;' but if the fall of the Turkish Empire is inevitable, Russia should invite her allies 'to deliberate in common on this great question.'

"The committee had also before it a remarkable letter addressed by Comte Capo d'Istrias to the Emperor Nicholas, on the 31st March, 1828. The celebrated Russian diplomatist, become president of regenerated Greece, proposed the following plan for the political reconstruction of the Balkan peninsula. The Ottoman Empire was to be replaced by five states of the second class. These states were to be (1) the Duchy or Kingdom of Dacia, formed of Moldavia and Wallachia; (2) the Kingdom of Servia, composed of Bulgaria, Servia, and Bosnia; (3) Thrace and Macedonia, properly so called, with the isles of the Propontis and those of Finbros, Samothrace, and Thasos, would form the Kingdom of Macedonia; (4) Epirus, comprising the provinces of

Upper and Lower Albania, would form the Kingdom of Epirus ; (5) finally, Greece, properly so called, from the river of the Peneus, in Thessaly, to the town of Arta, including all the islands, would form the Greek state. . . Constantinople was to become a free city, and the centre of the Confederation, which was to unite all the five states of the Balkan peninsula, and the Confederation was to be represented at Constantinople by a Congress. Count Pozzo di Borgo and M. de Daschkof brought forward amendments and critical observations relative to this plan ; they feared that the free city would not have the power to keep the straits shut to vessels of war which might have the object of attacking the Russian coast in the Black Sea. From the Protocols of the sittings, it appears that the committee considered it inopportune to decide on any fixed plan before the destruction of the Ottoman Empire became an accomplished fact, but they unanimously resolved—

“ 1. ‘That the advantages of the maintenance of the Ottoman Empire in Europe are greater than the evils it presents, and that its fall would be therefore contrary to the true interests of Russia. That consequently it would be prudent to seek to prevent it by profiting by all the chances which may still present themselves to conclude an honourable peace.’ Peace, accordingly, was made at Adrianople.”

This, however, was in my opinion as unwise and discreditable a policy as that which England still pursues, and I trust and believe that the Russian nation will insist on the expulsion of the Turks from Europe, and the reconstruction of the Greek Empire, even if they remain under the delusion that it is contrary to their interests instead of being, as I have shown, in perfect accordance with them.

“THE BUCKINGHAMSHIRE BUFFOON” (LORD
BEACONSFIELD).

POLITICAL SQUIB, 1874.

To understand the unfortunate mischances by which the Turcophile Conservative party are now in power, and the Russophile Liberal party in opposition, I subjoin the following satirical political squib from the *Pall Mall Gazette*, which was then less favourable to Conservatism than it has now become.

“Alas ! we are out of our places—
It is but too true, lackaday !
Imagine our woebegone faces,
As we are all packing away.
On Monday our colours we struck—struck—
Resigning the next afternoon ;
And all at the word of a Buck—Buck—
Buckinghamshire Buffoon.*

“I’m told the last Cabinet Council
Was something too painful to see ;
And, though you’re aware he don’t bounce ill,
You really would feel for poor G. ;†
He’s awfully down on his luck—luck,
And if some his wisdom impugn,
He’s better at least than a Buck—Buck—
Buckinghamshire Buffoon.

* Mr. Disraeli, now Lord Beaconsfield, formerly M.P. for Buckinghamshire.

† Mr. Gladstone.

"There Goschen was rending his garments,
 Here Cardwell was tearing his hair ;
 And who shall discover the torments
 That agonized poor Aberdare ?
 The Chancellor showed better pluck—pluck,
 Though he, too, was ready to swoon,
 He thought how he'd shunted the Buck—Buck—
 Buckinghamshire Buffoon.

"Old Halifax pining with Forster,
 Their visages full of distress,
 Proved how the sharp pangs of remorse stir
 The muscles of men in a mess.
 Poor G., who his bottle would suck—suck,
 Confessed he was in a balloon
 When he tipped such a chance to the Buck—Buck—
 Buckinghamshire Buffoon.

"Then Granville and Bright in a corner
 Sat sorrowful, sulky, and glum ;
 While Kimberley, even forlorn,
 Stood moodily biting his thumb ;
 But Lowe, as malicious as Puck—Puck,
 Flounced like a cantankerous loon,
 And scoffed at both G. and the Buck—Buck—
 Buckinghamshire Buffoon.

"There was Hartington drying his eyes,
 And Fortescue making his moan ;
 While Stansfeld, in vacant surprise,
 Did nothing but grumble and moan.
 Argyll seemed as if he'd been struck—struck
 By fatuous beams from the moon ;
 So blank did he look 'bout the Buck—Buck—
 Buckinghamshire Buffoon.

"Poor G., 'midst the weeping and wailing
 Attempted their feelings to calm,
 And promote a return to plain sailing
 By giving the tone to a psalm :
 But the words in his throttle they stuck—stuck
 Besides, he'd forgotten the tune,
 Put out, as it were, by the Buck—Buck—
 Buckinghamshire Buffoon.

"The Council then broke up in sorrow,
 Contrition, and mourning, and tears,
 All bitterly feeling the morrow
 From power would exclude them for years.
 If but to the old house they'd stuck—stuck,
 And proffered the Income Tax boon,
 They thought they'd have diddled the Buck—Buck—
 Buckinghamshire Buffoon.

"But now I must finish my letter,
 My pitiful story I've told ;
 I trust that we all shall be better
 For a time of it 'out in the cold.'
 How we have been running a muck—muck,
 We see by this inopportune
 Unexpected success of the Buck—Buck—
 Buckinghamshire Buffoon.

"You know that I am not a novice
 In many affairs of the world—
 I've long felt that some day from office
 We'd be ignominiously hurled.
 Poor G. overloaded his truck—truck,
 For nobody cared a doubloon,
 And thus he's been thrashed by the Buck—Buck—
 Buckinghamshire Buffoon."

THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE AID OF THE WOUNDED IN WAR AND THE STAFFORD HOUSE COMMITTEE.

NOTHING can be more discreditable, unfair, and even illegal than the conduct of the National Society for the Aid of the Wounded in the present war, but it is only what might have been expected, considering that the management of that Society is in much the same incompetent and one-sided hands as during the Franco-German war.

I was glad to observe in the *Times* a most excellent letter, from Mr. Auberon Herbert, in which he strongly and justly animadverts at the conduct of the Committee, dated 29th July, and which, though the month of August has arrived, the Committee have been unable to refute. He states :—

SIR,—I feel assured that my friend, Colonel Loyd-Lindsay, when placed in a position of responsibility, would not consciously give his approval to any act of partiality ; but I think that his letter of Friday will confirm the opinion that the action taken by his Committee will result in a very unequal distribution of supplies as between the Turks and their opponents, whether Russian or Montenegrin.

From Colonel Loyd-Lindsay's letter we may conclude that the Committee of the National Aid Society have rested from their labours since they despatched their ship to the Black Sea. But who are the persons likely to draw advantage from this ship ? The Turks have, and from the beginning of the war have had, the command of the Black Sea ; and whether the good ship operates on the coast of Asia Minor or of Roumelia and Bulgaria, it is almost certain that the supplies would have to pass

through Turkish hands before any part of them could reach Russian troops. We are obliged, then, to conclude that the equitable distribution of these supplies will depend upon the facilities which the Turks may give to some English surgeon who, dropped from the ship, presents himself at some point or other of the coast, and innocently demands to be forwarded through to the Russian lines. Your correspondent from Shumla described the other day the fate which awaited the stores forwarded by the Stafford House Committee. He writes:—

“Shumla, July 8.

“There are 88 wounded in Rustchuk, and the English doctors are not allowed to attend them. All are packed off with broken legs and arms, without being dressed, in a most dreadful state, for Constantinople. Soldiers implore the English doctors to extract bullets, but they are helpless, as 28 cases of medical stores sent by the Stafford House Committee have been seized by the Turkish doctor-in-chief at Rustchuk, in spite of the protest of English doctors. They have not been distributed, and are practically useless. Battalions are marched off without medical stores, while this man keeps everything under lock and key. All stores should be consigned to the English doctors.”

If it is a matter of such difficulty to succeed in applying for the use of the Turks themselves what is sent out from England, the Committee must indeed be of a hopeful disposition if they are prepared to believe that through the Turks they can also reach the Russians. I can confidently say that during the Franco-German War it would have been no easy or pleasant task to have forwarded supplies through Paris to the German troops, and the experiment of supplying one army through another army will not be easier because one of those armies happens to be the Turkish army. When supplies for the Turks were sent by the Society through Belgrade during the Servian War, we received accounts of the unfavourable impression created by such an arrangement, and yet Belgrade was removed from the field of war, and, comparatively speaking, might almost be said to have been in a state of peace. Moreover, it is an entirely different operation to ship stores at Belgrade and send them down the Danube to Turkish territory, to landing stores in the rear of the Turkish lines, for the purpose of passing them through the Turkish troops on

to the Russian army. Of course when the Turkish troops have retreated from northern Bulgaria, when the seaports are in Russian hands, when the Turkish fleet definitely resigns this part of the seaboard, it may be possible for the ship, should any stores have been reserved in view of such a future, to communicate directly with the Russians; but that will not prevent a large number of persons from feeling that the natural and equitable course would have been to send one part of the supplies through Constantinople to the rear of the Turkish Army and another part down the Danube to the rear of the Russian Army.

Colonel Loyd-Lindsay can hardly feel satisfied with his own excuse about Montenegro. Had some one else offered it he would readily perceive that it crawls upon even a smaller number of legs than usually belongs to the race of excuses. The resources of the Society are not inexhaustible; therefore nothing can be done for this little State. If I remember rightly, £70,000 was in the hands of the Committee at the beginning of the Servian War, and of this not £10,000, not £5,000, not £1,000 could be spared for a country which has such claims both on account of its want of resources and, as your correspondent pointed out, the value to the community of each life. The Society, says Colonel Loyd-Lindsay, cannot operate "in every place at the same time;" but that is no reason why the Society should place all its eggs in one basket, send one ship out to drift about the Black Sea, with a fair chance of not seeing a Russian, unless he be a prisoner in the hands of the Turks, during its whole cruise, and then remain with hands folded while war is going on and battles are being fought in places not accessible from the Black Sea. "At the same time," says Colonel Loyd-Lindsay; but it was in June that he describes his ship, and we have now reached the middle of July. I cannot think that there would have been any need to make time or place responsible for the present small results if the Committee had striven to make the most of their fund; but their apparent apathy gives some excuse for the harsh belief that, like other distributors of endowments, they have become bored with the task of dispensing the fund, that is

in their hands, and that ships to the Black Sea, irrespective of where the principal fighting is going on, suggest themselves as one of the least troublesome ways of getting rid in large sums of what so inconveniently remains. No grounds for such a belief ought to exist, and it is for the Committee at once to remove them. It is only fair to add that whatever blame falls to the share of the Committee some of it must rest on the public for having shown so little interest in the work of the Society; and I believe that the best course to be adopted would be for the Committee at once to call together a meeting of old subscribers and others willing, if only appealed to, to become subscribers, and reanimate a movement which has nearly passed from slumber into non-existence.

I regret to add that Dr. Sandwith has left England.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

Ashley Arnewood Farm, Lymington. AUBERON HERBERT.

The funds of the National Society were subscribed on the understanding that they should be expended as nearly as possible equally on the wounded of both sides in every successive war as long as any portion of them remained, and it seems to me a signal breach of faith to the subscribers, of whom I am one, to adopt measures by which, as Mr. Herbert points out, all or nearly all which is sent out will be monopolised by the Turks, because the "West-end" is almost to a man anti-Russian, and the overwhelming majority even opposed to the Turkish Christians.

The Stafford House Committee is also liable to the gravest censure for confining their operations to the Turks alone, as this is a breach of neutrality and practically levying war against Russia, one of the oldest and best allies of England, besides being a wanton insult to that great country, and it is more than doubtful whether the course they are pursuing is not even injurious to the Turks, since they are encouraged to depend chiefly on their assistance for the care of the sick and wounded, and as their soldiers seldom if ever receive a farthing of pay and are ill-clothed and half-starved, the sum which the Stafford House Committee have contributed, and which the Turks have saved by their disgraceful

and unparalleled inhumanity to their own wounded (to say nothing of their unfortunate wounded enemies, who may fall by a horrible misfortune into their hands), would maintain for a considerable time a battalion of soldiers who may probably wound a considerable number of Russians and Montenegrins, and thus the Stafford House Committee not only do not relieve the Russian wounded but indirectly increase their numbers. The quotation, however, in Mr. Herbert's letter from the *Times* correspondent at Shumla, shows that after all the Turks not only will not attend to their own wounded, but will not even allow the doctors and agents of the Stafford House Committee to aid them, acting, I suppose, on the principle, "Timeo Anglos et dona ferentes," and the result of Turkish incompetence and inhumanity to their own people is, according to the Vienna correspondent of the *Times*, that the Sultan told Mehemet Ali, his renegade German generalissimo, that according to the report of Namyk Pasha the Turkish army had lost the appalling and unprecedented proportion of forty per cent. of their numbers in consequence of bad food and bad management.

The Russians, on the other hand, spare no expense in reference to their own wounded and those of the Turks, and in evidence of this I now quote from the *Times* correspondent :—"An American surgeon, who is inspecting the hospital arrangements at Bucharest, pronounces them all that could be desired, and expresses his surprise to find all the modern improvements for caring for sick and wounded men in full operation here in the East. The Russian field ambulance trains are very extensive, and contain complete arrangements for the comfort of the wounded."

Since I wrote the foregoing paragraphs I formed one of a deputation, consisting of some members of Parliament and others, who waited on the National Society for Aid to the Wounded, &c., in order to urge that an equal sum should be expended on the Russian and Montenegrin wounded to that which was being laid out on the Turkish wounded, and that it would be fair to reckon the whole costs of the ship and cargo sent by them to the Black Sea to the debit of the Turkish share of our bounty.

In the course of a long discussion, Colonel Loyd-Lindsay

feebly attempted to justify the one-sided course the committee had adopted in breach of justice, the statutes of the Society, the wish of a large portion of the subscribers, of whom I am one, and the laws of neutrality—since assisting the Turkish side only is precisely the same thing as placing soldiers in the field against Russia—but he gave no explanation of the reasons why annual general meetings of the society and elections of members of the committee were not regularly held, in accordance with the rules. He added that when assistance had been tendered to the Russians they had replied that they did not require it, but that if we chose to send any stores they would accept them, provided they were not clogged with the condition of their being distributed by the agents of the society; and he stated that it was contrary to their regulations to give stores in this manner. Upon this I stated that it was highly creditable that the Russians, with a proper sense of national dignity, as long as they believed they had ample resources to meet the demands of a war which, after the passage by the Russians of the Danube and of the Balkans, seemed on the point of terminating, should have been averse to receive contributions offered with a bad grace by persons who were notoriously hostile to them, and avowed partisans of their enemies; but that the Russian losses at the battle of Plevna, the total change in the plan of the campaign, and the probable protraction of the war, had now shown them that their resources were inadequate, and that the Empress of Russia had caused a letter to be written to Mr. Lewis Farley, on the stamped paper of her “Chancellerie,” and sealed with her seal, saying that the Red Cross Society would “receive with gratitude” any contributions from the league for the protection of the Christians; and of course it follows that they will equally receive with gratitude contributions from any other quarter, if tendered *in a suitable manner*. Mr. Farley has also received a letter from Baroness Rahden, the president of the St. Petersburg branch of the Red Cross Society, to the same effect, and these letters I afterwards sent for the perusal of the committee of the National Aid Society. I added that in the Franco-German war I had myself distributed for the National Society a

considerable quantity of medicines and other stores, without any supervision on my part or that of any official of the society, in which I was confirmed by Sir Henry Havelock, who had been for a long time engaged in succouring the sick and wounded out of his own private funds, for which, on his return, he obtained very scant acknowledgment from the society.

The secretary then asserted that he had seen the evil consequences of stores being given during the Franco-German war without supervision, for some of them were wasted, others spoilt, and another portion made use of by unwounded combatants in perfect health; and, in short, the society took time to consider their answer.

It appears to me that it is most injudicious and absurd for the National Aid Society, or any other society for the relief of the wounded, to purchase any stores whatever unless the officials of the society with the Turkish, Russian, and Montenegrin armies write or telegraph that particular stores are required, and the only stores they should send out unasked are bales of lint and other articles contributed to them in kind, provided they will bear the cost of carriage, which, as Colonel Lindsay admitted, is not always the case. In the Franco-German war I was asked for, say biscuits, wine, and Liebig's essence of meat at one place, being the only thing they wanted; and I could only offer them lint, medicine, or surgical instruments, none of which could be eaten or drunk, so that wounded men may have died who might have lived if I had had enough money to buy as much as was wanted, of which there was plenty to be purchased in the town.

I feel certain that even if wine, biscuits, and other articles which would be acceptable to unwounded combatants were handed over to those who are at the head of the agencies of the Russian Red Cross Society at the headquarters of the Russian armies, they would willingly give and honourably fulfil the pledge that nothing whatever which the National Society gave for the wounded should be distributed to unwounded men in health; but if the National Society consider that these Russian gentlemen, who are often their equals, and sometimes their superiors, in social standing, are so

dishonest as to violate such a pledge, how can their agent see, after he has given the wine and biscuits to the doctor or nurses of a hospital, that every morsel of biscuit and glass of wine is given exclusively to the sick and wounded, and that even the doctors and officials take none themselves ?

I can imagine the Turks making free with such stores, as their men are half starved and live almost entirely on bread, whilst their superiors are notoriously corrupt, and Redif Pasha, the Minister at War, was dismissed lately for making a shameful profit by sending rotten biscuits to the Turkish army ; but the Russians, who are well fed, and whose officers, as well as the members of the Russian Red Cross Society, are often nobles of old family and large fortune, are incapable of such baseness.

Besides, nothing would be easier than to send only such stores as unwounded soldiers in health would not accept even if offered ; and I suppose even the National Aid Society will hardly allege that unwounded soldiers made free with their castor oil and senna in the Franco-German war ; and if they did it would scarcely contribute to the efficiency of the men in battle, and would be a breach of neutrality highly acceptable to the Turks.

The committee of the Sick and Wounded Russian and Montenegrin Soldiers' Relief Fund, of which I am chairman, send all our contributions in money, and not in kind, directly to the "chancellerie" of the Empress of Russia, and the Turkophiles will hardly venture to suppose that she will misappropriate it and apply it in aid of her pin money. I have no doubt that every pound sent by our society, which has no expenditure for secretary, offices, doctors, or agents, and which does not buy useless stores at the dearest rate, will go as far when expended by the Russians as treble the money tardily and reluctantly expended, chiefly in stores encumbered with perfunctory and sometimes useless doctors and champagne-bibbing agents.

The public may judge of the probable future course of the National Society by its past history, especially in the Franco-German War, and I therefore append my experience of it, and the strictures which I published at the time in the *Times* and other

newspapers, with my name attached, and which they did not even attempt to refute. Observing that only about half a dozen members of both Houses of Parliament had gone, either from curiosity or philanthropy, to the seat of war, I went up to London and saw the committee, who, morally, threw buckets of cold water on my zeal in what I considered a sacred cause. Colonel Lindsay, though I am his superior both in rank and age, treated me with the utmost hauteur, and strongly advised me to return home at once, as he did not want my services, and, in fact, would much rather be without them. I in vain informed him that I spoke French almost as readily and with as good an accent as English, that I could make myself understood in German, that I had robust health and strength, that I was persevering, active, not altogether devoid of intelligence, and anxious to be of use; and that as I was a baronet, the owner of the most extensive property in my own county, and its parliamentary representative, my zealous and disinterested services would be more welcome both to the French and Germans than those of probably any of their paid agents. All was to no purpose, but finding that I was not to be put off by any amount of discouragement, he gave me a document, which I found of very little use, and I started. The sequel will appear from the letters I now subjoin.

Colonel Loyd-Lindsay's reply, in the *Times* of August 21st, to the memorial presented by our deputation, and which, I suppose in accordance with a rule of a society (which excluded the press during that interview) is undated, quotes the letter which the National Society for Aid to the Sick and Wounded had received from the Government of St. Petersburg, which clearly shows that there is no foundation whatever for the indifference which, he alleged, existed on the part of the Russians to receive aid from the society.

