

# BULGARIAN HORRORS!

AND

## MR. GLADSTONE'S EASTERN POLICY.

BY

S. G. B. ST. CLAIR.

*SECOND EDITION.*

LONDON :

BLANCHARD & SONS,  
62, MILLBANK STREET, WESTMINSTER.

---

1876.

---

PRICE SIXPENCE.



# BULGARIAN HORRORS

AND

## MR. GLADSTONE'S EASTERN POLICY.

---

### I.

At the precise moment, when the British nation requires all the power of its mental faculties—when the greatest caution and coolness is needed to face terribly decisive events—there bursts forth a sensational cry against an allied power, and the public mind is confused and worked up almost to frenzy, and the people who profit by this demented condition, call it a burst of indignation, instead of qualifying it—national folly!

Then, when people have lost their reckoning, and the ship of the State is tossed by the waves of popular passions, up jumps a pilot and says: "Give me the helm and I will save"—what? "England" is it? No! I will save Russian finance and Bulgarian banditti!

He—a man who was once England's Premier—dares tell us that "There are State affairs in which human sympathy refuses to be confined by the rules, mainly limited and conventional, of International Law," which, however, is the law of England.\*

He further considers that our Ministry's greatest crime was, that because of England's honourable action, the "Russian funds" fell very heavily!"

When a man desires to become a pilot, that is to say, the guide of a ship at sea, he must, first of all, pass in pilotage. No one would trust his ship and the lives on board to an amateur sailor

---

(\*) *Vide* Appendix C.

who describes the Goodwin Sands as the safest anchorage in the Channel, and terms "Beachy Head" the best harbour in Great Britain: and what can be said of the nation's would-be pilot, who instead of soothing the public mind, blows it into a storm against, not merely, the only Ministry which acted with some sense of honour and dignity, but against England itself! "We must not be "moved by selfish motives," says Mr. Gladstone; he dares not say national motive. All that we must do is to save the Bulgarians. To save the Bulgarians we must throw aside the "interests" of England, and sacrifice ourselves and become the tools of Russia. Some people do not always sacrifice personal interests to public duty, or if they did, they would not dare speak so as to hurt the State.

If Mr. Gladstone's general principles of British policy, which might be thus described:—"Our neighbour has flogged his naughty "child, we must therefore and consequently jump out of the window," did not convince the world of the mental condition of the would-be Premier of England, a study of his pamphlet will show you what the author is.

From beginning to end, the pamphlet of Mr. Gladstone appears to be a tissue of wild assertions, which prove his utter ignorance, not only of Eastern matters, but of history, public law, and even the very rudiments of statesmanship; its only force is derived from grossly rude and violent language, and from appeals humbly flattering to the passion of the day.

But let Mr. Gladstone speak himself. Here we have his sketch of Turks and Turkey. Gladstonian history indeed!

"Let me endeavour very briefly to sketch, in the rudest outline, "what the Turkish race was and what it is. It is not a question "of Mahometanism simply, but of Mahometanism compounded with "the peculiar character of a race. They are not the mild Mahometans of India, nor the chivalrous Saladins\* of Syria, nor the "cultured Moors of Spain. They were, upon the whole, from the "black day when they first entered Europe, the one great anti-human specimen of humanity. Wherever they went, a broad "line of blood marked the track behind them; and, as far as their "dominion reached, civilisation disappeared from view. They represented everywhere government by force, as opposed to government by law. For the guide of this life they had a relentless "fatalism: for its reward hereafter, a sensual paradise." He further says, "The Koran was not of Turkish, but of Arab origin."

---

\* We have heard of Saldjuicide Turks, but never of Saladin Turks.

“ They were indeed a tremendous incarnation of military power. This advancing curse menaced the whole of Europe. It was only stayed, and that not in one generation, but in many, by the heroism of the European population of those very countries, part of which form at this moment the scene of war, and the anxious subject of diplomatic action. In the olden time, all Western Christendom sympathised with the resistance to the common enemy; and even during the hot and fierce struggles of the Reformation, there were prayers, if I mistake not, offered up in the English churches for the success of the Emperor, the head of the Roman Catholic power and influence, in his struggles with the Turk.”