M. Giers says, "The staff of our ambulances is complete, and permits us to give help, not only to our wounded, but to those of the enemy who may fall into our hands. Nevertheless, the Imperial Government would accept, *with gratitude*, every help in kind which the said society may be good enough to send us."

This sentence certainly does not bear out what Colonel Lindsay said at the meeting as to the coldness and indifference as to aid of which he accused the Russians, but flatly contradicts it.

Colonel Lindsay then says, "If, for instance, the proffered aid of surgeons is declined by the Russian Government, on the ground that they are amply provided by their own resources in that respect, and that they do not wish for foreign aid, this does not, in the opinion of the council, constitute a ground for withdrawing surgical aid from Turkish sufferers, lest, under a mistaken view of the subject, the principle of strict impartiality should be said to have been violated. . . . There is no suggestion in the memorial that any actual need has been left unsatisfied, either in Russia or in Montenegro, nor are they (the council) aware that any mention has been made of such requirements by correspondents writing home to English newspapers from the seat of war in Bulgaria and Montenegro."

All I can say is, that if the council find no evidence of there being any need in the letters of correspondents in the newspapers, it must be that either they only read the *Daily Telegraph*, or that they keep the eye with which they look on the Russian side shut, whilst that which is brought to bear on the Turkish side is wide open, and that none are so blind as those who won't see.

Nobody suggested, as Colonel Lindsay insinuates, "the withdrawing of surgical aid from Turkish sufferers." What we say is, give a precisely equal amount, "in meal or in malt," as the saying is, to the Russians and Montenegrins as to the Turks, as the society did in the Franco-German war, within a minute fraction, as was shown by the deputation; but then supposed British interests and British prejudices were not so decidedly involved.

Colonel Lindsay's argument amounts to this—because the Turks have provided hardly any surgeons or stores for the wounded, in order by this disgraceful inhumanity to their own soldiers to put more troops into the field, whilst the Russians have, regardless of expense, provided (*what was before the battle of Plevna, but perhaps is now no longer*) an ample surgical staff, but is deficient in stores, of which they could not foresee the amount required,

therefore the society will give a premium on the barbarous neglect of their wounded by the Turks, and will furnish them with both surgeons and stores; whilst as the Russians, with a proper sense of national dignity and a dislike of needless waste, do not want our surgeons, therefore they shall not even have an equal amount of stores to that which we gave the Turks, and must take their chance of such stores as the Turks should insist on forwarding to the Russians through their lines from the Black Sea, or of such as the National Society's ship may at some future time determine to convey up the Danube, with almost the certainty of being blown up by a torpedo. The insulting condition with which assistance to the Russians is clogged, that a surgeon or other agent of the society should distribute the stores, which was not rigorously imposed on the Germans, is simply a device on the part of a Turkomanic committee to avoid the obligation incumbent on them of giving an equal share of their funds to the Russians, and it is as much as to say to the Russians, "You are such blackguards that if we gave you the stores you would sell them, steal them, or misuse them."

It is evident that a wounded Russian soldier would rather have a surgical operation performed, or a sick soldier would rather have his malady prescribed for, by a Russian doctor, to whom he could explain his wants, his symptoms, his sensations, and his ailments, and who could converse with him, than by an English surgeon, with whom he could hold no more intercourse than with a Chinaman; and in the Franco-German war the two surgeons sent by the National Society (with me) were not allowed, either by the Germans or the French, to operate, and refused to attend the sick, so that all their expenses were as much wasted as money thrown into the sea. The Russians, if they were not so honourable, might nominally accept our surgeons to distribute our stores, and if they did it would be impossible for them to insist on operating, or to prevent the misappropriation of the stores if, which is not the case, the Russians wished to misapply them.

If the Russian claim for aid cannot be otherwise got rid of, I would suggest that the National Society should impose the con-

dition that the parties receiving relief should go down on their knees before their agent, in which case doubtless the Turks, who are accustomed to do this to their Sultan, would probably agree, whilst the Russians would be certain indignantly to decline.

At the meeting Colonel Lindsay stated that the announcement I made that the Empress of Russia had caused a letter to be written to Mr. Lewis Farley, saying that the Russians would "*gratefully accept*" aid, threw an entirely new and unexpected light on the subject; and on sending him the letter, he wrote to me that he had perused it with *great interest*; but no mention is made of this important communication in Colonel Lindsay's long-winded reply in the *Times*.

As the Turks mutilate and murder the Russian wounded, whilst the Russians, instead of retaliating, treat the Turkish wounded like their own, it is quite clear that even if the National Society gave an equal sum to the Russians and Montenegrins as to the Turks, the former would still not have their fair share, since the amount expended by the Russians on the Turkish wounded would not be balanced by a similar amount spent by the Turks on the Russian wounded, whom they not only murder and mutilate, but rob. The *Popolo Romano*, as appears by the *Daily News*, has published a letter from its correspondent at Bucharest, in which he says, in conclusion, "the truth is, the Russians behave like civilized people, the Turks like savages."

FROM THE "TIMES."

Lady Sinclair, of Thurso Castle, has kindly favoured us with the following graphic letter, which her ladyship has received from Sir Tollemache, who lately paid a visit to the scene of war operations near Sedan:—

*Ambulance Anglo-Americaine,
Sedan, Sept. 13, 1870.*

I wrote you a long letter from Arlon, which I trust you duly received, and I telegraphed to you to-day from here to say that

I am safe and well, that I see my way to do some good here, and that for the present I intend to remain at Sedan; but as I was only one night at Luxembourg, and another at Arlon, I have not yet received any letters from home, for you could not have written in time. As I mentioned in my letter from Arlon, I devoted some hours of the day which I spent there to classify the stores of the English Society for Aid to the Sick and Wounded in War in a book, so that the agents of the Society might know how much of each article they possessed, but I found that everything was in the greatest confusion, and that the contents of many bales and cases were unknown. However, I at last succeeded, as I thought, in making an inventory, and I proposed next day to classify the stores, by placing all articles of the same kind together, instead of leaving them in a confused heap; but, as they preferred their own plan, I left them to their own devices. On the preceding day two waggons were sent off from Arlon, with two surgeons and two dressers (on foot) to Beaumont—a distance of about thirty miles—on one of the wettest days I have ever seen, although carriages could be had on hire in the town; but I saw clearly that the waggons were only half-loaded, and I afterwards found that the articles had been badly selected, and on the third day the doctors had hardly anything to eat and were glad of some assistance from the stores of our party. The two doctors, whom I accompanied, very properly refused unnecessarily to trudge thirty miles to Stenay, and, although the agent could not find any carriage for them, they themselves found an omnibus and pair, which he at first declined to hire for them, but at last he yielded the point, and we made arrangements for our departure. I was anxious that we should have a good assortment of everything likely to be useful, and especially drugs, and that the waggons should be sufficiently loaded; but I could only secure a very few drugs, and when everything that they were inclined to give us, out of the many tons of stores, had been put on, I saw that the waggons were not even half full. The agent and the store-keeper, however, maintained that the waggons could not carry

more, and that the carters' estimate of about two tons per waggon was about right. I felt certain that they were wrong, and asked them to weigh one waggonload, but was told that they had no scales and weights, and that none could be got in the town. However, I found both at the hotel at which the head-quarters of the Society are established, and on weighing the first waggon the load turned out to be 915 kilogrammes, instead of 2,000. However, they refused to put any more on, and the other waggon had a still lighter weight, so that the two together had not sufficient for one, whilst each waggon cost the Society 100 francs for going and returning.

We started in the afternoon, and reached Virton that night, where we found many French refugees, and, amongst others, a sub-lieutenant, who had been taken prisoner at Sedan, and who had escaped. In the course of the evening a Municipal Councillor from Montmedy, which still holds out for the French, came in, and asked us to give him drugs, as they were in great want of medicine; but finding they had enough in the meantime, we refused, and gave them the address of a doctor in Brussels, who would send them whatever they wanted—a plan which, simple and obvious as it is, had never occurred to the doctors and druggists of Montmedy.

Next morning we started early, and reached Montmedy (which is strongly fortified and somewhat picturesque) about ten a.m., when we were at once taken under the charge of a gendarme, and conducted to the French Governor of the fort. The Germans had bombarded the place a few days previously, but were unable to take it; and though their bombs destroyed some houses in the upper town adjoining the citadel, the lower town was wholly uninjured.

The Governor at first eyed us with some suspicion; but on observing by my passport that I was a member of Parliament, he said I might have a pass, and asked me if I would take charge of a Luxembourg ambulance which had arrived at Montmedy the day before, but which he suspected was a commercial venture in stores, for the benefit of the Germans. We were

then taken to the office, and the clerk asked me to draw up the pass in my own words, which I did, and it was then duly signed and stamped; but just at that moment a French captain of artillery came in, and intimated more plainly than politely that he believed our stores were for the Prussians, and that not improbably we were spies, who ought to be shot, or, at any rate, thrown into prison. I showed him my passport, and he then was convinced that he was mistaken as to us, but spoke very roughly to the Luxembourggeois, and told them distinctly that he would prevent them from proceeding to Stenay, and immediately afterwards they were deprived of their stores and sent back. He then expressed himself bitterly against the English, who, he said, all sympathised with the Prussians, although I had told him that upwards of two millions of francs had been subscribed in England to aid the French and German wounded indiscriminately, or far more than the French had subscribed for their own wounded.

On walking down to the lower town we inspected the hospital, which was tolerably comfortable, and then ordered our horses to be put to in order to continue our journey; but the drivers refused to go, and added that they had been threatened so much by the people that they were afraid to proceed. With much trouble we succeeded in getting them to agree to proceed; but a mob collected, who told us that they would prevent us from going to Stenay, although I showed them the pass signed and sealed. We, however, ordered them to drive on, when some men rushed forward and seized the horses by the bridles. I then took the bridles from them, and led the waggon forward. After going a few yards another knot of people stopped us, and then another, and, at last, with difficulty, we reached the top of the hill; but here a large collection of people met us, and absolutely refused to let us proceed, and I had to go in search of a lieutenant, who was most polite, and at last enabled us to descend the hill. So much for the state of discipline in Montmedy.

We baited half-way, at a small village, and I took the oppor-

tunity of talking to a number of the people, and found that they no longer feared the Germans, and that only one man out of the entire population had volunteered for the army, and he had only gone because he had quarrelled with his wife! I saw clearly that none of them were ambitious of fighting the Prussians, and that they did not care a straw whether France lost Alsace or not. In fact, the rural population of France is sick of war-glory and bloodshed. They have no arms, and few of them know how to use a gun; indeed, there were only about six fowling pieces in the village and neighbourhood, and these the Prussians have taken. I asked them whether, if the Prussians were defeated and flying past their doors, pursued by the French, they would stop them, kill them, or injure them? But they all assured me that they would not molest them in any way, but would rather show them any kindness in their power. If, as I believe, this is a fair specimen of the temper of the people of France, it is clear that all the tall-talking of the French newspapers about *levees en masse*, about francs tireurs, and exterminating the German travellers, is buncombe. Because the Spaniards half a century ago formed guerilla bands, and massacred as many French soldiers as possible, therefore it is urged the French peasantry could and should become francs tireurs, and destroy as many Germans as they can. In those days, however, the peasantry were treated with the grossest cruelty; women were dishonoured, and the population reduced to ruin, starvation, and despair; whereas now the invading army treats the peasantry at least as well, and, in some cases, better than their own troops. They feel that their rulers are to blame for an aggressive and unprovoked war; and they see clearly that, whether victorious or beaten, they will get but little thanks for the dangers and sufferings which they are invited to encounter in a war begun because the King of Prussia refused to see Benedetti.

In a few hours we reached Stenay, a town of nearly 3,000 inhabitants, and there we put ourselves in communication with the French and Prussian medical men, and found that they had hardly any drugs, and that there was a deficiency of almost every-

thing required by the sick and wounded. Though Captain Brackenbury, the agent for the Society, had forbidden us to give away any of our drugs, I felt myself compelled by the urgent necessity of the case to disregard his instructions, and I distributed nearly the whole equally between the French and Germans, who were most grateful and obliging. We dined with the principal surgeon of Stenay, and met a number of French and German surgeons, who were most civil and agreeable; but before dinner was over one of them mentioned that from 2,000 to 3,000 French prisoners from Sedan were expected at Stenay that night, and that he was afraid that they would not obtain even bread to eat. I said that I thought it a disgrace to the people of Stenay utterly to neglect the French prisoners, and that I could not sit still and drink champagne and claret and hear that the prisoners had no bread and the wounded no wine. They told me that little or no bread could be had in Stenay; but fortunately we had brought 700 pounds of bread from Belgium, and I resolved to distribute this at my own expense, and refund the price to the Society, as their funds are only applicable to the sick and wounded. Only one or two of the doctors accompanied me, and I had the greatest difficulty in obtaining a few volunteers out of the numerous idlers in the streets, to carry my bread to the prisoners. On entering the church I saw the poor soldiers, pale and emaciated, and worn out with fatigue and hunger, not having had anything to eat for more than twenty-four hours, but overjoyed to hear that an Englishman had bread at least to give them, although their own countrymen utterly neglected them. When I produced the bread there was a general rush towards me, and it required two Prussian soldiers, with fixed bayonets, to keep them from crushing me to death as I passed through them; whilst on all sides they besought me, for the love of God, to give them a morsel, however small. I at last completed the distribution with my own hands, and my store provided one-third of a pound for each man, for which the poor fellows were most grateful; and I am glad to say that they all behaved extremely well, and that the strong and healthy who

contrived to secure the loaves divided them fairly with the weak and sickly.

About 70,000 prisoners out of 100,000 taken at Sedan passed through Stenay, staying each one night; and if the people of that town had been philanthropic they would have been able, for 1,750 francs, or £70, to give a pound of bread to each soldier, which they could have obtained, as I did, by sending carts to Belgium or putting themselves on half rations. No doubt the Germans were bound to feed their prisoners; but if they could and would not do this, the French should and could have done it, and, as a precautionary measure, they should at least have provided a pound of bread a man, even although they believed that the Germans would provide the usual minimum and insufficient ration which prisoners receive. How different is the way in which the Germans treat the sick and wounded and the French prisoners in their own country! When the trains arrive ladies and gentlemen of the highest rank vie with each other in munificent provision for their wants, distributing not only bread, which is not needed, but cigars, wine, fruit, and delicacies of every kind, in profuse abundance; in short, the French are infinitely better treated by their enemies than by their countrymen.

Next morning it distressed me to see many of the prisoners limping along without shoes and with sore and bleeding feet, but none of the wealthier class in Stenay were there, as far as I could see, to say even a kind word to any of them; and though I would gladly have taken the boots off my own feet, it was impossible to delay the march, and not one of the people of Stenay had provided a carriage or even a cart for those who were compelled, though quite unable, to march a second twenty miles without breakfast and without money to buy the food which some of their more fortunate companions had eagerly purchased from their grasping fellow-countrymen at usurious prices. A German Protestant pastor gave me a seat in his carriage to Sedan, and my companions followed slowly at a walk by another road which passes through Beaumont, and where

they found even more than the usual dearth of provisions and medicines. After passing through several small villages, where I distributed chloroform, Liebig's extract of meat, and other things of which there were an utter destitution, we reached Mouzon, where there is a beautiful church, which, before the war, was being restored. I went to the German and French ambulances, and found that they also stood in want of medicine, and of almost everything else, and I therefore gave what I could out of the Society's stores, but not nearly as much as they wanted, or as I would have wished. Amongst other requirements the doctors and nurses at the French hospital told me that they wanted wine, which they said could not be bought in or near Mouzon. Upon this I went to the principal hotel, when they told me that they could sell me 100 bottles of Burgundy and fifty of claret, the latter at fifteen pence per bottle; but on mentioning this to the doctors they said it was far too dear, and as no cheaper wine could be got, the sick and wounded must do without, unless I could supply them. I told them that I considered such parsimony cruel and foolish, for, setting aside humanity, a soldier was supposed to be worth at least one hundred pounds in peace and more in time of war, and that it was sound economy to save their lives by giving tolerable wine to their patients, as, after all, it was cheaper than medicine, and one-third of the quantity of claret at fifteen pence a bottle would do as much or more good as a full ration of the wretched vin ordinaire at five pence. As argument and entreaty were useless, I bought six bottles of good claret and served it round myself to all the patients, saying it was a present from the English Society for the Relief of the Wounded, and they were all very thankful, even for this small attention.

The commanding officer of the German Volunteer Dépôt for the wounded gave me a chassepot rifle and sword-bayonet, which I accepted, and offered me a sabre and helmet, of which I did not like to deprive him, and we then proceeded to Douzy, where there are many sick and wounded, and from thence to Bazielles, a large village, every house of which was totally destroyed by

the German artillery during the battle of Sedan. It is a fearful and extraordinary sight, and I trust I may never again witness such a wreck.

A short distance further, after looking at the field of battle, still strewn with dead horses, which poisoned the air with an insufferable stench, we reached Sedan, which is a large town of about 150,000 inhabitants, with what was formerly considered most formidable fortifications, and to add to their strength the river had been dammed up, and a large extent of country was flooded. As there was no room at any hotel I gladly accepted the proffered hospitality of the surgeons of the Anglo-American Ambulance; and I am now writing this letter in the room where I am to sleep with the two principal surgeons, who are now fast asleep, it being nearly one in the morning. The hospital here accommodates about 500 patients, being far more, I understand, than any other of the ambulances here, and every bed is occupied, while a considerable number occupy tents outside. The doctors seem most [attentive, and I believe they have been unusually successful, and all comforts are liberally provided, whilst the medical men themselves are content with a diet which is even too Spartan for me, though I am easily satisfied. Seven Frenchmen, however, died yesterday, some of them, I believe, in consequence of having been prematurely removed from the German hospital to make room for Prussians, which is a fatal mistake, as the French would have had a far better chance if they had not been moved, and the Germans might have been sent here, where they would have been better off than in their own hospital.

We breakfasted about seven o'clock this morning, and I afterwards went with a party to Donchery, three miles from here, where the railway is open to Belgium, and there I found about 200 French wounded prisoners, who were to be sent off by train, many of them on stretchers, having legs or arms amputated, and I should have thought utterly unfit for the journey, and some of them nearly certain to die on the road. The [poor fellows were lying on straw on waggons, or sitting in third-class carriages,

and they told me that they had received no food that day except some biscuits, which they saw in a box, and to which they helped themselves. They said, moreover, that ever since the campaign began they never had a sufficiency of food, and had received wine only three times in three weeks. An itinerant vendor of chocolate having left his box open for a few minutes, a few of the wounded soldiers helped themselves, but were soon detected by the owner, who abused them in no measured terms. Finding that the wounded preferred chocolate to anything else, I bought enough for the whole of the men, and then one of the ladies gave them apples, and we then supplied them all with water to drink, and filled bottles for them in case they were thirsty on the journey; but no one but ourselves paid them the slightest attention, and one of their own officers looked tranquilly on, but gave us no assistance, though some of the wounded were officers. Nothing could exceed the gratitude of the poor men for our trifling attentions, and we drove off amidst cries of "Vive l'Angleterre!"

On my return to Sedan we saw that the camp of the French prisoners was deserted, but I learned to my horror that they were half starved, and had little else but horseflesh to live on, and not enough of that, though Sedan is a rich manufacturing town, close to the camp, and feeding them all when here with bread would only have cost about £900. After a rather unsatisfactory luncheon of dry bread and wine, I drove to see Dr. Frank, whom you recollect at Cannes, and who seems to be most active and useful, for those of his patients whom I addressed speak warmly of his kind and skilful treatment.

On my return I determined to visit every hospital and every private house where there were any wounded men, and, besides endeavouring to supply any pressing wants, to offer to transmit letters and telegrams through Belgium to their relatives, and to forward replies by the same channel, and I was delighted to find that many gladly availed themselves of my offer, including several officers, who for three weeks have never been able to communicate with their friends, as the plan which I have

adopted, though easy and inexpensive, had never occurred to them. One unfortunate officer who, I fear, cannot survive, told me that he had been robbed of all his money when lying wounded on the field of battle by a French soldier!

It appears to me that the management of the affairs of the English Society for the Relief of the Sick and Wounded is most unsatisfactory, and, as a French surgeon said to me to-day, before we distribute half of our stores and money the wounded will probably be dead or cured, and the war will be ended; and I have telegraphed to this effect to the Society in London, with the concurrence of the two English doctors who accompanied me to Sedan. It is quite a mistake to suppose that the peasantry are starving, and that the necessaries of life are enormously dear. Bread sells at five pence the kilogramme, which is more than two English pounds, and on inquiry at Balan to-day I found that meat was 1s. 3d. per kilogramme, whilst butter is two francs per French pound, and Bordeaux, in cask, 1 franc 25 centimes per litre, which is about one-fourth more than the contents of a bottle.

It is now past two o'clock, so I must conclude abruptly.

Yours, &c.,

J. G. T. SINCLAIR.

REFUSED BY THE "TIMES."

The following letter, from Sir J. G. T. Sinclair, Bart, M.P., appears in the *Morning Advertiser* :—

SIR,—Having returned home to-day from the seat of war, after an absence of three weeks, I consider it an imperative though irksome duty to bring before the public, through your columns, the gross mismanagement of the London Committee and the foreign agents of the National Society for Aid to the Sick and Wounded in War.

As far as I can judge, the proceedings both of the London Committee and of their agents on the Continent have been a strange, and, to an Englishman, humiliating combination of parsimony

and extravagance, recklessness and timidity, dilatoriness and hurry; the whole combined with an utter want of method, and an entire absence of any intelligible guiding principles of action; and, by their own confession, they have not forwarded from London more than about one-fourth of the amount of the subscriptions, of which the greater part has not yet been locally expended, though the war is practically nearly over, and all the great battles have already been fought.

The society was originally formed in July, and a meeting was held in London, when a sort of Provisional Government was formed, much in the same haphazard way as the present political Government of Paris, without, as I think, proper consideration as to the qualifications of the individuals to whom the serious, responsible, and difficult task of directing this important national object was to be entrusted; and thus duties of vital consequence to the sick and wounded at the seat of war, and to the honour of the English name for philanthropy and liberality, fell into the hands of a few wealthy and inexperienced amateurs, instead of into those of officials and men of business like Sir Charles Trevelyan and others, who would have inspired confidence in the nation, and thus have stimulated subscriptions, and who would have made half the money go further than the present administration with the entire funds.

Any one of the smallest discernment and the most slender faith in the benevolence of his fellow-countrymen must have foreseen, by previous examples of the unbounded generosity of the British public, that the subscriptions for the sick and wounded could not and ought not to be below £100,000, and it is already nearly £200,000; and if the London Committee had been equal to the occasion, they should have immediately begun operations on a scale commensurate with such a fund, and if individuals of such well-known wealth were afraid to incur such a pecuniary responsibility, a guarantee fund of that amount could have been raised in London within twenty-four hours. Instead of this the committee proceeded slowly, timidly, and parsimoniously, with only faith like a grain of mustard seed in British philanthropy,

and the critical days after the battles of Woerth, Weissenburg, Spicheren, Gravelotte, Mars-la-Tours, Rezonville, and Sedan were allowed to slip away without anything effectual having been done. And now when the worst is over, when the wounded are dead or have been sent away, the surgeons, agents, and wagons of the society, loaded with superfluous stores, come out at last, too late, lumbering slowly into the seat of war.

The first agents selected by the society, as might have been anticipated, did not give satisfaction, and were consequently superseded by Captain Brackenbury, who, in the letter published from him in the *Times*, condemns their management in strong terms; but he does not allude to one of their proceedings which he mentioned to me—namely, that they bought £700 worth of carriages, horses, and harness, which have gone off, as I understood, empty in the rear of the Prussian army of Paris, and which I have little doubt have been used for other purposes than those contemplated by the National Society, if they have not been confiscated by the franc-tireurs, who are as formidable to the peaceful civilians as they are comparatively innoxious to the Germans.

My first intercourse with the London Committee was in the shape of letters which I wrote, enclosing a subscription to the funds, and suggesting that if lint could not be obtained in sufficient quantities, it might be made to almost any amount out of cleansed and selected rags from the paper manufacturers, and that as the greater number of the wounded (both German and French) were in the hands of the Prussians, the funds of the society should not be divided equally among the armies of both nations, but given rateably to the proportion of wounded. To these and other suggestions I received no other reply than a short acknowledgment of my subscription.

Being impressed with the distressing conviction derived from the letters in the *Times*, *Telegraph*, and other papers, that the whole management of the National Society was defective, and that their staff was insufficient, I proceeded to London, and offered to place my services at the disposal of the committee (if

they would give me a definite and independent mission), who, however, told me that they did not see what I could do, as they had more representatives already than they knew what to do with. In reply, I said that it was impossible that any Englishman going out at his own sole expense, with the desire to do good, could fail to find some means of usefulness, and that I was determined to go. They then offered me one of the very few parchment commissions, of which, as I understood, they had then granted but three, accrediting me as one of their agents. But preferring independence of action, and disapproving of the terms of the document, I declined it.

I then proceeded to Arlon, and offered my services to Captain Brackenbury, who also was utterly unable to point out any shape in which I could assist the society; but at last, in the mode pointed out in my letter, which is published in the *Times* of Thursday last, I myself had no difficulty in discovering various ways in which I could have been of great use at Arlon if I had not been prevented by Captain Brackenbury; and on my journey to Stenay, Mouzon, and Sedan, I had the inexpressible gratification of being able to render important services to the sick and wounded, but only by disobeying his positive instructions, and giving drugs and other stores to the various ambulances, though they did not require the services of the surgeons who accompanied me. I believe I was the means of saving the lives of a large portion of 2,400 French prisoners at Stenay, by appropriating and purchasing most of the bread which was sent with me for the wounded, and which the latter did not require, except a few of those at Pouilly; but of course this was a trifle hardly worth the consideration of the National Society and its agents, though I myself would have travelled from the utmost extremity of the earth to have the inestimable privilege of being able, especially at an utterly insignificant pecuniary sacrifice, to render such a service.

Further, at nearly all the ambulances and hospitals which I visited there was either a total deficiency or a wholly inadequate supply of everything beyond the barest necessities; and the

nursing of the sick, when not performed by sisters of charity, was entrusted to professional *infirmiers*, who usually discharged their duty in the most perfunctory and unsatisfactory manner, and whose average numbers are only one to ten wounded men, which is obviously wholly insufficient. At the various ambulances the medical men are so overworked that they have not time to attend to any other than strictly professional duties, and even the officers complain that their diet consisted merely of *bouillon*, which, as many of your readers know, is only another name for tepid water, with a little grease floating on the top, into which a little beef has been boiled for a few minutes, and *bouilli*, which is the said morsel of meat with the food extracted, and a handful of dry and usually acid bread. And there was abundant occupation in seeing that a more nourishing and palatable diet is added by giving Liebig's extract, preserved meat, chocolate, coffee, jelly, biscuits, good wine, and cigars to the sick and wounded; also in writing and sending letters and telegrams to their relatives, and, in the case of the dying, to endeavour to prepare them for the solemn event—a task which is carelessly and indifferently performed at present by a few ungenial priests—in showing sympathy with their bodily and mental distress in conveying their last dying messages to friends and relatives, and in trying, however feebly, to soothe their last moments. These, however, are services which are best discharged by some of those benevolent ladies with whom Britain abounds, as it is difficult for men to establish that immediate and complete feeling of implicit confidence which in such moments the more sympathetic nature and greater tact and self-devotion of women so easily inspire. In fact, most of the wounded seem to die altogether unwarned of their approaching end, and one of them could get no other book to read than a dry pamphlet on the Propaganda.

Such services are chiefly, if not solely, needed by the French officers and soldiers, who, in Sedan and elsewhere, are most shamefully neglected by their fellow-countrymen and countrywomen, and who are utterly helpless when they are in a diffi-

culty, even if they have plenty of money. I visited a considerable number of French officers, many of them suffering from agonising wounds, lying on short, narrow, iron bedsteads, with a straw and a wool mattress, and a hard, cylindrical pillow, which catches the extreme back of the head and shoulders, and leaves a considerable strain on the muscles of the neck; and finding that I, though well and fatigued, could not sleep a wink under such circumstances, I wondered much that none of the rich inhabitants of Sedan had been willing to give up, even for a single night, one of their soft, roomy beds, spring mattresses, and large downy pillows, for any of their wounded officers. In fact, the selfish and cynical indifference of the French to the wounded and these who were prisoners was to me astounding and appalling. I called at one of the largest mansions in Sedan and saw the proprietor and his wife, who asked me if I could obtain any intelligence of a French colonel of hussars, who was lying wounded at Beaumont, and in whose welfare the husband professed a strong interest. I replied that if he really cared for his wounded friend he should take his comfortable carriage after breakfast and bring him home to dinner, instead of giving others the trouble who were fully employed; and I proceeded to dilate in the strongest terms on the conduct of the people of Sedan and elsewhere to the French wounded and prisoners, as I also did afterwards at greater length to a large party of French surgeons and others at the French Ambulance at the Solus-Prefecture, with the almost entire assent of my audience.

On the morning preceding my departure from Sedan I was surprised and pained to learn that a considerable number of wounded were being removed, or, as the phrase goes, *évacué*, from the Anglo-American Ambulance, though in the opinion of our surgeons many were unfit to travel; and it would have been better and kinder to have placed a pistol at their heads and to have shot them on the spot. It was most distressing to hear the cries of the poor men as they were jolted in wagons without springs, and with but little straw, over rough roads.

The same evening orders were received that forty out of the

sixty-seven *infirmiers*, or hospital attendants, should leave our ambulance, at which our doctors were naturally most justly irate, and loud were the denunciations of the inhumanity of the Germans.

I proceeded next morning to the Commandant, who received me most politely, and told him that as my sympathies were with the German cause, I was distressed to see and hear his countrymen accused of ordering wounded men to be removed who were incapable of the journey, and of recklessly depriving the Anglo-American Ambulance, at an hour's notice, of two-thirds of the hospital attendants, when there were already too few; and as one of the chief surgeons of the German army who accompanied me round the wards remarked, there was a deficiency of cleanliness, caused by an insufficient and inefficient staff of servants. The Commandant said in reply that the Chief of the French Intendance had called to inform him that many of the wounded in the various ambulances, and, amongst others, in ours, could and should be removed; and not supposing that he would be guilty of carelessness or inhumanity to his own countrymen at any rate, he gave the necessary orders, but was shocked and grieved to hear my statement, and would inquire immediately into the circumstances. He added that on the preceding day the French Intendance had complained of the excessive number of *infirmiers* in our ambulance, and said that twenty-seven, instead of forty-seven, were amply sufficient, upon which (again believing his representation, and knowing that nineteen-twentieths of our wounded were French) he permitted forty to be removed. The Commandant seemed hurt that I could have believed it possible that he could be intentionally guilty of such inhumanity, of which no German officer, he said, would be capable; and he went on to say that, while we English spoke of our neutrality, it seemed odd that nearly all our wounded were French, and that none of the stores of our National Society, as far as he knew, had been sent to the Germans, whilst he saw wagon-loads outside our ambulance at half-past four that morning. I told him that the proportion of French was, I felt sure, acci-

dental; that the French surgeons were, I understood, less skilful and attentive than the German surgeons, and less provided with medical necessities and comforts; that our stores had only arrived the preceding evening, and that I would do all in my power to obtain a large supply for the Germans from our now superabundant stores; but the Germans are too proud to ask, and at the time we had no one authorized to ascertain what they required, and to proffer such gifts as we could spare.

I also took the opportunity of seeing other German officers of rank, to ask whether it was true that the 100,000 French prisoners were half-starved by them at Sedan. They told me that on the day of the capitulation, and for a day or two after, no bread was baked, and there was a deficiency of everything; but they gave as much food as they could spare to the prisoners, and their own men were upon little more than half rations at the time. It was obviously impossible for the Germans to anticipate and provide against the capture of 100,000 prisoners, and it is wonderful indeed that things were not much worse. In fact, if the French had taken the German army as prisoners of war, they would not only have had nothing for them, but must have fed themselves chiefly from German stores. Some officers told me that the German authorities ordered the people of Sedan to supply the prisoners, and they could easily have done this from Belgium—a distance of about twenty miles—by borrowing money on the security of the town; and, in any case, even if the Germans were bound to find the barest necessities of life, the French might have taxed their private and municipal resources to provide something more than dry bread in addition to the German rations, or in lieu of them; and this, as I have shown in my last letter, would only have cost about £900 to £1,000; and even had they done this, it would have been far inferior to the profuse liberality of the Germans in their own country, not only to their compatriots, but to the French prisoners.

The night before I started from Sedan I dined at the Hotel d'Europe with an English acquaintance of the Jewish persuasion, with whom I had much satisfaction in co-operating in

various plans for the benefit of the wounded. At dinner we met with the agents of the Brussels Society for the Wounded, who had at last arrived to secure a sufficient number of wounded to fill 1,200 beds which had been granted at Brussels, as well as thousands more in other parts of Belgium; but up to that day (the 14th) they had obtained hardly any, though hundreds had been sent off by railway without any attempt on their part to secure them; and even now, I believe, only a small portion of the beds are occupied, so that, by a fatal coincidence, the same mismanagement which characterizes our English National Society is chargeable, though in a less degree, against the Belgians; whilst the Dutch ambulances are admirably managed, and leave scarcely anything to be desired.—I am, sir, yours, &c.,

J. G. T. SINCLAIR.

Thurso Castle, Sept. 24, 1870.

A letter in the *Cologne Gazette* suggests that the balloons now so much in vogue should be utilized so as to dispose the French people towards peace. It says:—"Now that Paris is completely invested, the employment of balloons for the purpose of dispersing over Paris proclamations or other necessary information—particularly accurate information as to the position of affairs and the whole course of events since the declaration of the war—is resorted to. It would be desirable if members of the Geneva Convention and of the international societies for the relief of the wounded would by means of such communications disseminate information which would weaken, if not remove, the blind prejudices of the French population. The statements of well-accredited correspondents, such as the Duke of Manchester, Sir Tollemache Sinclair, and others, would also have a beneficial effect on the people if made known in this war."

The *Times* publishes the following extracts from a letter of Sir J. G. T. Sinclair:—

"At the time of my visit the streets of Sedan and the cafés

were full of men, chiefly attached to the French ambulances, who appeared to have nothing to do but enjoy themselves; and the commissariat clerk of one of these, which, he informed me (and as I fully believe from his business-like proceeding and candour) was doing great service in a neighbouring village, told me that half the French ambulances were partially or entirely idle, and that some of them had left Paris without either instruments or drugs, and were still without either.

“On paying a visit to the hospital on the evening before my departure I remained till past nine, and, as the town was in a state of siege, the drawbridge was lifted, and the sentry told me that I must remain; but on finding the guard the sergeant most good-naturedly brought down six men, who lifted the heavy bridge with difficulty, and let me return to my hotel, refusing any remuneration for their services.

“Next morning we started from Sedan for Libramont in my friend's carriage, with two wounded French officers, and on arriving at Givonne, visited the Duc de B——, a French officer, who was severely wounded, and is now nursed by his mother; and it seemed to me strange that other French ladies did not follow her example, as the Germans make no difficulties, but are most civil and obliging, and my passport was never once asked for by them. The Duc and five other French officers were under the care of German doctors, and were loud in praise of their attention and skill; but here again there was a great want of everything beyond the bare necessities of life, and a scarcity of drugs. In fact, at the very moment that I arrived a poor soldier was suffering severely from tetanus, and there was no hydrate of chlorate to give him; but fortunately I had a bottle of this, along with other medicines, from my good-natured friends of the Anglo-American ambulance, which I gave, and which was gratefully accepted. My friend offered to take one of the wounded officers at Givonne to his house in Brussels, where he intends keeping a number of wounded officers at his sole expense till they are well, and one of them gladly accepted the invitation. He told

me that the officers of the French Intendance were *des canailles*, and that one of them wanted to 'evacuate' him; but he ordered him off in double quick time, and told him that he was a *cochon*. He added that some of the gentlemen attached to a French ambulance, consisting of the Duc de F—— and other Parisian exquisites, called on them, and asked if they wanted anything; but though they required everything but necessities they were too proud to ask, upon which a few cigars only were given to each. Before they left one officer said he wished he could buy a paletot, upon which these gentlemen told him that he might have as many as he pleased, as money was no object, and they had abundance of stores; but the paletot never arrived, and the fact is, a large proportion of those who accompany French ambulances are *fainéant*, who like the honour and *éclat* of playing at philanthropy at the smallest possible cost.

"At Libramont I parted with my friends and went to Luxembourg, where I found that the correspondents of various newspapers, whose acquaintance I had the pleasure of making on my last visit there, had gone to the neighbourhood of Metz, and I therefore started next morning—stayed for a few hours at Treves, where I saw some handsome churches, the beautiful Roman gateway, and other objects of great interest; met Comte Palikao's daughter, who could not obtain any tidings of her father, or of her brother and cousin, and whom I could not assist in her search, and reached Saarbruck that night. At Saarbruck I found your correspondent, and I put myself also in communication with a medical gentleman, sent by the National Society from London, of, I believe, considerable reputation in his profession, who received me most cordially, and was most anxious to make himself useful, but who had received no precise instructions, and had nothing whatever to do.

"We took six hours, instead of two, in going to Remilly, where bread, cheese, wine, brandy, and other articles were being sold at reasonable prices, and where I saw that the Germans had even respected the geese and poultry of the French—not even apparently confiscating an egg. Captain Maclaine kindly placed

his carriage and pair at the disposal of myself and three other English gentlemen, and we started on a fine afternoon for the last outpost of the Prussian army at Merci-le-Haut, within twenty-five minutes' walk of Metz. When we reached the last post but one it appears that our coachman was ordered to stop, but neither he nor any of us at first heard the challenge, but on its being reiterated I stopped the carriage, when we were roundly scolded for disobeying orders, and told that if the sentries had done their duty they would have shot us. Our pass was only for two, and we were four, so that at first I was told that I could not proceed, but by means of a little civility we soon gained on the invariable good nature of the Germans, and they allowed us to go on.

"On arriving at the last outpost the officers kindly sent a sentry with us, as we were within shot both of the cannon from the town and the French sentinels, and we dodged down as near as we could, and stood behind trees within less than half the range of a chassepot, which we saw in the hands of a French sentry, who, however, did not attempt to molest us. We saw men, houses, tents, &c., outside Metz, within the French lines, and heard the band playing in the town most distinctly. I suspect Metz is better provisioned than the Germans suppose, and that they will have to return to the bombardment which the king had humanely ordered them to suspend.

"On returning to Remilly we stayed a short time at Courcelles, and found that a quarrel had occurred between the chief of the Johanniter there and the military commandant (which an English coadjutor might probably have appeased), and I was sorry to learn afterwards that the former, not being able to obtain reparation, had retired with, I suppose, his stores; so that it is probable there is a special opening at present for the English National Society at that place. The chief of the Johanniter Ritter at Courcelles is a most intelligent and gentlemanlike man, and speaks both French and English extremely well; indeed, nearly all the German officers I have met with can at least make themselves understood in French, and many in English.

"On our return to Remilly we were stopped by the sentry at the entrance of the village, as it was half-past seven, and no one was allowed to enter after seven; but two of us got leave to go in search of our Anglo-German officer, who escorted us back to your correspondent's lodgings, where I was entertained as hospitably as the nature of the case permitted, but had to sleep on a few handfulls of straw laid on the floor, with the aforesaid present from the British nation to the German army as my pillow.