The man who forgets the state of the Byzantine Empire—who confuses two distinct and opposed races—Turks and Tartars, Caucasians and Turanians—who forgets that Turkey stopped the Mongul wave of conquest led by Timour—who ignores the power of Turkish rule—which, being based upon impartial justice to all its subjects, so ably described by Mr. Butler Johnstone in his pamphlet on Turkey, goes further, and would lead us to believe that prayers offered up in the “English churches” did more to cripple Turkish power than the clear swords of the followers of King John Sobieski, the descendants of whom now groan under real oppression and suffer far more from brutal and bestial persecution, to use Mr. Gladstone’s vocabulary, at the hand of a merciful, civilised and Christian power called Russia, than even the Bulgarians did in a moment when passions were on fire in the district of Philipopoli and Bazardjyk. (\*).

Further, Mr. Gladstone writes,—

“ But although the Turk represented force as opposed to the law, yet not even a government of force can be maintained without the aid of an intellectual element, such as he did not possess. Hence there grew up, what has been rare in the history of the world, a kind of tolerance in the midst of cruelty, tyranny and rapine. Much of Christian life was contemptuously let alone; much of the subordinate functions of government was allowed to devolve upon the bishops; and a race of Greeks was attracted to Constantinople, which has all along made up, in some degree, the deficiencies of Turkish Islam in the element of mind.”

Mr. Gladstone, who has never been in Turkey, here pretends to know all about Turks of the present, past and future. Could he be sent to a Turkish school and there learn the A. B. C. of Turkish

---

\* *Vide* Appendix A.



statesmanship and politeness, which is very simple and elementary, because it teaches a man to respect himself and not to speak on matters of which he is grossly ignorant—"bestially ignorant" would say the great man of the day.

We advise Mr. Gladstone to read Mr. Butler Johnstone's pamphlet, which is one of the cleverest of writings as far as Turkey is historically and governmentally concerned; it has been to me a real wonder that a European could write so truly and graphically.

We can only add that these very Greek clergy, so honest, so good, so mild, so truly clever, made such a shameful and foul use of the church autonomy which Turkish rule vested in them\*—that Mr. Gladstone's 'protégés' the Bulgars, had to revolt against this Christian rule of Christians, and would to-day even prefer to become Mahomedans than to recognise the spiritual supremacy of the Phanar. Let us add further, that every abuse, of which the blame is laid to the Turkish Government, has for aider, abettor, or inventor, a Christian!

## II.

So much for Mr. Gladstone's knowledge of history. Now let us see his knowledge of facts, of the condition of Christians in Turkey, and of that criminal misgovernment which he stigmatizes in the harshest of language. In the appendix we can see how the Christian is treated, and treats himself to wine, and after that we will see how he treats himself to the joys of insurrection.

Mr. Gladstone has used very high words. I use figures and facts. Let him attempt to disprove them. Words are wind, but facts are facts. Ignorance can drape itself in the mantle of humanity, but cannot refute what is true. Here is what I certify to be true. If Mr. Gladstone can prove it to be untrue, I may be led to believe in his knowledge.

1st. That the Christian Rayah's taxes are only one one-fifth those of the Mussulman.

2nd. That as far as his religious and municipal government is concerned, he enjoys the fullest autonomy.

3rd. That that autonomy goes so far that most Christian monasteries are places of refuge, not under Turkish, but under the Phanars' jurisdiction, so much so, that not only cannot the police enter

---

\* The cause of the Bulgarian movement was, first of all, rebellion against the Phanar clergy. See, on this subject, "A Residence in Bulgaria."—*John Murray*, 1866.—Eastern Christians.

them, but their very lands are exempted from taxation, whilst no Turkish Convent or Teké is thus exempted—that in their schools, Rayahs prohibit the use of the Turkish language, and that no Turk meddles with either school, church, or even Rayah quarters, which all are governed by the Priest and Tchorbadjy.

4th. That this autonomy was not granted to Rayahs through the intervention of foreign pressure, but by the Sultan who conquered the land, and who granted such municipal autonomy because it was in accordance with the Ottoman Constitution and the Coran.

5th. That the Rayah is about the richest of peasants in Europe.

6th. That if he is oppressed it is principally by his own people, or else by the absurd reforms which have confused Government in Turkey, and have changed its nature in order to please Europe.\*

7th. That if he is not still better off it is the fault of his laziness and drunken habits—a Rayah consuming two gallons of wine on an average daily, and only working 183 days per annum at the most.