"Next morning I returned to Saarbruck, and had another long and interesting conversation with some German officers. On reaching Saarbruck, I went with some English acquaintances to see if anything could be done in the way of establishing an hospital there, in anticipation of the fall of Metz, where typhus and dysentery prevail. We had an interview with the head of the local German medical staff, who told us that he thought the German Government would not be disposed to authorize the English National Society, under the circumstances, to establish such an hospital, and that, if more ambulance was required, the Government would supply them themselves; also, that the German Government did not wish to accept gifts of bread, meat, and other necessaries from any one (unless by some unforeseen and extraordinary circumstance a deficiency arose at any place); that he had power to order wine and any other comforts at the cost of his Government, where they were absolutely necessary; but that they would gladly receive wine, cigars, and other comforts which, though not rigorously necessary, were highly desirable for the use of the wounded, and for which at that moment there was want, as the Johanniter could not afford to give enough. The interview ended, I believe (for I left before its close), by an agent of the society obtaining permission, as a species of favour, to establish such an ambulance, under the supervision of the German Medical Chief, a condition to which few first-class English doctors would submit.

"From Saarbruck (after visiting the almost impregnable heights of Spicheren, which no troops but German or English

could, I believe, have taken, and where I found hardly any relics of the battle, and not a single bullet or fragment of shell) I went to Treves with one of the 'correspondents' of one of your contemporaries, who had been taken as a Prussian spy and rudely treated at Rheims; and thence I went home by way of Brussels, which is full to overflowing with rich French refugees from Paris, and where I had the utmost difficulty in securing a single bed.

"As I have animadverted on the management of the National Society for Aid to the Wounded, I think it right to state the course which I think should have been adopted by it, and which even now might be advantageously pursued; and I am confirmed in my views by an interview which I had with the North German Ambassador, who seemed to approve in the main of the views I entertain on that subject.

"The whole of the munificent contributions of the Germans for the Aid of the Sick and Wounded in war are distributed by the Johanniter Ritter, or Protestant Knights of St. John, for North Germany, and by the Johanniter Maltese Ritter, who are the Catholic Knights of Malta, for the South of Germany. Both of these bodies consist conclusively of German noblemen of rank and standing, who are as particular as the members of one of the best London clubs as to those of their order whom they will admit. The German Government place almost unlimited confidence in these Johanniter, who wear a uniform and cross, and a certain number are attached to each *corps d'armée*, which is complete in itself on the decentralized system, which is the antipodes of that of the French. The Johanniter can always obtain the use of the railway wagons, carriages, post, and telegraph free of expense; they can obtain supplies and horse transport by requisition at fair prices, instead of at the fancy prices extorted from our society; they work in concert with the military medical authorities; and they are aided by intelligent and practical men of business, who have volunteered in large numbers for the purpose. It appears to me that this system, though it may be open to some objections, is on the whole

admirable, and that the proper course for the National Society would be to send out an intelligent English gentleman, without salary, like one of the almoners of the Society for the Relief of Distress in London, aided perhaps by an intelligent clerk, to act in concert with the Johanniter in command at each German *corps d'armée*. The English agent should be a gentleman by birth and manners, and, if possible, one of those who sympathizes with the German cause. He should have cash or credit to an adequate amount, but no stores, excepting such articles as can be bought cheaper and better in London, or are given gratuitously. By concert with the Johanniter and his numerous and effective staff, the wants of the sick and wounded would be made known from day to day, or even from hour to hour, and each English agent could have frequent intercourse with the other English agents and with the *corps d'armée* for mutual advice and assistance, while he could communicate regularly, rapidly, and easily with the London Committee, while correspondence *via* Arlon is rare, tedious, and intermittent.

“As matters now stand we are likely to send, too late, abundance of stores which the Germans do not want, and which could usually be bought by them far cheaper, quicker, and better, while they will not receive in time a sufficiency of those things which they do want, and however munificent the English subscriptions are in money and in kind (the committee apparently not having taken the trouble of approximating to value the latter, which is much to be regretted), the Germans will only remember receiving too late, sometimes in inadequate doles and at other times in overpowering profusion, a lot of comparatively useless stores, which have been bought and transported at usurious rates, many of which will probably have to be sold at the end of the war for an old song. Even those who do not understand or believe in the good management of the Johanniter must surely see that the Germans would naturally prefer being aided chiefly through their own people, who know their wants, and not mainly by foreigners, who generally speak their language very imperfectly; and if so wildly improbable a contin-

gency had occurred as that the French had organized a national subscription for the relief of the distress in Lancashire caused by the cotton famine, and they had distributed their relief by a separate and expensive French organization, instead of by the English association under Lord Derby, every one would have considered their management wasteful and absurd in the extreme. A judicious Englishman might do much to correct any faults of the Johanniter system; and, besides the advantage which the English society would have derived from the gratuitous, intelligent, and zealous aid of the Johanniter, a contribution of £100,000 from England in money would have gone, probably both in appearance and reality, even further than £200,000 in stores, and would have given us an influence of a salutary and effective nature with these patriotic and intelligent German noblemen, besides endearing the name of England to every German heart, and removing, or at least mitigating, the bad impression justly produced by our refusal to prohibit the export of arms to either belligerent.

“With respect to the French, nothing can exceed the inefficiency and absurdity of their centralized system; and it seems to me absolutely essential that English agents and English medical men should be employed for them. On the other hand, as probably more than five-sixths of the sick and wounded of both nations are in the hands of the Germans, it would be evidently unfair to send half the money and stores to the French armies and hospitals, and it would be only just to proportion our gifts to the number of sick and wounded with each army as nearly as can be calculated. The stores of the society should have been at Libramont, which is by far the nearest railway station to Sedan, or at the adjoining village; and, if adequate storage could not have been obtained, wooden sheds could have been immediately and cheaply erected for both stores, lodging, and stabling.

“These stores would then have been within a few hours’ journey by cart from Sedan, instead of two days’ distance, as at Arlon, where the stores were only begun to be warehoused on

the 9th of September from Luxembourg, instead of sending them direct to Sedan, and the transport would have cost exactly half what it now amounts to, or less than one-quarter if the stores were weighed, and full loads sent instead of less than half loads, as usually forwarded by the agent. The depôt at Libramont would have had the further enormous advantage of being at the point at which nearly all the wounded joined the railway, and where incalculable good could have been done, and probably many lives saved, by daily giving them various comforts which they actually much required, while all that they actually got, so far as I could see, was some bread and butter, water and cigars, from the Belgians and Germans. In fact, all but the English stores passed by Libramont.

“I may add that by a letter in the *Times* it appears that the Anglo-German Society for the Wounded, with much more limited means, but with judicious, timely, and bold liberality, has spent more on the spot than our National Society, with all its enormous resources, and has even had to come to the rescue of our Anglo-American ambulance at Sedan, where there were hardly any other than French patients; that I am told the individual I was not allowed to assist at Arlon with the stores, and whom I considered utterly inefficient, but who, the society’s agent told me, was one of the best storekeepers in Europe, is no longer in their employment; and Mr. Churchward, of Dover, informed me that he believed the stores of the society sent by Calais were simply put into the French Government warehouse there, instead of being sent forward for the wounded.

“I make many apologies for trespassing so long on your space and on your readers’ patience, which extreme haste and the importance of the subject can alone justify.

“Thurso Castle, Caithness, Sept. 26.

“P.S.—While writing the foregoing I was surprised to see a letter in the *Times* of Friday last from Colonel Loyd-Lindsay, stating that the London Committee is engaged in sending out an ambulance and twelve waggons from England with Dr. Longmore, &c., and that the North German Ambassador promises to

give permission to convey a large stock of 'chloroform' through the Prussian lines into the 'besieged cities' of Metz, Strasburg, and 'Montmedy.' I believe there are already far too many English surgeons and too few dressers, nurses, and clerks at the seat of war; and I should like to see a return of the work actually performed by each, as I know some who, when I left, had done absolutely nothing, and could find nothing to do; and except the Anglo-American ambulance at Sedan under Drs. Sime and Frank, which is only partially connected with the National Society for Aid to the Wounded, I believe comparatively little good has been done by the English surgeons sent out, generally without any fault of their own, as the foreign surgeons and chiefs of ambulances keep nearly all the operations jealously to themselves. Why not, therefore, utilize those already there instead of sending others? As to wagons, &c., they could be bought or hired infinitely cheaper and better close to the seat of war.

"As no sortie has been made from Metz since September 1, probably no surgical operations are now requisite, and, therefore, chloroform is most likely unnecessary there; and, as Metz is suffering from typhus and dysentery, other drugs, and not chloroform, are required.

"I was at Montmedy on the 11th inst., which is a mere village, and not a 'city,' and which was not then, and I believe is not now, 'besieged;' and, as I gave the druggists and medical men there, as I afterwards did at Sedan (where I found many drugs at the shops, of which there were supposed to be none), the address of a Brussels physician who would put them in communication with the Brussels chemist (which, of course, the French Ambassador or Consul there would have also done), and as there were only about twenty sick and wounded at that place, I refused to give them chloroform, of which I had abundance, finding that they had sufficient for the present, and could easily, cheaply, and speedily obtain all necessary supplies."

The following letter appeared in the *Times* :—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "TIMES."

SIR,—Observing in the *Times* of Tuesday, received to-day, a letter from Captain Brackenbury, in which he attempts to reply to my letter in the *Times* on the subject of the mismanagement of the London Committee and local agents of the National Society for Aid to the Wounded, I have to request your permission to state—

1. That on the 8th of September the English Minister at Brussels was not even aware where I could find the agent of the National Society, and the Secrétaire-General of the Belgian Society for Aid to the Wounded (Dr. Holsbeek) told me that he thought the stores were at Bouillon.

2. A store could have been built of wood at Libramont by a contractor from Namur or elsewhere before the agent could have brought his bales and cases from Luxembourg, and store room could have been hired at the adjoining village to Libramont and at Bouillon on paying an adequate price. Waggon and carts could have been hired from the villages round Libramont and the adjoining towns, as was done by the Germans, and wine, cigars, and other comforts and necessities could have been ordered by telegraph and sent by rail to Libramont.

3. From Arlon to Sedan occupied two days by waggon, while from Libramont to Sedan was a one day's journey.

4. The Anglo-American ambulance at Sedan was so badly supplied, as appears by Dr. Hart's report, that they were obliged to send special messengers to London for stores, which arrived the day after an enormous consignment from Arlon.

5. Your readers will observe that the correspondents of the *Times* at the headquarters before Paris, before Metz, and at Strasburg, unanimously condemn the mismanagement of the National Society, and that opinion is confirmed in the strongest terms by the correspondent of the *Scotsman*.

I may add that I was much amused on leaving Saarbruck for Remilly early in the morning to find that one of the agents of

the society had followed me in haste to the station in order to deliver to me a parcel containing the following articles:—Two or three bandages, one small bottle of Liebig, about a yard of lint, and as much wadding, two pairs of socks, one pair of slippers, two shirts, two flannel vests, two pair of drawers, two pocket handkerchiefs, a bottle of opium pills, and a bottle of other pills, as a present from the English National Society to the wounded and sick of the German army of 300,000 men before Metz!

Yours obediently,

J. G. T. SINCLAIR.

FROM THE "MORNING ADVERTISER."

Amongst the many interesting communications which have reached this country from the seat of war with respect to the condition of the sick and wounded, and the arrangements which have been made for their relief, we have read none more deserving of attention than that which has been published from the pen of Sir Tollemache Sinclair. Other writers have mainly confined themselves to the vast field which the war has opened to the philanthropy of all who could contribute either in money or in kind, or in personal service, to assuage the sufferings of those who have fallen in this disastrous war; or they have described, as far as language could do, the more shocking features of the misery which has come under their notice. The motives prompting these communications are as excellent as the good they have effected has been great. They have served to stimulate the compassion of the people of this country, ever ready to respond to such appeals, and they have thereby been the means of saving many lives, and of soothing the last hours of hundreds of poor fellows who were wounded beyond hope of recovery.

But none of the writers of these letters have attempted to criticise the mode in which relief has been administered, or to suggest an improvement upon that which has been adopted. And yet, when we consider how suddenly the war broke out, and how little time there was to organize a system of ambu-

lances and other hospitals, we should not be surprised to find that the arrangements of our Central Committee have not been as good as they no doubt would have been with more time for deliberation. It is upon this point that Sir Tollemache's letter, interesting as it is in other respects, deserves our primary attention at this moment. How long this disastrous war will last it is impossible to predict, but unhappily it cannot be doubted that before it can be fought out to the bitter end thousands of soldiers who are to-day unhurt will be in need of all the help we can bestow upon them. It is, therefore, of the utmost consequence that we should look about us, and see whether it is not possible for us to use our resources to better purpose than hitherto, and any evidence that can help us to form an opinion upon this point ought not to be neglected.

We, therefore, turn to Sir T. Sinclair's letter, not only because anything proceeding from him merits attention, but because he has carefully examined this subject, and has been in communication, in regard to it, with those who may be supposed to have a thorough understanding of what is needed. We learn, in the first place, with surprise that a proposition which Sir Tollemache and some English friends made with a view to establishing an hospital at Saarbruck, in anticipation of the fall of Metz, was not favourably entertained by the chief of the local German medical staff, who expressed his belief that the German Government would not be disposed to authorize the English National Society under any circumstances to establish such an hospital, and that if more ambulances were required, the Government would supply them themselves. The result of the interview with this gentleman seems to have been that the society obtained permission, "as a kind of favour," to establish such an ambulance, but with the condition that it should be under the supervision of the German medical chief. Something like a reflection upon the mode in which the society has organized its resources seems to be conveyed in the exaction of this condition, and Sir T. Sinclair details at length the course he thinks it ought to have pursued, and which it is, unhappily, not even yet too late to adopt.

It must be remembered that the Germans already possess an organization through which their own contributions have been administered, and which has the advantage that it has not been extemporized to meet a sudden necessity, but has long been in existence. It is composed of the Johanniter Ritter, or Protestant Knights of St. John, for North Germany, and the Johanniter Maltese Ritter, or Catholic Knights of Malta, for South Germany. "Both of these bodies," Sir Tollemache writes, "consist exclusively of German noblemen of rank and standing, who are as particular as the members of one of the best London clubs as to those of their order whom they will admit." In these bodies the German Governments have almost unlimited confidence, and place railway waggons, carriages, post, and telegraph at their disposal, free of expense. Moreover, they can obtain supplies and horse transport by requisition at fair prices, while those extorted from our National Society are described as "fancy prices." They are in concert with the military medical authorities, and they are aided by intelligent and practical men of business, who have volunteered in large numbers for the purpose.

Sir T. Sinclair is of opinion that the system is, on the whole, admirable, and that the proper course for the National Society would be "to send out an intelligent English gentleman, without salary, like one of the almoners of the Society for the Relief of Distress in London, aided, perhaps, by an intelligent clerk, to act in concert with the Johanniter in command at each German corps d'armée." By this means he thinks that the wants of the sick and wounded would be known from day to day, or even from hour to hour, while "each English agent could have frequent intercourse with the other English agents and with the corps d'armée for mutual advice and assistance," and "could communicate regularly, rapidly, and easily with the London committee," whereas "correspondence *via* Arlon is rare, tedious, and intermittent." Unless good reason can be shown why there should be several independent organizations working without concert, or with only spasmodic concert, for the same end, this advice seems to be sound.

Independent action is not conducive to what is familiarly known in this country as "a long pull, a strong pull, and a pull all together." We can quite believe that upon the system we are at present pursuing we are in danger of sending, too late, an abundance of stores which the Germans do not want, and which they can obtain cheaper and better than from us, while they will not receive in time a sufficiency of the things of which they are in need. It is not only possible but probable that our supplies will at times reach them in inadequate doles, and at others in such overpowering profusion that they will be useless.

Again, is it not a mistake to have fixed the head-quarters of the National Society at Arlon? Sir T. Sinclair does not stand alone in maintaining that it would have been better to have established them at Libramont, where they would have been within a few hours' journey of Sedan, instead of a journey of two days. Time and money would have been saved by such an arrangement, and the great object for which we are labouring would have been accomplished with far greater ease and effect. We confess that there is too much reason to doubt whether, in the desire to act upon an independent plan, we have not, to a great extent, neutralized the means at our disposal. It is not, however, too late to correct this error; and we are confident that a prejudiced adherence to its own views will not, as undoubtedly it ought not, prevent the Central Committee from adopting a better plan than its hastily-improvised organization permitted, if such a plan can be suggested, as we believe it has been in Sir T. Sinclair's letter.

The following letter appeared in the *Daily Telegraph* :—

SIR,—Independently of Mr. J. Stuart Mill and Mr. Froude, whose able, bold, and convincing letters against war with Russia I have read with much satisfaction, I have received letters from several members of Parliament, expressing the same views; and I am confident that, if all England was polled by universal suffrage, the immense majority would be against war on account of the step which Russia has announced her intention of now taking.

It should be observed that Russia can build any number of the largest men-of-war in the Sea of Azov or the Dnieper without violating the Treaty of Paris; or she could, as in the case of the "Alabama" and the steam rams, build large men-of-war on the pretext that they were merchantmen, and keep their armament separate. Again, if she had a fixed intention of conquering Turkey, she could build a fleet of any size or strength in the Baltic or in America; and iron-plated men-of-war could force the Dardanelles more easily than it was done by a British admiral with wooden vessels many years ago.

I am one of those who totally disapproved of the Crimean war, and who long to see a Greek Empire established in European Turkey, or else that Russia will expel the handful of Mussulmans who so grievously oppress the enormous majority of the population, who are Christians. I do not believe that it would necessarily follow that because Russia acquired Turkey she would annex Egypt, and which, as compared with Turkey, is well and wisely governed. In any case, however, if the supposed interests of England are to interfere with progress and the rights of millions of oppressed Christians, the philanthropist will consider us selfish and tyrannical oppressors; and if we should, as is at least possible, meet with a disastrous defeat, and, like the French, have to submit to humiliating and ruinous terms, it would be thought that we deserved our fate. It is most likely that the Americans, in case of war, would fit out hosts of privateers, who would hoist American colours when they met our men-of-war, and the Russian when none were near, and they would then burn and destroy our shipping and our maritime towns, the end of which would, of course, be a war with the United States. As to our honour obliging us to fight, I have to observe that, at the beginning of this century, private duelling was considered as obligatory as some pretend that international duelling still is. If any man did not challenge and kill any individual who called him a liar or a scoundrel, he was considered a coward, wanting in all sense of honour; but now, even for such a heinous and irreparable injury as the seduction of a wife—as may be observed

by a recent remarkable trial—no one is expected to challenge the wrong-doer; and public opinion, so far from thinking a man a coward, would strongly disapprove of a duel being fought even in such a case; and if the injured man challenged the seducer and killed him, it would be certainly a crime for which he would be severely punished.

In the same way I consider international duelling both a folly and a crime, and that war is only justifiable to defend our shores or colonies, and not for any verbal offence or repudiation of unjust or humiliating treaties, or to protect other nations, who are never grateful to us for officious meddling.

Surely, after allowing the partition of Poland, the annexation of Nice and Savoy, and the dismemberment of Denmark, we cannot dream of going to war on behalf of Turkey. As an Englishman and a member of Parliament I protest against sending another 20,000 men to the European shambles, to be killed for a Quixotic idea, and I also strongly deprecate sacrificing another £70,000,000 of treasure, as in the Crimean war, the interest of which would give us a free breakfast table, and remove most of the taxes which fall so oppressively and so unjustly on the poor.

If the editors of those newspapers who, with vicarious courage, attempt to goad the nation into war, and all bellicose M.P.'s had to go to the war, as in Prussia—and I would wish them sent to the very front of the battle—there would be as many advocates for peace among the ruling class, in proportion, as amongst the people at large.—Your obedient servant,

J. G. TOLLEMACHE SINCLAIR, M.P.

The following letter in reply to that from the pen of Sir Tollemache Sinclair, M.P., has appeared in the *Times* :—

SIR,—My attention has been called to a letter in your journal of September 30, headed "Sick and Wounded," from Sir J. G. T. Sinclair, M.P., in which a remark is made that may mislead the public, and it also implies a want of judgment and

management on the part of the chief agent (Captain Brackenbury, R.A.) of the Society for the Sick and Wounded. As he is so far away, will you allow me to state the facts in justice to him and the society ?

It states that the society's stores ought to have been at Libramont instead of Arlon. Your correspondent is quite right, and such was the intention ; but no stores were to be had, nor a small shed to make into a store-room. To erect one was out of the question ; all the workmen were gone off in the Belgian army, and no wood was to be had. The stationmaster stated that if the waggons were sent there he could not receive them, having more than he could attend to. At this time the railway trucks containing the stores belonging to the Belgian Government were being charged for their detention. Arlon has also other advantages even superior to Luxembourg, there being a banker there ; bread, hams, and sausages cooked, with wine and cigars, at a moment's notice ; carts can be had there, not Libramont. I can understand that a superficial observer, without inquiry, would make this mistake. There was another most important consideration which I afterwards found to be correct ; no forage or any food for man or beast was to be had on the road from Libramont to Sedan—all was taken by the Belgian and Dutch ambulances and the prisoners.

Captain Brackenbury, with some difficulty, obtained from the Bourgomestre of Arlon the use of the rooms and vaults under the Palais de Justice. Bad as they were, I think in no other town in that part of the country could their equal be found for accommodation at the moment.

I will give your correspondent every credit for his exertions. He received the first goods into the stores at Arlon while I was unloading the railway trucks. Not knowing him, I imagined him to be some person accustomed to the storehouses of Lower Thames Street, and he most certainly deserves the thanks of the society for his exertions, independent of the good he did afterwards. If he had remained in Arlon another twelve hours he would have found that all his suggestions had been carried out.

Those of your readers who know what warehousing is will appreciate those exertions when I mention that there were 1,000 pairs of blankets, 600 cases and bales of linen bandages, clothing, &c., 40 cases, &c., of provisions, 30 cases of medicine, 20 cases of wines and spirits, and 20 cases, &c., of bottled beer, barrels of plaster of Paris, and various other cases; that all the medicine cases had to be unpacked, sorted, and re-packed, the same with linen and extract of meat, and that 16 waggons had to be loaded with an assortment of these articles, all within 24 hours. To weigh all these goods was an impossibility with the staff we had; we were obliged to judge their weight, and some wagons could not hold so much as others, while some had to travel with three horses instead of one in consequence of the roads; hence the difference in weight. If they had been railway trucks instead of country waggons it would have been different. Although the journey was longer and the cost of transport greater from Arlon than it would have been from Libramont, I consider that there was no alternative but to select Arlon as the depôt.

In reference to his remarks about the Johanniter Ritter, or Protestant Knights of St. John, and also the Johanniter Maltese Ritter, whom he calls the Catholic Knights of Malta, your Masonic readers will know that these orders combine both Protestants and Catholics, and being a member of both, and meeting with a "companion" on leaving Arlon, I affiliated myself with them, and thus visited all the ambulances in the vicinity of Sedan up to Rheims, and I have seen the great good done by the English Society from the stores sent from Arlon; at the same time I did more good in my own profession. I never had occasion to show my passport, being taken for an Alsatian. Nurses are not now required, and what was wanted were women of the country, not English ladies.

He is quite right in stating that the Germans will not allow English doctors to interfere; even those engaged by the Ambassador in London are only allowed to act as dressers; they will take anything you like to give them in the way of

stores. The French are different, but exceedingly jealous of our interference.

From what I have seen, I consider that next to the Johanniter the English Society have done the most good, even more so than the Anglo-American Ambulance, because we have not confined ourselves to one place, but wherever it was required there we have been, and Captain Brackenbury and Mr. Furley have achieved wonders.

I beg to add that I went out as an unpaid servant of the society, and that as soon as a paid storekeeper arrived I left, and made my way to the seat of war, all of which has been so ably described by your correspondent.

There now remains plenty of work for the doctors in the shape of typhus, but surgeons must go west of Paris.

I remain, yours, &c.,

GEORGE WARRINER,

Late Storekeeper at Arlon to the Society for the
Relief of the Sick and Wounded.

London, Oct. 3.

Truth says:—"Lady Strangford is moving heaven and earth to get an audience of the Sultan in order to receive his Majesty's thanks for her disinterested labours among the Bulgarians. Neither the lady nor her labours are popular in Turkish society. She has not pulled well with her nurses, and is now homeward bound with an exhausted exchequer and no accounts worth mentioning.

"In Bulgaria the chiefs of the two rival relief funds are called the King and the Queen. The King himself sits arrayed in a white cravat and silk stockings and pumps, a number of blankets on one side of him for distribution among the Bulgarians, and a few bottles of champagne on the other side for the delectation of himself and his friends. He has an excellent French cook, and, although the Bulgarians may starve, takes good care himself to fare sumptuously.

"The outbreak of war has deprived the Bulgarians of their King and Queen. The latter suddenly discovered that the health

of the district in which her charities were bestowed was so far restored that no further need existed for her hospitals. They were accordingly closed, and her staff of volunteer doctors disbanded and left to shift for themselves. Disgusted with the ingratitude of the Bulgarians, she will make her next appearance as ministering angel to the wounded soldiers of the Sultan, and, backed by the Stafford House Fund, will gather a further crop of laurels from the inexhaustible field of Turkish gratitude. Bracelets are no longer in vogue, but the Osmanli will form a brilliant addition to the many orders which adorn the bosom of this indefatigable little woman. . . . He (the King) no sooner heard of her flight than he prepared to follow, and made a pompous progress as soon as his friend the Bulgarian bishop could collect, by hook or by crook, a sufficiently imposing following through Bajardzik to the railway station. There, in a long-winded speech, he bade farewell to the impracticable Bulgarians, whom he had failed to convince that his method of housing them in crowded barracks, badly built of rough sawn boards, was superior to their old custom, where each family lived in a separate house in its own grounds. Both (King and Queen) are greedy of the glory of distributing public money, and it is generally supposed that their Majesties will run a hard race for the Stafford House Guineas."

PHOTOGRAPH OF AN M.P., BY DICKENS.

THE obstructives in the present Parliament, who propose amendments which they admit to be nonsensical, and who talk by the hour, or rather by the yard or mile, to a wearied and irritated audience, whilst the reporters hardly take down a single word, resemble, and will probably meet with some such reception from their constituents as that depicted in the following graphic photograph written by the inimitable Boz:—

“‘Gentlemen,’ said Mr. Gregsbury, ‘you are welcome. I am rejoiced to see you.’

“‘For a gentleman who was rejoiced to see a body of visitors, Mr. Gregsbury looked as uncomfortable as might be; but perhaps this was occasioned by senatorial gravity, and a statesman-like habit of keeping his feelings under control. He was a tough, burly, thick-headed gentleman, with a loud voice, a pompous manner, a tolerable command of sentences with no meaning in them, and, in short, every requisite for a very good member indeed.

“‘Now, gentlemen,’ said Mr. Gregsbury, tossing a great bundle of papers into a wicker basket at his feet, and throwing himself back in his chair with his arms over the elbows, ‘you are dissatisfied with my conduct, I see by the newspapers.’

“‘Yes, Mr. Gregsbury, we are,’ said a plump old gentleman in a violent heat, bursting out of the throng, and planting himself in the front.

“‘Do my eyes deceive me,’ said Mr. Gregsbury, looking towards the speaker, ‘or is that my old friend Pugstyles?’

“ ‘I am that man, and no other, sir,’ replied the plump old gentleman.

“ ‘Give me your hand, my worthy friend,’ said Mr. Gregsbury. ‘Pugstyles, my dear friend, I am very sorry to see you here.’

“ ‘I am very sorry to be here, sir,’ said Mr. Pugstyles; ‘but your conduct, Mr. Gregsbury, has rendered this deputation from your constituents imperatively necessary.’

“ ‘My conduct, Pugstyles,’ said Mr. Gregsbury, looking round upon the deputation with gracious magnanimity—‘My conduct has been, and ever will be, regulated by a sincere regard for the true and real interests of this great and happy country. Whether I look at home or abroad; whether I behold the peaceful industrious communities of our island home; her rivers covered with steamboats, her roads with locomotives, her streets with cabs, her skies with balloons of a power and magnitude hitherto unknown in the history of aëronautics in this or any other nation

—say, whether I look merely at home, or, stretching my eyes farther, contemplate the boundless prospect of conquest and possession—achieved by British perseverance and British valour—which is outstretched before me, I clasp my hands, and turning my eyes to the broad expanse above my head, exclaim, “Thank heaven, I am a Briton!”’

“ ‘The time had been when this burst of enthusiasm would have been cheered to the very echo; but now the deputation received it with chilling coldness. The general impression seemed to be, that as an explanation of Mr. Gregsbury’s political conduct, it did not enter quite enough into detail; and one gentleman in the rear did not scruple to remark aloud that, for his purpose, it savoured rather too much of a ‘gammon’ tendency.

“ ‘The meaning of that term—gammon,’ said Mr. Gregsbury, ‘is unknown to me. If it means that I grow a little too fervid, or perhaps even hyperbolical, in extolling my native land, I admit the full justice of the remark. I am proud of this free and happy country. My form dilates, my eye glistens, my breast heaves, my heart swells, my bosom burns, when I call to mind her greatness and her glory.’

“ ‘We wish, sir,’ remarked Mr. Pugstyles calmly, ‘to ask you a few questions.’

“ ‘If you please, gentlemen ; my time is yours—and my country’s—and my country’s’—said Mr. Gregsbury.

This permission being conceded, Mr. Pugstyles put on his spectacles, and referred to a written paper which he drew from his pocket ; whereupon nearly every other member of the deputation pulled a written paper from *his* pocket, to check Mr. Pugstyles off, as he read the questions.

“ ‘This done, Mr. Pugstyles proceeded to business.

“ ‘Question number one.—Whether, sir, you did not give a voluntary pledge previous to your election, that in event of your being returned, you would immediately put down the practice of coughing and groaning in the House of Commons? And whether you did not submit to be coughed and groaned down in the very first debate of the session, and have since made no effort to effect a reform in this respect? Whether you did not also pledge yourself to astonish the Government, and make them shrink in their shoes? And whether you have astonished them, and made them shrink in their shoes, or not?’

“ ‘Go on to the next one, my dear Pugstyles,’ said Mr. Gregsbury.

“ ‘Have you any explanation to offer with reference to that question, sir?’ asked Mr. Pugstyles.

“ ‘Certainly not,’ said Mr. Gregsbury.

“ ‘The members of the deputation looked fiercely at each other, and afterwards at the member. ‘Dear Pugstyles’ having taken a very long stare at Mr. Gregsbury over the tops of his spectacles, resumed his list of inquiries.

“ ‘Question number two.—Whether, sir, you did not likewise give a voluntary pledge that you would support your colleague on every occasion ; and whether you did not, the night before last, desert him and vote upon the other side, because the wife of a leader on that other side had invited Mrs. Gregsbury to an evening party?’

“ ‘Go on,’ said Mr. Gregsbury.

“‘Nothing to say on that, either, sir?’ asked the spokesman.

“‘Nothing whatever,’ replied Mr. Gregsbury.

“The deputation, who had only seen him at canvassing or election time, were struck dumb by his coolness. He didn’t appear like the same man; then he was all milk and honey; now he was all starch and vinegar. But men *are* so different at different times!

“‘Question number three—and last,’ said Mr. Pugstyles emphatically. ‘Whether, sir, you did not state upon the hustings, that it was your firm and determined intention to oppose everything proposed; to divide the House upon every question, to move for returns on every subject, to place a motion on the books every day, and, in short, in your own memorable words, to play the very devil with everything and everybody?’ With this comprehensive inquiry, Mr. Pugstyles folded up his list of questions, as did all his backers.

“Mr. Gregsbury reflected, blew his nose, threw himself further back in his chair, came forward again, leaning his elbows on the table, made a triangle with his two thumbs and his two forefingers, and tapping his nose with the apex thereof, replied (smiling as he said it), ‘I deny everything.’

“At this unexpected answer, a hoarse murmur arose from the deputation; and the same gentleman who had expressed an opinion relative to the gammoning nature of the introductory speech, again made a monosyllabic demonstration, by growling out ‘Resign!’ Which growl being taken up by his fellows, swelled into a very earnest and general remonstrance.

“‘I am requested, sir, to express a hope,’ said Mr. Pugstyles, with a distant bow, ‘that on receiving a requisition to that effect from a great majority of your constituents, you will not object at once to resign your seat in favour of some candidate whom they think they can better trust.’

“To this, Mr. Gregsbury read the following reply, which, anticipating the request, he had composed in the form of a letter, whereof copies had been made to send round to the newspapers.

“ ‘MY DEAR MR. PUGSTYLES,

“ ‘Next to the welfare of our beloved island—this great and free and happy country, whose powers and resources are, I sincerely believe, illimitable—I value that noble independence which is an Englishman’s proudest boast, and which I fondly hope to bequeath to my children, untarnished and unsullied. Actuated by no personal motives, but moved only by high and great constitutional considerations; which I will not attempt to explain, for they are really beneath the comprehension of those who have not made themselves masters, as I have, of the intricate and arduous study of politics; I would rather keep my seat, and intend doing so.

“ ‘Will you do me the favour to present my compliments to the constituent body, and acquaint them with this circumstance?

“ ‘With great esteem,

“ ‘My dear Mr. Pugstyles,

“ ‘&c., &c.’

“ ‘Then you will not resign, under any circumstances?’ asked the spokesman.

“ ‘Mr. Gregsbury smiled, and shook his head.

“ ‘Then, good morning, sir,’ said Pugstyles, angrily.

“ ‘Heaven bless you!’ said Mr. Gregsbury. And the deputation, with many growls and scowls, filed off as quickly as the narrowness of the staircase would allow of their getting down.

“ ‘The last man being gone, Mr. Gregsbury rubbed his hands and chuckled, as merry fellows will, when they think they have said or done a more than commonly good thing; he was so engrossed in this self-congratulation, that he did not observe that Nicholas had been left behind in the shadow of the window-curtains, until that young gentleman, fearing he might otherwise overhear some soliloquy intended to have no listeners coughed twice or thrice, to attract the member’s notice.

“ ‘What’s that?’ said Mr. Gregsbury, in sharp accents.

“ ‘Nicholas stepped forward and bowed.

“ ‘What do you do here, sir?’ asked Mr. Gregsbury; ‘a spy upon my privacy! A concealed voter! You have heard my answer, sir. Pray follow the deputation.’

“ ‘I should have done so, if I had belonged to it, but I do not,’ said Nicholas.

“ ‘Then how came you here, sir?’ was the natural inquiry of Mr. Gregsbury, M.P. ‘And where the devil have you come from, sir?’ was the question which followed it.

“ ‘I brought this card from the General Agency Office, sir,’ said Nicholas, ‘wishing to offer myself as your secretary, and understanding that you stood in need of one.’

“ ‘That’s all you have come for, is it?’ said Mr. Gregsbury, eyeing him in some doubt.

“ Nicholas replied in the affirmative.

“ ‘You have no connexion with any of those rascally papers, have you?’ said Mr. Gregsbury. ‘You didn’t get into the room to hear what was going forward, and put it in print, eh?’

“ ‘I have no connexion, I am sorry to say, with anything at present,’ rejoined Nicholas,—politely enough, but quite at his ease.

“ ‘Oh!’ said Mr. Gregsbury. ‘How did you find your way up here, then?’

“ Nicholas related how he had been forced up by the deputation.

“ ‘That was the way, was it?’ said Mr. Gregsbury. ‘Sit down.’

“ Nicholas took a chair, and Mr. Gregsbury stared at him for a long time, as if to make certain, before he asked any further questions, that there were no objections to his outward appearance.

“ ‘You want to be my secretary, do you?’ he said at length.

“ ‘I wish to be employed in that capacity, sir,’ replied Nicholas.

“ ‘Well,’ said Mr. Gregsbury; ‘now what can you do?’

“ ‘I suppose,’ replied Nicholas, smiling, ‘that I can do what usually falls to the lot of other secretaries.’

“ ‘What’s that?’ inquired Mr. Gregsbury.

“‘What is it?’ replied Nicholas.

“‘Ah! What is it?’ retorted the member, looking shrewdly at him, with his head on one side.

“‘A secretary’s duties are rather difficult to define, perhaps,’ said Nicholas, considering. ‘They include, I presume, correspondence?’

“‘Good,’ interposed Mr. Gregsbury.

“‘The arrangement of papers and documents?’

“‘Very good.’

“‘Occasionally, perhaps, the writing from your dictation; and possibly, sir,’—said Nicholas, with a half smile, ‘the copying of your speech for some public journal, when you have made one of more than usual importance.’

“‘Certainly,’ rejoined Mr. Gregsbury. ‘What else?’

“‘Really,’ said Nicholas, after a moment’s reflection, ‘I am not able, at this instant, to recapitulate any other duty of a secretary, beyond the general one of making himself as agreeable and useful to his employer as he can, consistently with his own respectability, and without overstepping that line of duties which he undertakes to perform, and which the designation of his office is usually understood to imply.’

“Mr. Gregsbury looked fixedly at Nicholas for a short time, and then glancing warily round the room, said in a suppressed voice—

“‘This is all very well, Mr. — what is your name?’

“‘Nickleby.’

“‘This is all very well, Mr. Nickleby, and very proper, so far as it goes—so far as it goes, but it doesn’t go far enough. There are other duties, Mr. Nickleby, which a secretary to a parliamentary gentleman must never lose sight of. I should require to be crammed, sir.’

“‘I beg your pardon,’ interposed Nicholas, doubtful whether he had heard aright.

“‘— To be crammed, sir,’ repeated Mr. Gregsbury.

“‘May I beg your pardon again, if I inquire what you mean, sir?’ said Nicholas.

“ ‘My meaning, sir, is perfectly plain,’ replied Mr. Gregsbury, with a solemn aspect. ‘My secretary would have to make himself master of the foreign policy of the world, as it is mirrored in the newspapers; to run his eye over all accounts of public meetings, all leading articles, and accounts of the proceedings of public bodies; and to make notes of anything which it appeared to him might be made a point of, in any little speech upon the question of some petition lying on the table, or anything of that kind. Do you understand?’

“ ‘I think I do, sir,’ replied Nicholas.

“ ‘Then,’ said Mr. Gregsbury, ‘it would be necessary for him to make himself acquainted, from day to day, with newspaper paragraphs on passing events; such as “Mysterious disappearance, and supposed suicide of a pot-boy,” or anything of that sort, upon which I might found a question to the Secretary of State for the Home Department. Then, he would have to copy the question, and as much as I remembered of the answer (including a little compliment about independence and good sense); and to send the manuscript in a frank to the local paper, with perhaps half a dozen lines of leader, to the effect, that I was always to be found in my place in Parliament, and never shrunk from the responsible and arduous duties, and so forth. You see?’

“ Nicholas bowed.

“ ‘Besides which,’ continued Mr. Gregsbury, ‘I should expect him, now and then, to go through a few figures in the printed tables, and to pick out a few results, so that I might come out pretty well on timber duty questions, and finance questions, and so on; and I should like him to get up a few little arguments about the disastrous effects of a return to cash payments and a metallic currency, with a touch now and then about the exportation of bullion, and the Emperor of Russia, and bank notes, and all that kind of thing, which it’s only necessary to talk fluently about, because nobody understands it. Do you take me?’

“ ‘I think I understand,’ said Nicholas.

“ ‘With regard to such questions as are not political,’ con-

tinued Mr. Gregsbury, warming; 'and which one can't be expected to care a curse about, beyond the natural care of not allowing inferior people to be as well off as ourselves—else where are our privileges?—I should wish my secretary to get together a few little flourishing speeches, of a patriotic cast. For instance, if any preposterous bill were brought forward, for giving poor grubbing devils of authors a right to their own property, I should like to say, that I for one would never consent to opposing an insurmountable bar to the diffusion of literature among *the people*,—you understand?—that the creations of the pocket, being man's, might belong to one man, or one family; but that the creations of the brain, being God's, ought as a matter of course to belong to the people at large—and if I was pleasantly disposed, I should like to make a joke about posterity, and say that those who wrote for posterity should be content to be rewarded by the approbation of posterity; it might take with the house, and could never do me any harm, because posterity can't be expected to know anything about me or my jokes either—do you see.'

" 'I see that, sir,' replied Nicholas.

" 'You must always bear in mind, in such cases as this, where our interests are not affected,' said Mr. Gregsbury, 'to put it very strong about the people, because it comes out very well at election-time; and you could be as funny as you liked about the authors; because I believe the greater part of them live in lodgings, and are not voters. This is a hasty outline of the chief things you'd have to do, except waiting in the lobby every night, in case I forgot anything, and should want fresh cramming; and, now and then, during great debates, sitting in the front row of the gallery, and saying to the people about—"You see that gentleman, with his hand to his face, and his arm twisted round that pillar—that's Mr. Gregsbury—the celebrated Mr. Gregsbury—" with any other little eulogium that might strike you at the moment. And for salary,' said Mr. Gregsbury, winding up with great rapidity; for he was out of breath—'And for salary, I don't mind saying at once in round numbers, to prevent any dissatisfaction—though it's more than I have been accustomed to give—fifteen shillings a week, and find yourself. There!'

“With this handsome offer, Mr. Gregsbury once more threw himself back in his chair, and looked like a man who had been most profligately liberal, but is determined not to repent of it notwithstanding.

“‘Fifteen shillings a week is not much,’ said Nicholas mildly.

“‘Not much ! Fifteen shillings a week not much, young man ?’ cried Mr. Gregsbury. ‘Fifteen shillings a——’

“‘Pray do not suppose that I quarrel with the sum, sir,’ replied Nicholas ; ‘for I am not ashamed to confess, that whatever it may be in itself, to me it is a great deal. But the duties and responsibilities make the recompense small, and they are so very heavy that I fear to undertake them.’

“‘Do you decline to undertake them, sir ?’ inquired Mr. Gregsbury, with his hand on the bell-rope.

“‘I fear they are too great for my powers, however good my will may be, sir,’ replied Nicholas.

“‘That is as much as to say that you had rather not accept the place, and that you consider fifteen shillings a week too little,’ said Mr. Gregsbury, ringing. ‘Do you decline it, sir ?’

“‘I have no alternative but to do so,’ replied Nicholas.

“‘Door, Matthews !’ said Mr. Gregsbury, as the boy appeared.

“‘I am sorry I have troubled you unnecessarily, sir,’ said Nicholas.

“‘I am sorry you have,’ rejoined Mr. Gregsbury, turning his back upon him. ‘Door, Matthews !’

“‘Good morning, sir,’ said Nicholas.

“‘Door, Matthews !’ cried Mr. Gregsbury.

“The boy beckoned Nicholas, and tumbling lazily down stairs before him, opened the door, and ushered him into the street. With a sad and pensive air, he retraced his steps homewards.”

THE
GREAT BATTLE OF *KATSH-TARTAR BAZARDJIK.

THE *Blood and Thunder Gazette* has killed so many Russians on paper in their long and unbroken series of imaginary Turkish victories that one wonders how a single Cossack is left to fight on the Muscovite side, unless the Czar can instantaneously raise soldiers by sowing an unlimited number of dragons' teeth. The following telegram has this instant been received by the *Blood and Thunder Gazette*, from their veracious correspondent, the well known Baron Munchausen† :—

FROM THE SPECIAL TWENTY-FOURTH EDITION OF THE "BLOOD
AND THUNDER GAZETTE."

GLORIOUS TURKISH VICTORY !

SEDAN OUTDONE !!!

DEFEAT AND CAPTURE OF THE WHOLE
RUSSIAN ARMY BY A TURKISH FORCE OF
LESS THAN ONE-TENTH OF THEIR NUMBER !!!!

234,567 RUSSIANS KILLED, WOUNDED, AND
MISSING !!!!!

THE TURKISH ARMY MARCHING ON ST.
PETERSBURG !!!!!!!!!

"The Russian army, 502,200 strong, all veterans, with 1,010 Krupp guns, were most advantageously posted at the top of an

* This is a common Turkish word. "Katsh grush" is, "How many piastres?"

† The impartial Baron is *Gay*—with a decoration.

elevated plateau, with perpendicular mountains behind and on both sides, and a deep morass in front, whilst the Turks were, by the necessities of the case, and not from any want of military skill on the part of their able leaders, most disadvantageously placed in a low-lying valley, their army consisting of precisely 49,999 men, all recruits, with 101 guns, all smooth bores.

"We all know the saying, 'Scratch the Russian and you will find the Tartar,' and, by a singular coincidence, the Turks, who are all born gentlemen, came up with the Russian forces, which were exclusively composed of serfs, at Katsh-Tartar Bazardjik, which your readers will find incorrectly spelt Tatar Bazardjik, at the foot of the Balkans.

"The battle took place on the fifteenth Shabun, in the year 1294 of the Hegira, for, having myself embraced the Mahometan religion, I use their chronology.

"On the night previous to the battle the whole Russian army, including officers and men, were drunk, and they passed the night in blaspheming, torturing, and killing exactly 11,110 sacred dancing dervishes, 6,760 women, and 13,330 children, two of them twins, whom by a base stratagem they had taken prisoners. Of these 31,200 victims we have ascertained that 3,540 were broken on the wheel, 8,420 had their throats cut, 9,270 were bled to death, 6,310 had all their extremities cut off and were then decapitated, 2,460 were crucified, 620 were impaled, and the remaining 580 were compelled to hang each other, the last man hanging himself.*

"As the Russians are well known to be all cannibals, the bodies of the whole of their victims were eaten by them with evident relish, whilst some of the superior officers kept a few joints of cold dancing dervish, which has a strong gamy flavour, for breakfast next morning, and they quenched their thirst with copious draughts of the blood, drunk out of the skulls of their victims.

"The Turks, on the other hand, spent the eve of the engagement in fasting and prayer, and, after giving a champagne and *pâté de foie gras* supper to the Russian prisoners whom they had captured, magnanimously liberated them, giving each a new suit

* This took place on a former occasion, when the Swedes invaded Poland.

of clothes, a well-filled purse, and as many Turkish bonds as they could conveniently carry to make into cigarettes, being their customary use in Turkey.

"The Turkish forces were commanded by the Serdar Ekrem Backsheesh* Pasha, supported by the following able generals: Bowstering Pasha, the Muchir Redif Rotoon Biskeet Pasha,† late Minister of War, Chefket Pasha, the hero of Batak, the Pasha of Many Tails,‡ the Egyptian generals, Bloobeer and Baztynaydoo Pashas, with the El Muddee and Souakim corps, sent with the concurrence of England as a friendly and equitable return for Russia's promise not to attack Egypt, together with the following ex-Christian generals, who had abandoned the Ghiaour creed and had embraced the sublime religion of Mahomet, namely—Grenouille and Gobemouche Pashas, from France, Saur Kraut and Donner-und-Blitzen Pashas, from Germany, Buncombe and Longbow Pashas, from America, and *Penitentiary* Pasha, from England, to whom were added Admiral Paul Jones Filibuster Pasha (who performed such humane and *disinterested* prodigies of valour with the Turkish fleet against the overwhelming forces of the ferocious Cretan traitors); General Sir Hardhold Kannon Ball, Military Commissioner with the Turkish army, who, in strict observance of British neutrality, directed all the operations of the Turkish army; and also Judas Iscariot, and Ananias Effendis, whose duty was to invent Turkish victories and Russian atrocities, and Shylock Effendi, whose mission was to decide whether in any case mercy should be ever extended to a Christian Ghiaour.¶

"The Russian army was commanded by Prince Ruric Romanoffsky, under whose orders were the following generals:—Count Oleg, Baron Vladimir, Alexander Newski, Boris Godonof, Todtle-

* Backsheesh is the Turkish word by which they ask you for a present of money.

† Supposed to be the Turkish adaptation of the nickname he got for making a profit by sending rotten biscuits to the Turkish army when he was paid for sound ones, which caused his removal from the Ministry of War, but did not prevent his getting a command, like Chefket Pasha.

‡ A friend of Captain Marryat's, who wrote the "Pacha of Many Tales."

¶ Ghiaour means infidel or miscreant.

ben, Popoff, Jaroslaw, Swiatoslaw, Wsewolod, Rostislaw, Demidoff, Troubetzkoi, Galitzin, Mentschikoff, Ignatieff, Tehnernayeff, Kauffman the Hetman Platoff, and General Mazeppa, commanding the Cossacks.

"During the night a force of 1,010 men was despatched under Achmet Aga, of Batak celebrity, which executed a flank movement and took possession of a ledge inaccessible to the Russians, on the heights immediately behind the Muscovite army, and beyond the range of the Russian rifles.

"Before break of day the Ottoman army advanced noiselessly to a tract of firm ground which is situated in the middle of the morass already mentioned, and which exactly held the whole force, and deployed into line one deep, to give the Russians the idea that their army was double its real number, by which device, I need hardly say, the credulous Russians were completely deceived.

"The Turkish troops, in spite of the enormous disparity of numbers and of guns, and of the almost impregnable position of the Russian army, were, as is invariably the case, confident of victory, and eager to be led against a foe whom they equally despised and hated.

"The Turkish artillery began the attack by a well-directed fire from their 101 guns, which were so well served that, at each discharge, 101 cannon balls entered into a corresponding number of Russian guns, splitting them up and rendering them entirely useless, so that at precisely the tenth volley not one Russian gun remained serviceable. The incredulous reader may, perhaps, inquire what the Russian artillerymen were doing whilst their cannon were being destroyed; but this is easily explained. The 1,010 men on the heights picked off each successive gunner who attempted to load the 1,010 Russian cannon, so that they were unable to fire a single shot.

"On taking up their position in order of battle the Turks, with that chivalry which distinguishes them above all other nations, exclaimed, 'Gentlemen of the Russian army, fire first!' on which exactly 501,999 balls were fired at the Turks, one man having missed fire, who, being six inches beyond the range of the Russian rifles, caught as many of the spent balls as they wanted in their

hands, and then, loading their own rifles with them, discharged them with fatal effect at the Russian army.

"The Russian army was drawn up in a line four deep, and being considerably within the range of the Turkish rifles, which were fired with unerring accuracy by the Ottomans, who had been carefully instructed by William Tell Pasha, each ball passed through the centre of the forehead of the opposing Russian soldier in the front rank, and thence through the skulls of the three men behind him, so that at the first round exactly 199,996 Russians were killed.

"At this appalling slaughter, which was accomplished in 1 minute $33\frac{3}{4}$ seconds, the Russian army was paralysed with terror, whilst the Turkish army, with incredible enthusiasm and shouts of 'Death to the Ghiaour! Backsheesh to the true believer!' waded through the morass, their heads and rifles only appearing above the surface.

"Meantime the Russian army fired wildly at the advancing foe as soon as they came within range, but as the Turkish skulls are remarkably thick, most of their bullets glanced off as harmlessly as from the hide of a rhinoceros, and, as already explained, the whole of the bodies of the Turks were protected by their being immersed in the morass.

"On the attacking army emerging on the other side, the perpendicular elevation of the Russian position prevented the Muscovites from depressing the muzzles of their rifles sufficiently to bear upon the Turks. The ground on which the Russian army stood being on a concave declivity, the bodies of the slain rolled over the precipice, forming an inclined plane, over which the Turkish army advanced to the attack.

"Meantime the 1,010 men behind the Russian position kept up a continual discharge, whilst they themselves were out of range, killing each time from 1,010 to 4,040 men, according as that part of the Russian army against whom they fired were one to four deep.

"The main Turkish force then scaled the cliffs in front of the Russian position like greased lightning—a feat in comparison

with which the ascent of the heights of Spicheren by the German troops was but child's play.

"Upon this the Russians were suddenly seized with a panic when they saw their resolute aspect, and they could not conceal from themselves the injustice of their cause and the abominable and treasonable ingratitude of their Christian allies who had rebelled against the wisest and most benevolent Government which ever existed since the world began. Not being able to retreat, and being struck with terror and remorse, the whole Russian army surrendered as prisoners, and being overpowered by the bravery, humanity, and magnanimity of the Turks, and convinced, by the miraculous destruction of their cannon by a special interposition of Mahomet—whose spectre was distinctly visible in the air, like that of St. James at Compostella—of the superiority of the Mussulman religion, they immediately became Mahometans and subjects of the Sultan. The Turks, in spite of the cruel massacre of their countrymen on the preceding evening with every refinement of torture, received the Russians as brothers, kissing them repeatedly on both cheeks.

"The total loss of the Russians was 234,567, that of the Turks only 1,234, chiefly drowned in the morass, killed in scaling the heights, or of the fatigue of slaughtering Russians.

"An ambulance, belonging to the Stafford House Committee, was with the Ottoman army, under the direction of Lady Gamp and her friend Mrs. Harris, with Mr. Benjamin Allen and Mr. Bob Sawyer as surgeons, but the Turks would not avail themselves of its services, as they find that it is cheaper to bring over voluntary recruits from Asia in handcuffs,* than to cure their wounded, who are seldom of much use, even when, in spite of the Turkish doctors, they recover; besides, it would be cruel to retard their arrival at the pavilions of the houris.

"An enormous number of Russian soldiers and officers were weltering in their blood; but as they had received strict orders from the very humane members of the committee not to assist the Russian vermin under any circumstances, who being, like fish,

* These 1,500 recruits were driven to Jaffa, manacled together in files of ten to twenty.—*Times*, 14th July.

cold-blooded creatures, are insensible to pain, and consider bleeding to death a luxury, they left them to their fate.

“After Lady Gamp had relieved her ill humour by scolding the nurses, the officials of the ambulance, having nothing better to do, sat down to a sumptuous luncheon, prepared by their French cook, consisting of all the delicacies in or out of season, and some remarkably choice Chateau Yquem at only 50 francs a bottle, and passed a most agreeable day.

“The Turkish rulers, unlike the superstitious governments of infidel countries like England and France, do not consider it necessary or expedient to have a staff of imaums to give their dying soldiers the last consolations of religion individually, but a dancing dervish accompanies each army, and dances a species of tarantella after each battle, from which the Turkish wounded are said to derive great spiritual benefit, so that death becomes a positive pleasure. Some Roman Catholic Bosniacs being among the mortally wounded on the Turkish side, as there were no Romish priests to give them the last sacrament, and as their spiritual guides had informed them before leaving home that the Russo-Greek priests were imps of Satan, and that the Mahometan religion much more nearly resembled the Romish faith than that of the Greek Church, eagerly sought and received the ministrations of the dancing dervish, who extemporized a new step on the occasion, which gave the dying men infinite comfort and smoothed their passage to eternity.

“The 113 armed civilian Turks of Katsh-Tartar Bazardjik, thus fighting by Bashi Bazouks and other deputies for their hearths and homes, which they had now rescued from all fear of destruction, gave a gentle hint to the 1,130 unarmed Christian inhabitants by bastinadoing them all, and by afterwards politely inviting them to set fire to their houses and to sign a declaration that they had done this voluntarily as an expiation of their enormous crimes in rebelling, neglecting to pay treble taxes, and daring to prevent the friendly visits of the Bashi Bazouks to their houses, and their attentions to their wives, daughters, and *good-looking sons*.

"The Turkish army thus reinforced is in full march for Moscow and St. Petersburg.

"I myself counted the respective armies, the victims massacred by the Russians, and the killed, wounded, missing, and prisoners, and I can, therefore, vouch for the absolute accuracy of my figures.

"In a short time I expect to announce to your readers the capture of Moscow and St. Petersburg, the annexation of Russia to the Ottoman dominions, and the conversion of the whole Russian nation from the errors of Christianity to the true religion of Mahomet.

"P.S. (private) To the Editor. Please say if my telegram was spicy enough, or whether your readers would relish a little more 'blood and thunder,' and let me know the profits of the special edition containing my telegram. You really ought to give me a percentage.

"It was too bad of the correspondent of the *Times* to say that a brother correspondent (evidently alluding to me) had agreed to sign and transmit any telegrams or letters on the subject of Russian atrocities which the Turkish officials might invent, on condition that he obtained earlier and more authentic intelligence of the events of the war than other correspondents, for hawks, according to the proverb, should not pick out hawks' eyes. However, I suppose all is fair in love and war, and if I had not made this bargain you could not have had the astounding and thrilling information contained in this telegram, which you will find will appear in no other journal.

"After all, my telegram, I must admit, is very tame indeed in comparison with some which have already appeared in the *Blood and Thunder Gazette*."

AN ILLUSTRATION OF THE UTTER IMPOSSIBILITY
OF PERSUADING ENGLISHMEN TO BELIEVE ANY-
THING CONTRARY TO THEIR PRECONCEIVED
NOTIONS.

ALL English-speaking people but geographers firmly believe that John O'Groat's House is the most northern point on the mainland of Great Britain, but the fact is, as every map that has ever been published of the British Isles clearly shows, that Dunnet Head is considerably further north; consequently, hundreds of tourists annually proceed, at considerable expense, to visit John O'Groat's House, but hardly a single individual ever visits Dunnet Head, and what renders this more surprising is that Dunnet Head, besides being easier of access, is a lofty and noble promontory with cliffs descending almost perpendicularly to the sea, whilst at John O'Groat's House there is nothing whatever to be seen but low sand-hills, and not a vestige of the house which every one comes to see is 'to be found—indeed, for my part, I do not believe that any such house ever existed.

Even their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales, and General Grant, the Ex-President of the American Republic, when they did me the honour of visiting me at Thurso Castle, would not take my advice to visit Dunnet Head instead of John O'Groat's, and could hardly be persuaded that the former was further north than the latter; and probably few Englishmen would venture to confess that they had visited Dunnet Head and had omitted John O'Groat's, any more than they would own that they had visited Egypt without seeing the

Pyramids; and as long as the world endures the vulgar error will last that Great Britain extends from the Land's End to John O'Groat's, instead of, as is the fact, from the Land's End to the Land's Beginning (Dunnet Head).

If, in a matter which does not involve "British interests," national pride, or any other influence or feeling whatever, we so absurdly adhere to a palpable and obvious error, no one need be surprised that Englishmen cling to the equally erroneous and equally general idea that Turkey has been always the ally of England, and Russia has been our constant foe; for I proved from historical facts and statements by eminent men the diametrical opposite in my speech in the House of Commons. As soon as I sat down, member after member rose up to repeat the misstatements which I had so clearly and fully refuted, and, whilst I was listened to with impatience and incredulity, they were applauded to the echo.

LIST OF INDIVIDUALS AND AUTHORITIES QUOTED
IN THE ORDER IN WHICH THEY OCCUR.

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| 1 Comte Seebach | 28 Lord Aberdeen |
| 2 Sir Stafford Northcote, M.P. | 29 Herr Von Vincke |
| 3 Lord Beaconsfield | 30 Kinglake |
| 4 Talleyrand | 31 Napoleon III. |
| 5 <i>The World</i> | 32 Count Nesselrode |
| 6 Lord Byron | 33 Count Buol |
| 7 Lord Sandon, M.P. | 34 Lord Grey |
| 8 Mr. Courtney, M.P. | 35 <i>The Allgemeine Zeitung</i> |
| 9 Mr. Cross, M.P. | 36 Rushdi Pasha, late Grand
Vizier |
| 10 Mr. Baxter, M.P. | 37 Midhat Pasha, late Grand |
| 11 Sir Robert Peel, M.P. | 38 Rifaat Bey [Vizier |
| 12 Mr. Foster, M.P. | 39 Abedin Bey |
| 13 Mr. Bourke, M.P. | 40 Sir George Campbell, M.P. |
| 14 Lord Elcho, M.F. | 41 Lady Duff Gordon |
| 15 Major O'Gorman, M.P. | 42 Author of Secret Dispatches
of General Ignatieff |
| 16 Dr. Kenealy, M.P. | 43 Mr. Mackenzie Wallace |
| 17 Mr. Gladstone, M.P. | 44 Consul Holmes |
| 18 <i>The Times</i> | 45 Musurus Pasha |
| 19 Colonel Vincent | 46 Montesquieu |
| 20 Schuyler | 47 Count Andrassy |
| 21 Maghan | 48 The Turkish Commissioners |
| 22 Chinese Envoy | 49 <i>The Daily News</i> |
| 23 Jefferson | 50 Mr. Baring |
| 24 Mirabeau's brother | 51 The Berlin Memorandum |
| 25 The Duke of Wellington | 52 Lord Derby |
| 26 Lord John Russell | |
| 27 The Emperor Nicholas | |

- | | |
|--|---|
| 53 Prince Milan | 91 Mr. Peel (afterwards Sir Robert) |
| 54 Sir Henry Elliott | 92 Lord Raglan |
| 55 Prince Gortschakoff | 93 The Duke of Newcastle |
| 56 Safvet Pasha | 94 Mr. Denton |
| 57 The Czar Alexander | 95 Colonel Baker |
| 58 Lord Stratford de Redcliffe | 96 The Duke of Argyll |
| 59 The Emperor of Germany | 97 Lord Hartington |
| 60 M. Melegari | 98 The Earl of Dudley |
| 61 Edhem Pasha | 99 The Marquis of Bath |
| 62 Sultan Hamid | 100 Mr. Evans [M.P.] |
| 63 Count Schouvaloff | 101 Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice, |
| 64 Mr. Jocelyn | 102 Mr. Holms, M.P. |
| 65 Lord A. Loftus | 103 Vice-Consul Dupuis |
| 66 The Duke of Rutland | 104 Mr. Cobden |
| 67 La Rochefoucauld | 105 Mehemet Kuprisli Pasha |
| 68 The <i>Grajdavine</i> of St. Petersburg | 106 Captain Ward |
| 69 Sir W. Vernon Harcourt, M.P. | 107 Mr. Barkley, C.E. |
| 70 Mr. Freeman | 108 Achmed Veofic Effendi |
| 71 Prince Bismarck | 109 Mr. Senior |
| 72 M. Tisza | 110 Vice-Consul Blunt |
| 73 Mr. Augustus Sala | 111 Consul Monson |
| 74 Sydney Smith | 112 M. Ristich |
| 75 Mr. Sandford, M.P. | 113 Consul Reade |
| 76 Mr. Forsyth, M.P. | 114 Consul Brophy |
| 77 Ockley's "History of the Saracens" | 115 Consul Calvert |
| 78 Tacitus | 116 General Sir Fenwick Williams, of Kars |
| 79 Tom Moore | 117 Colonel Horvatovitch |
| 80 Mahomet | 118 Mr. Cooper |
| 81 Wilkes | 119 Lady Mary Wortley Mon- |
| 82 Omar | 120 Fuad Pasha [tague |
| 83 Alison | 121 Mr. Layard |
| 84 M. de Tchitchatchef | 122 Sir Henry Bulwer (Lord Dalling) |
| 85 Mahomet II. | 123 Prince Nicholas of Montenegro |
| 86 Lady Verney | 124 Colonel Thömmel |
| 87 Lord Holland | 125 Mrs. Thistlethwayte |
| 88 Edmund Burke [ton) | 126 Comte de Maistre |
| 89 Mr. Hobhouse (Lord Brough- | |
| 90 Sir James Mackintosh | |

- | | |
|---|---|
| 127 Lord Brougham | 166 M. Theodore Juste |
| 128 Admiral Griffin | 167 Lesur |
| 129 Mr. Luttrell | 168 Gaillardet |
| 130 Macaulay | 169 Chevalier d'Eon |
| 131 Mr. Parnell, M.P. | 170 Peter the Great |
| 132 Mr. O'Neill Daunt | 171 Mr. Lowe, M.P. |
| 133 Dr. Leland | 172 Carlyle |
| 134 Carter | 173 Heine |
| 135 Lord Clarendon | 174 De Tocqueville |
| 136 Charles II. | 175 The Czar Alexander I. |
| 137 William III. | 176 Lempriere's "Classical
Dictionary" |
| 138 Lord Gosford | 177 The <i>Figaro</i> |
| 139 Lord Moira | 178 M. F. Martens |
| 140 Smollett | 179 Mr. Horsman |
| 141 The <i>Saturday Review</i> | 180 Casimir V. of Poland |
| 142 Thackeray | 181 Madame de Motteville |
| 143 Mr. Urquhart, M.P. | 182 Baron de Worms |
| 144 Voltaire | 183 M. Thiers |
| 145 Lord Chatham | 184 Odysseus |
| 146 Mr. Pitt | 185 Mr. Scarlett (afterwards
Lord Abinger) |
| 147 Fox | 186 The <i>New York Times</i> |
| 148 Lord North | 187 Adolphus Slade |
| 149 Lord Aberdeen | 188 Thornton's "Turkey" |
| 150 Lord Palmerston (late) | 189 Mathien's "La Turquie" |
| 151 Lord Carnarvon (late) | 190 Eton's "Turkey" |
| 152 Mr. Dunlop | 191 Mr. Macfarlane's "Kismet" |
| 153 Sir Alexander Burnes | 192 M. Cousiniery (Voyage
dans le Macedoine) |
| 154 Mr. Kaye | 193 Colonel Mansfield |
| 155 Sir Herbert Edwardes | 194 General Comte Kotzebue |
| 156 Mr. Bright | 195 Count Valerian Krasinski |
| 157 Hadji Pasha | 196 The <i>Tablet</i> |
| 158 Mr. Douglas Freshfield | 197 Sir James Stephen |
| 159 Adam Oleasius | 198 Mr. Laing, M.P. |
| 160 Klaproth | 199 Lord Hardinge |
| 161 Laurence Oliphant | 200 General Scott |
| 162 Lieutenant Royer | 201 Mr. Baillie |
| 163 <i>Harper's Illustrated Journal</i>
(New York) | 202 <i>Truth</i> |
| 164 Dr. Rieger | |
| 165 Lord Salisbury | |

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| 203 Dr. Birdwood | 242 Miss Martineau |
| 204 Professor Monier Williams | 243 Mr. Layard |
| 205 Mr. Ashbury, M.P. | 244 Consul Saunders |
| 206 The Attorney-General | 245 Consul Baratti |
| 207 "Statesman's Year Book" | 246 Consul Neale |
| 208 Lord Carnarvon | 247 Dr. Sandwith |
| 209 Mr. G. J. Holyoake | 248 Rev. C. Hawkins |
| 210 <i>The Scotsman</i> | 249 Miss Irby |
| 211 <i>Ost Preussische Zeitung</i> | 250 Captain Burton |
| 212 <i>Daily Review</i> | 251 Mr. Barkley |
| 213 <i>Cologne Gazette</i> | 252 Mr. Evans |
| 214 <i>Londoner Zeitung</i> | 253 Sir G. Campbell |
| 215 <i>Kreuz Zeitung</i> | 254 Swiderski |
| 216 Mrs. Garrett Fawcett | 255 Gibbon |
| 217 Lord Granville | 256 <i>Almanac de Gotha</i> |
| 218 <i>Le Nord</i> | 257 Mr. G. Warriner |
| 219 <i>La Gazette de Moscou</i> | 258 Mr. Goschen |
| 220 <i>Morning Advertiser</i> | 259 Lord R. Montagu |
| 221 <i>Daily Telegraph</i> | 260 Captain Marryat |
| 222 <i>La Revue des Deux Mondes</i> | 261 The Bible |
| 223 M. Leroy Beaulieu | 262 The Mishna |
| 224 M. de Latacaz | 263 Maimonides |
| 225 <i>Punch</i> | 264 Bortanova |
| 226 <i>Nord Deutsche Zeitung</i> | 265 Mr. Innes |
| 227 <i>Annual Register</i> | 266 Tacitus |
| 228 "Statesman's Year Book" | 267 Charles Dickens |
| 229 Hansard's "Parliamentary
Debates" | 268 <i>Moniteur Roumain</i> |
| 230 Mr. Auberon Herbert | 269 M. Golesco |
| 231 Lamartine | 270 M. Boeresco |
| 232 Mr. Stephens | 271 Vice-Consul St. John |
| 233 Eliot Warburton | 272 Consul-General Green |
| 234 Mr. Walsh | 273 M. Cogalniceano |
| 235 Mr. Spencer | 274 Adolphe Vaimberg |
| 236 Mr. Crowe | 275 Israelitish notables of Jassy |
| 237 Bayle St. John | 276 M. Manuel |
| 238 M. Blanqui | 277 M. Bratiano |
| 239 Earl of Carlisle | 278 M. Mititsch |
| 240 Rev. H. Southgate | 279 <i>Kladderadatsch</i> |
| 241 Dr. Acton | 280 G. Augustus Sala |
| | 281 Sir John Cowell Stepney |

INDEX TO PART II.

AMERICANS, their dislike of the Jews, 133

BEACONSFIELD, Earl of, Count Seebach's "open letter" to, 42. Letter to the Chancellor of the Exchequer on Count Seebach's charges, 50

Blood and Thunder Gazette, its description of the "great battle of Katsch-Tartar Bazardjik," 241

Bright, Mr., on the Eastern Question, 24
Bulgaria, *Truth* on the "king" and "queen" of, 229

Bulgarian atrocities, Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet on the, 84

Daily News, on the Russian and Turkish atrocities, 75, 85. Its correspondents at the seat of war, 88. On the position of the Jews in the East, 131

Daily Telegraph and the alleged Russian atrocities, 71, 72, 74

Debate on the Eastern Question, curious and comic incidents of the, 1. "Catching the Speaker's eye," 2, 3. Speeches of Mr. Courtney, 3; Dr. Kenealy, 4, 7; Mr. Cross, 4; Lord Sandon, 5; Mr. Baxter, 5; Sir Robert Peel, 5; Mr. Bourke, 6; Lord Elcho, 6; Major O'Gorman, 7; and Mr. Gladstone, 8

"Diary of my Ride to Khiva," extracts from *Punch*, 66

Dickens, Charles, his photograph of an M.P., 231

EASTERN Question, the debate on the, 1. Mr. Gladstone's speech in the debate, 8. Mr. Bright on the, 24. Professor Martens on the, 176

England's policy in the East, the Jew's notion of, 113

"England's policy in the East," by Baron Henry de Worms, some re-

marks on, 98. Description of its contents, 99. Its ridiculous errors and exaggerations, 100, 102. Its abuse of the Russians, 103. Inaccuracy of its statistics, 104. Opinions of the press on, 105

FORBES, MR. ARCHIBALD, his dispatch on the crossing of the Danube, 88

"Foreign Policy and the Eastern Question," by Lord R. Montagu, criticism of, 108, 111

Franco-German War, correspondence of Sir J. G. T. Sinclair on the mismanagement of the English aid to the sick and wounded, 192, 202, 210, 220. *The Morning Advertiser* on Sir G. T. Sinclair's correspondence, 221; and reply of Mr. George Warriner to his criticisms and suggestions in the *Times*, 226

Freeman, Mr., extracts from his "Otoman power in Europe," 36

GLADSTONE, Mr., part of his speech in the debate on the Eastern Question, 8. Remarks on Russian deeds in Turkistan, 13

INDIVIDUALS, and authorities quoted in this work, list of, 249

Interview between an Englishman and a Turkish Pasha, sketch by Kinglake, 57

JEWS, the, and the newspaper press, 112, Mr. Worms' computation of their numbers in the Russian Empire, 113. Sketch of their national career, 114, 129. Present number of, in the United Kingdom, 129. Ties which unite the Jews and Turks, 291. Included in the Russian conscription, 129.

- Our foreign loans brought out by, 130. Mock auctions and lock-outs, 130. Charles Dickens's Fagin, 130. Contempt of Spinosa and Heine for Judaism, 131. *Daily News*, on their position in the East, 131. A most undesirable element in the population, 132. The Talmudists and the congregation of British Jews, 133. Dislike of the Americans to, 133. Their banishment from England, 135. The Jewish money-lender, 135. Their disregard of the Mosaic law, 136. Not allowed to sit in Parliament till 1860, 136. Tacitus on their character, 137. Their alleged ill-treatment in Roumania and Servia, 137, 153. Their filthy habits, 142. Their barbarous condition in Roumania, 147. Letter of M. Manuel on their persecution by the Mahometans, 148. M. Matitsch on the Jews in Servia, 149. M. Boeresco on the sale of spirituous liquors by the Jews, 151.
- Jews, sketch of their career from the earliest period to the present time, 114, 129. Incidents in their history from the book of Genesis, 114, 115. The exodus from Egypt, 115. Their disregard of the ceremonial law, 116, 117. Their wars of extermination, 118. Their barbarities to their own countrymen, 118. The Levite and his concubine, 118. The massacre of the Benjamites by the Israelites, 119. Their idolatry, 120. Jephthah's vow, 120. Jael's treachery, 120. David and Uriah, 120. Solomon's proverbs, 120, and doubtful wisdom, 120. Solomon's opinion of the Jews, 121, *note*. Abijah's slaughter of the Israelites, 121. Their conduct to our Saviour, 121. The trial of Jesus a mockery of justice, 123. The crucifixion, 124. Gibbon on the Jews of the middle ages, 125, 127; and their horrible massacres in Cyprus and Cyrene, 127. Their savage ferocity in modern times, 128. Themurder of the Patriarch Gregory, 128. Their defeat of the Greeks at Navacta, 128.
- Jews, their alleged ill-treatment in Roumania and Servia, Government blue-book on, 137. Dispatches of Vice-Consul St. John, 137, 139, 140, 152; of M. Cogalniceano, 142. Letter of the President of the Israelitish community at Bucharest, 145. Address of the Israelite notables of Jassy, 146. Extract from the *Moniteur Roumain*, 150.
- KARAPAPAKS, the, 79
- Kemball, Sir Arnold, his disgraceful and insulting treatment by the Turks, 87
- Kinglake, sketch of an interview between an Englishman and a Turkish Pasha, 57
- MANNERS IN THE EAST, sketch by Thackeray, 62
- Martens, Professor, on the Eastern Question, 176
- Montagu, Lord R., his "Foreign Policy and the Eastern Question," criticism of, 108—111
- Montenegrins, their treatment of Turkish prisoners, 84
- M.P., photograph of an, by Charles Dickens, 231
- Murder, punishment of, in Turkey, 75
- NATIONAL SOCIETY for the Aid of the Wounded in War, the, 181. Letter of Mr. Auberon Herbert to the *Times* on the conduct of the Committee, 181. Unequal distribution of its supplies, 184. Deputation to, 185. Reply of Colonel Loyd-Lindsay to the deputation, 185. The purchase of stores, 187. How to prevent the misappropriation of stores, 188. Willingness of Russia to receive its aid, 191. The author's experience of its working during the Franco-German War, 188—192
- National Society for the Aid of the Wounded in War and the Stafford House Committee, 181
- Northcote, Sir Stafford, letter on Lord Beaconsfield and Count Seebach, 50
- OPINIONS on Turkey by travellers of various nationalities:—M. de Lamartine, 155. Mr. J. L. Stephens, the American traveller, 155. Mr. Eliot Warburton, 156. Mr. Walsh, 156. Mr. Thackeray, 156. Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, 156. M. Guizot, 156. M. de Tocqueville, 157. Mr. Spencer, 157, 159. Mr. Crowe, 157, 160, 163. Mr. Bayle St. John, 158. M. Blanqui, 158. The Earl of Carlisle, 159. The Rev. Horatio Southgate, 160. The author of "Eöthen," 161. Dr. Aiton, 161. Miss Martineau, 162. Mr. Layard, 162, 163. Mr. McCulloch, 164. Colonel Saunders, 164. Vice-Consul Baratti, 164. Consul Neale, 164. Consul Saunders, 164. The author of "Ex-

- periences of an English Sister of Mercy," 165. Dr. Sandwith, 165, 166. Letter to the Rev. Ernest Hawkins, 168—170. Miss Irby, 171. Captain Warren, 171. Captain Burton, 172. Mr. Henry C. Barkley, 173. Mr. Evans, 174. Sir George Campbell, 174
- PHOTOGRAPH of an M.P., by Charles Dickens, 231
- Punch*, Mr. Burnand's "Diary of my Ride to Khiva," 66. On alleged Russian atrocities, 68
- RUSSIAN atrocities, the alleged, a few remarks on, 71. In Turkistan, 13. *Punch* on, 68. Aarifi Pasha's statistics, 71. The *Daily Telegraph's* sensational reports, 71, 74. Points which should be established, 73. Statements of twenty representatives of the Press, 73. The Parliamentary paper on, 74. Extracts from the *Times*, 76—80, 86, 89; the *Daily News*, 75, 85; *Le Temps*, 80; the *Stamboul*, 78; the *Cologne Gazette*, 79; and the *XIXme Siècle*, 90. Mr. Layard and Saffet Pasha inconsistencies in their reports, 81, 82. Extracts from Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet, 84.
- Russian deeds in Turkistan, Mr. Gladstone on, 13
- Russian navy, heroism of the, 77
- Russians, their care of the wounded, 185
- Russo-Turkish war, Turkish soldiers distrusted by their generals, 76. Turkish treachery, 76, 90. Humane treatment of Turkish prisoners by the Russians, 77, 83, 85, 92. Discipline of the Russian troops, 79, 85. Barbarous treatment of Russian prisoners by the Turks, 81, 92. Incapacity and laziness of Turkish generals, 83. Amenities of newspaper correspondents, 88, 89. Letter to the *Daily Telegraph*, by Sir J. G. T. Sinclair, on English intervention, 225
- SEEBACH, COUNT, and the Earl of Beaconsfield, letters to the *Nord*, 42, 54; to the *Daily News*, 47, 50, and 51, to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, 50. Article from the *World*, 55
- Seebach, Count, translation of his "open letter" to Lord Beaconsfield, 42. Translation of his rejoinder to Lord Beaconsfield's reply, 54
- Shipka Pass, abandonment of positions by the Turks, 73. Treachery of the Turks, 76. Turkish atrocities on the Russian wounded, 89
- Sick and Wounded Russian and Montenegrin Soldiers' Relief Fund, 188
- Sinclair, Sir J. G. Tollemache, Bart., M.P., letters to the *Daily News* on Count Seebach's charges against Lord Beaconsfield, 47, 51. His correspondence on the working of the National Society in Aid of the Wounded during the Franco-German war, in the *Times*, 191, 210, 220; in the *Morning Advertiser*, 202; in the *Daily Telegraph*, 224. On English intervention in the Russo-Turkish war, 224. Article in the *Morning Advertiser* on his letters during the Franco-German war, 221. Opinions of the *Cologne Gazette* on his correspondence, 210. Reply of Mr. George Warriner, 226
- Stafford House Fund, the committee open to censure for confining their operations to the Turks, 184. *Truth* on Lady Strangford and the, 229
- Stamboul*, suspension of the, for exposing a fabricated report of alleged Russian cruelties, 78
- THACKERAY, sketch of manners in the East, 62
- "The Buckinghamshire Buffoon" (Lord Beaconsfield), political squib from the *Pall Mall Gazette*, 178
- "The great battle of Katsch-Tartar Bazardjik," description of, in the *Blood and Thunder Gazette*, 241
- "The Jews the implacable foes of the Christians," 112
- Times*, the, on Russian and Turkish atrocities, 76, 77, 78, 86, 90, 92. Interception and alteration of its correspondent's telegrams, 93, 95.
- Turcos, cruelty of, in the Franco-German war, 72
- Turkish army, recruiting for the, how managed, 97
- Turkish atrocities, description of, by the *Times*, 76, 92; by General Tchernayeff, 81; by the *Cologne Gazette*, 97
- Turkistan, Mr. Gladstone on Russian deeds in, 13
- Turks, their treatment of the wounded, 185
- "VESTA," the, her combat with an iron-clad, 78
- WALLACE's "Russia," extract from, 31. *World*, the, on Count Seebach's charges against Lord Beaconsfield, 55.
- WORMS, Baron Henry de, some remarks on his book, "England's Policy in the East," 93.

the first of the year 1771, the British government, in consequence of the late war, had been obliged to raise a loan of £1,000,000, which was to be repaid by a new tax on the consumption of spirits. This tax was to be levied on the importation of foreign spirits, and on the retail sale of domestic spirits. The tax on foreign spirits was to be 10s. per gallon, and the tax on domestic spirits was to be 5s. per gallon. The total amount of the tax was to be £1,000,000 per annum. The government had also been obliged to raise a loan of £1,000,000, which was to be repaid by a new tax on the consumption of spirits. This tax was to be levied on the importation of foreign spirits, and on the retail sale of domestic spirits. The tax on foreign spirits was to be 10s. per gallon, and the tax on domestic spirits was to be 5s. per gallon. The total amount of the tax was to be £1,000,000 per annum.

OPINIONS ON SIR TOLLEMACHE SINCLAIR'S PUBLICATIONS.

FROM THE "DAILY REVIEW."

THE member for Caithness has been to the war, looking at it from a political point of view, seeing matters for himself, and has come home with a bundle of opinions about it so extremely emphatic that it is highly interesting to examine them in detail. There is a quality about Sir J. T. Sinclair's letter which is not to be found everywhere among either official or non-official documents about the war, the quality of rude, hard-hitting common sense. Sir John is a violent partisan, and yet he makes a terribly good case for his friends the Germans. He rather out-Bismarcks Bismarck in one or two points. A "neutral partisan," to use an Irishism, is generally more strong in his statement of affairs than either of the belligerent parties. Count Bismarck wishes to leave open some loophole for peace; Sir John Sinclair states the German case so very emphatically and so very inexorably that we doubt whether any peace could be got, short of actual ruin to France, were he Prime Minister of Germany.

Gambetta means well, but he is deceiving both himself and the people at present. Sir John Sinclair's letter, though in places exaggerated, is far nearer the truth than Gambetta's proclamations; yet if this letter was translated into French, the French would probably vote it to be "the letter of an English citizen in a state of distraction." They would, had they the power, probably hang Sir John Sinclair first, and examine his letter afterwards. For our part, we were rather glad that this very plain-spoken gentleman got through the debatable ground on the border in safety to Luxembourg. He was in great danger; and had there been a precedent for shooting a member of Parliament of an allied nation, Sir John Sinclair would have been the man. Scarcely a man has a better right to speak than

he, and we only regret that such a very able letter should show in places a little more bias than we care to see from a man in his position.

The French have made a hideous mistake, a mistake which, were the Prussians expelled from France in three months from now, could not be put right in the lifetime of the present generation. We think that Sir John Sinclair, knowing as he does that the letter he has written will be sooner or later sent to each of the French journals, has been too hard on the French. It may be said that he can prove his accusation against them. We do not doubt that, but there is a time for mercy as there is a time for judgment.

It seems to us that Sir John Sinclair's friends should very much moderate their terms if they mean to have a peace without exhausting and paralyzing themselves as much as they do their enemies. A fortnight will either add to German demands, or will reduce them by one-half. In the meantime we can most heartily thank Sir John Sinclair for his deeply interesting though one-sided letter.

TRANSLATED FROM "KREUZ ZEITUNG."

THE opinion of the English newspapers of the conduct of the war is shown by the appearance in the *Times* of an article by Sir Tollemache Sinclair, who, after a considerable stay with the German army, has just returned to England. Although we cannot give the article (which, from the originality of its ideas, and the evident effort to be impartial, may be interesting in Germany), we shall extract some of the most important passages, as well as some others, which demand more than a word of observation. After Sir Tollemache Sinclair has strikingly portrayed the moderation shown by the Germans, as contrasted with the insolence of the French with regard to the conditions of peace, as hitherto debated, he goes on to say that after the taking of Paris public opinion in Germany will make higher demands than before of the conquered.

With praiseworthy (decision) Sir Tollemache Sinclair turns, in the following paragraph, upon the English, showing their leaning towards France and against Germany. He cannot conceal his astonishment that there are persons who do not understand that in France all parties eagerly desired war with England. The sum of his conclusion on this point he puts in the significant sentence—"That every killed or wounded German has saved an Englishman from a similar fate, and that in this war Germany fights as much for England as for herself."

As he goes on with great sharpness to criticize the conduct of the war by the French (those "Greeks of the West"), Sir Tollemache Sinclair's friendly feeling towards Germany makes itself constantly apparent.

We add, finally, as most significant, the following very sensible proposals:—The writer wishes that, to encourage France in the cession of the forfeited German territory, England should, on her part, set her a good example, by giving up, in the same way as she freely resigned the Ionian Islands to Greece—the Island of Heligoland—useless to her, and a gift which would be gladly accepted by Germany, and thus efface all dissatisfaction at England's attitude towards her. Now, we are sure that our Englishman deceives himself as little here as in his opinion of our army, and it is only to be desired that on the other side of the Channel there were more men like him.

FROM THE "OST PREUSSISCHE ZEITUNG."

AMONG these writers of communicated letters, one of the most zealous champions for Germany—her rights and her claims—is the member of Parliament, Sir Tollemache Sinclair. He is acquainted with Germany—travelled through it before the war—and since it commenced visited the fields of battle and ambulances after the battle of Sedan, and upon these he has written valuable, because unexaggerated, reports. His repeated and detailed letters to the *Times*, *Morning Advertiser*, and other newspapers, have appeared on the side of Germany, against her English opponents and their charges, and has especially maintained her right to the re-acquisition of Alsace and German-Lorraine. In one of his most recent letters he acutely answers the objections made to the annexation of a pretendedly unwilling people, by referring to the proceedings of nearly every other Power.

FROM THE "KÖLNISCHE ZEITUNG."

AN English M.P., Sir Tollemache Sinclair, of Thurso Castle, who has several times visited the seat of war, has sent two comprehensive articles to the *Times*, which combine the most praiseworthy impartiality with the justest apprehension of the position of affairs, and prove in the most gratifying way that the thoughtful and well-informed Englishman considers the cause of Germany to be the right one throughout.

Sir Tollemache Sinclair depicts in a singularly clear and

thoroughly truthful manner the disgraceful and false bearing of the French and the manly and upright behaviour of the Germans, on whose side he agrees throughout, so that it is easy to see that he visited the seat of war as an attentive observer.

We have entered somewhat fully on this article, because it must make a very good impression in England, when experienced men—members of Parliament—declare themselves so openly on the side of Germany. Such articles do honour to the English nation, and enable us to hope that the English Government itself will take the right course.

THIERS, and still more the military writers, will tell you how many thousands the Emperor had in hospital at the end of every campaign, and how much his garrisons were weakened even in time of peace. In the battles to be wounded at all severely was to die. The surgeons were not over skilful; they were even less remarkable for humanity. Officers of rank were well attended to, but the spirit of benevolence was not yet sufficiently active for the soldier to be cared for as a man and a brother—as something more than a pawn on the chessboard of war. Among the civil population there was little or no interest in the work of the hospital. The people were gratified by victory; they had a vague pity for their soldiers under disaster; but it needs education and moral refinement to make people feel acutely even the sufferings they witness. Erckmann-Chatrian tells us how little pity the peasants used to show for the wounded soldiers, their own countrymen. The same phenomenon is noticed in the present war. Sir Tollemache Sinclair described yesterday the indifference with which the French bystanders, and even their unwounded comrades, witnessed the sufferings of the wounded, and it would seem that the imagination and sentiment which education gives are necessary for a quick sympathy with suffering. In the old wars the soldier, looked upon by Prince, by General, and by society as a kind of public gladiator, who must be killed or die sooner or later, went to his fate with recklessness, and whole levies of conscripts disappeared, to be succeeded by others as a matter of course.—*Times*.

TRANSLATED FROM "LONDONER ZEITUNG."

SIR J. G. TOLLEMACHE SINCLAIR, one of the best informed persons on Continental matters in this country, writes to the *Times* as follows:—"Had I gone to the theatre of war as an ardent

admirer of France, I must have returned an enthusiastic partizan of Germany, after having had an opportunity of comparing the noble bearing of this brave nation with the despicable deeds of the French." It is very agreeable to find in this country, where so few persons understand Continental politics, some highly-cultivated individuals who with great insight defend the rights of Germany.

FROM PRINCE BISMARCK.

Versailles, 1st July, 1871.

SIR,—Your esteemed letter, which I have read with lively interest, unfortunately came to hand at a moment when the state of my health forbade me any but indispensable labour, so that for a period of six weeks I was obliged to abstain from the most urgent business.

ON WORK ON FRANCO-GERMAN WAR.

Now that I have been able to read your publication, I have learnt with lively satisfaction that you, in England, are spreading the ideas which the German people consider to be just and right. If I have not earlier thanked you for this, I beg you to believe that the delay has only arisen from circumstances which were beyond my control.

Accept, sir, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Signed,

V. BISMARCK.

ON WORK ON THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE London correspondent of the *Birmingham Weekly Post* (Mr. George Holyoake) says:—"Good books upon the House of Commons are rare. One of the Palgraves a short time ago published a clever lecture, in its way, upon the 'History and Manners of Parliament,' but Sir Tollemache Sinclair has very much surpassed this latter production in a very clever 'Glance at the House of Commons,' which he took in a lecture probably delivered to his constituents in Caithness. There is an air of clever and amusing candour about it—there is a calculating recklessness in the style which is quite refreshing. The speaker appears to dash off his ideas, but when the phrases have entertained the reader there is found to be good sound judgment in them. He describes the architecture of the House, the outside and the in, the entrances and lobbies, the division lobbies, the order of business, the incidents and oratory of the House, and one section is devoted to Sir Tollemache's own speeches—and it is very rarely that one meets with a passage of more original and creditable egotism. Sir Tollemache has the rare gift which an illustrious countryman of his so much desired, that of seeing himself as others see him; but he is worth seeing and hearing for his own sake, and the account he gives of himself is as amusing as it is modest. He thinks it likely his lecture may not be read; but if the nature and contents of it were known, I venture to say that a very large edition would be bought of a small pamphlet which gives more information of the manners, customs, and oratory of the House of Commons than anybody else has given within the same compass. The lecturer had an ancestor, Sir George Sinclair, of Clyth, who represented Caithness in several Parliaments. Sir Tollemache's father was himself successful in Parliament.

He often told his son that, if he had to begin life again, no consideration would induce him to represent a constituency. It is fortunate his son has not grown up of the same opinion, or the public would never have had the charming little glance at the House to which I have referred."

ON PUBLICATIONS ON THE EASTERN QUESTION.

FROM THE "NORD" NEWSPAPER.

"THE two remarkable letters of Sir Tollemache Sinclair, member of the English Parliament—letters which appeared at first in the *Scotsman*, and which we reproduced last week—have caused in Russia an impression so much the more lively since one is so little accustomed to meet in the English press opinions so impartial on the politics of Russia in the East. 'How can one explain to oneself,' inquires the *Moscow Gazette*, on this occasion, 'that a person who is known should choose a provincial newspaper in which to publish his opinions? Must one really admit that even a member of Parliament cannot obtain insertion in an influential journal of anything favourable to Russia? That is, however, the case. We know from an unimpeachable source (adds the *Moscow Gazette*) that the London journals persistently refuse the publication of communications the tenor of which diverges from the ideas and the views which dominate in Governmental spheres. There is more than this. The speeches pronounced in Parliament, if they are in sympathy with Russia and with the Eastern Christians, find no place in the newspapers. They are abridged to such an extent as to lose all their vigour, and often even their meaning.'"

"Perhaps our colleague of Moscow goes a little too far when he reproaches the London journal for not accepting communications at variance with the ideas and the views which predominate in Ministerial regions. The *Times* and the *Daily News* have sometimes published letters respecting which they must have been more annoyed than satisfied in Governmental circles. But it is consequently only the more surprising that these journals have shut their columns to the two letters of Sir J. Tollemache Sinclair, which, by the interesting historical views which they furnish, and the ability with which all the various elements of the Eastern problem are therein found condensed, largely merited being welcomed there, even leaving out of account the position occupied by their author, and the generous hospitality accorded by the *Times* to preceding communications due to the same pen. It is that this honourable member of Parliament has stretched out a sacrilegious hand against a prejudice which the *Times* and its brethren of London will not tolerate doubtless to be touched; he has shown by historical facts that the pretended ardent desire of Russia to establish itself at Constantinople is a pure fable; he has recalled the fact that the Russians occupied Constantinople in 1833, and that it only depended on them to remain there. Before such palpable material proof, how could any one sustain the theory which is in such honour in the English press, and in almost the whole Continental press? It is much easier not to publish these facts, in order to be able to continue to descant at your ease on phantasms which they destroy. This is evidently what the *Times* has thought, and it is therefore, doubtless, why it refused to publish the letters of Sir T. Sinclair."

* Such as that of Colonel Mure, who had promised the Christians to represent their grievances, and could not get the House to listen or the newspapers to report him.

OPINIONS ON SIR TOLLEMACHE SINCLAIR'S PUBLICATIONS.

FROM THE "NORD DEUTSCHE ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG," OF BERLIN,
August 28, 1877.

Sir T. SINCLAIR is known since 1870 to the German press through his unceasing efforts during the war to influence his countrymen in favour of the German cause. By speech and writing Sir T. Sinclair stood up for the justice of the Germans in warding off the French attacks, and for the fairness of the German offers of peace. He has not only displayed a very stirring activity on the subject of the care of the wounded, but found leisure to bring in numerous articles from the leading English and foreign papers in favour of Germany against the attacks and falsehoods of that portion of the press who were hostile to us. His activity was recognized by letters of thanks from Prince Bismarck, from Versailles, and in the following year he received a letter from Field-Marshal Count Moltke. Sir T. Sinclair is now occupied on a book, and in a few days we shall hear his views in favour of a reconstruction of the Greek Empire. Sir T. Sinclair here tells his countrymen something hardly agreeable to them. Had they only to choose between a Russian and a Greek Mediterranean fleet, they would choose the latter as the lesser evil; but in thereby quieting this Power they would certainly displease every other maritime Power which comes near the English on the way between Gibraltar and Suez. And with the growth of Greece there would be also a growth of its naval power, its maritime importance, and also an increase of Greek commerce and Greek influence on the east coast of the Mediterranean. We do not know if it would be possible for the English to satisfy themselves with these ideas.

When Sir J. G. T. Sinclair began, he not only had a claim to the consideration of the Germans, who remember with pleasure their debt of gratitude to him, without at the same time endorsing in their full extent his political opinions in regard to Greece, but he can also recall, in opposition to the opinions of his countrymen, the Iron Duke, the Duke of Wellington, who fifty years ago had another Greece in view than that which had too nobly struggled again to be subdued, but which was finally deemed too small to form a powerful active State with a mission as bearer of civilization into the East.

So far, no one could treat the subject with more warmth and eloquence than Sir T. Sinclair. The many political and unpolitical heads in Europe, whom the present war alarms, because they fear the very improbable aggrandisement of Russia, will find in the conclusions of the Scotch baronet the most fitting way for their own tranquillity, and therefore they will probably be strongly supported.

OPINIONS OF EMINENT MEN ON RUSSIA, TURKEY, AND ENGLAND.

"I AM altogether a Russ."—*Lord Chatham*, 1773.

"I thought it would enlighten the world to drive those brutes, the Turks, out of Europe."—*Napoleon I.*

"It would be absurd to think of bolstering up the Turkish power in Europe. It is gone, in fact. We must reconstruct the Greek Empire. There is no doubt it would have been better for the world if the Treaty of Adrianople had not been signed, if the Russians had entered Constantinople, and if the Turkish Empire had been dissolved."—*The Duke of Wellington*, in 1829.

"The protection of the Christians of Turkey by Russia was, no doubt, prescribed by duty, and sanctioned by treaty."—*Lord John Russell's Dispatch to Sir Hamilton Seymour*, 1853.

"The newspaper outcry against Russia is no more respectable to me than the howlings of Bedlam, proceeding as it does from the deepest ignorance, egoism, and paltry national jealousy."—*Carlyle*.

"I believe the people of Russia to be as capable of noble sentiments as any people in Europe."—*Gladstone*.

"It was but bare justice to Russia to say that her dealings with the Ottoman Power had been characterised by as great forbearance as the conduct of that power (Turkey) by continued insolence and incorrigible obstinacy."—*Sir J. Mackintosh*.

"Russia, too, was our ancient ally. . . . In 1770 our allies, the Russians, sent a great fleet into the Mediterranean for the purpose of overpowering the Turks. What was the policy of this country? To assist the Russian navy. In 1798 Russia is called in the treaty our old and natural ally."—*Lord Holland*.

"I heartily wish her (Russia) success. In that war (1828-9), my opinion is that the Turks were the aggressors. . . . 1833. If we have quietly beheld the temporary occupation of the Turkish capital by the forces of Russia, it is because we have full confidence in the honour and good faith of Russia."—*Lord Palmerston*.

"Was it in the nature of man that the Russians should remain calm spectators of the destruction, he had almost

OPINIONS OF EMINENT MEN—*Continued.*

said the annihilation, of the Greeks? I feel rather surprised at their long forbearance.”—*Lord Carnarvon*, 1827.

“His Imperial Majesty (the Czar) at once divested himself of the character of a belligerent in the Mediterranean, and no one would deny that the sincerity and generosity the Emperor of Russia had displayed in doing this were entitled to the highest praise.”—*Lord Aberdeen*, July 16, 1828.

“The policy of depriving England of India could hardly have been initiated by Peter the Great, because he died in 1725, and the Empire of British India was not established till 1757.”—*Lord Salisbury*.

“Russia, which had for a long period, out of deference to their feelings, foregone the fair object of all her ambition—which, with an attention to the general policy of Europe and a magnanimity unparalleled, had long resisted the strongest temptations, had attended only to the representations of this country and her allies, and had waited faithfully to the last moment before she had taken any open measures to oppose the insults of Turkey—had resisted the disposition of her people to go to war. Russia had now engaged in war, which upon all principles of policy and public law she had a right to wage, nay, was called on by her duty to wage . . .”—*Lord Holland*, 1828.

“I have great doubts that any intention to partition that empire (Turkey) at all entered into the policy of the Russian Government. Besides, I very much doubt also whether the Russian nation, properly so called, would be prepared to see that transference of power, of residence, and of authority to the southern provinces which would be the necessary consequence of the conquest by Russia of Constantinople.”—*Lord Palmerston*, 1833.

“They (the Russians) have adopted a very defective system of conduct towards the people of these mountains (the Circassians); they employ gentleness and humanity—means which fail, because they regard them as marks of weakness and fear.”—*Klaproth*.

“If we must have war sooner or later, I would rather have it later than sooner.”—*Canning*.

“Russia does not aim at great conquests . . . As long as we stand upon this place, you will never succeed in making a rent in our friendship for Russia—a friendship which has lasted for centuries, and is based upon history.”—*Prince Bismarck*, 1876.

OPINIONS ON SIR TOLLEMACHE SINCLAIR'S PUBLICATIONS.

FROM PRINCE BISMARCK.

"Now that I have been able to read your publication, I have learnt with lively satisfaction that you, in England, are spreading the ideas which the German people consider to be just and right."—*On Work on Franco-German War.*

ON WORK ON HOUSE OF COMMONS.

"There is an air of clever and amusing candour about it—there is a calculating recklessness in the style which is quite refreshing. The speaker appears to dash off his ideas, but when the phrases have entertained the reader there is found to be good sound judgment in them. He describes the architecture of the House, the outside and the in, the entrances and lobbies, the division lobbies, the order of business, the incidents and oratory of the House, and one section is devoted to Sir Tollemache's own speeches—and it is very rarely that one meets with a passage of more original and creditable egotism. Sir Tollemache has the rare gift which an illustrious countryman of his so much desired, that of seeing himself as others see him; but he is worth seeing and hearing for his own sake, and the account he gives of himself is as amusing as it is modest."—*G. J. Holyoake.*

ON PUBLICATIONS ON THE EASTERN QUESTION.

"The two remarkable letters of Sir Tollemache Sinclair, member of the English Parliament—letters which appeared at first in the *Scotsman*, and which we reproduced last week—have caused in Russia an impression so much the more lively since one is so little accustomed to meet in the English Press opinions so impartial on the politics of Russia in the East."—*Nord of Brussels.*

"When Sir J. G. T. Sinclair began he . . . had a claim to the consideration of the Germans, who remember with pleasure their debt of gratitude to him, without at the same time endorsing in their full extent his political opinions in regard to Greece. . . . So far no one could treat the subject with more warmth and eloquence than Sir Tollemache Sinclair."—*From the Nord Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung of Berlin, August 28th, 1877.*

Also, by the same Author, price Sixpence,

THE BATTLE OF KATSH-TARTAR BAZARDJIK.