8th. That if he is not dominant in Turkey, it is only because of his moral and intellectual inferiority.†

Does Mr. Gladstone ignore this?

Now let us examine the would-be Premier in another point, a rather grave one, that of veracity. He writes:—

“I express then my gratitude to Mr. Schuyler, and to the Government which sent him into the field. It is too late, as I have said, to hope to convince Europe by any report of ours. We may ourselves be sceptical as to Russian reports. Every European State is more or less open to the imputation of bias. But America has neither alliances with Turkey, nor grudges against her, nor purposes to gain by her destruction. She enters into this matter simply on the ground of its broad human character and moment; she has no ‘American interests’ to tempt her from her integrity, and to vitiate her aims.”

We read:—

“Nous avons publié, à l'exemple d'autres journaux, le rapport que M. Schuyler, consul-général des Etats-Unis à Constantinople, a fait sur les ‘atrocités en Bulgarie.’ On peut se demander à quel titre un diplomate figure comme redresseur des torts du gouvernement auprès duquel il est accrédité. Les journaux slaves prétendent que M. Schuyler a été chargé ‘d’une mission’ à ce

\* Surely Mr. Gladstone knows that the *Hattı Humayoun* was a Russo-French Trick, and so was the second reform, named *Vilayet System*, both of which were meant to hurt Turkey and its Christian subjects.

† *Vide Appendix B.*

“sujet : il n'en est absolument rien. Voici quelques renseignements très sûrs qui éclairent ‘la mission’ de ce fonctionnaire américain.

“Avant sa nomination à Constantinople, M. Schuyler remplissait les fonctions de premier secrétaire de légation à Saint-Petersbourg. Très-amateur de voyages, il fit une excursion dans le Turkestan, et, de retour, il rédigea un rapport dans lequel il accusa avec la dernière violence l'administration russe et en particulier le gouverneur général Kauffmann, absolument comme il accuse aujourd'hui le gouvernement turc et le commissaire impérial Edib.

“Il communiqua ce rapport au général Tchernaïef, ennemi du général Kauffmann, son ancien chef. M. Tchernaïef ne trouva rien de mieux que de traduire le rapport de M. Schuyler et de le publier dans son journal *Russki Mir*. De là l'intimité entre M. Schuyler et M. Tchernaïef.”

Now, to confuse General Tchernayeff's friend with the American delegate to inquire into atrocities committed in Bulgaria, is to bewilder the public mind. The argument of Mr. Gladstone denotes either his thorough ignorance of facts, which is unpardonable in one who would enlighten the public mind, or else the wilful suggestion of the fact that Mr. Schuyler went to Bulgaria, as American delegate, and not as General Tchernayeff's friend. In both cases Mr. Gladstone has acted, not only in a manner unpardonable in a statesman, but even intolerable in a private British subject. Now comes a worse and more grievous elimination of words and facts.

“Then, by way of Appendix, comes *one original* document in proof, which contains, in the form of a sort of Catechism, the plans and instructions of the great Bulgarian conspiracy. They are signed by twelve names of individuals, without profession or employment specified ; who may, for all we know, have been the most insignificant men in the country. The Report, however, states that the Insurgents had instructions to massacre the Mussulman population. The sole document appended in proof of its charges contains, together with very severe provisions against such as should resist, the following passage :

“ ‘ Question 13. What course is to be pursued with regard to those Turks who submit?

“ ‘ Answer. They should be put in charge of our agents, who will convey them to the headquarters of the insurrection. From thence, they will be sent, *with their families* and with the aged, to the places occupied for refuge by our own families. *They are to live there as our brethren.* It is part of our duty to take care for their happiness, their life, and their religion : on the same ground as for the life and the honour of our own people.’ ”



Now the answer to this question I have read in the original, and there it distinctly says that the Turks who submit are to be separated from their families, and to be kept as hostages.

Turkish documents and evidence are not trusted by Mr. Gladstone. The one "*original document*" is one of Bulgarian origin. Now why even denaturalise this? since the answer to Question 13 is not as Mr. Gladstone prints it, and hostages are not guests.

Further, we have—

"Mr. Schuyler, officially, and with an American directness, declares that Edib's report contains statements on a particular point, 'and on every other, which are utterly unfounded in fact,' and that it practically is 'a tissue of falsehoods.'"

All those who are clear-minded must know now who Mr. Schuyler is, and were Mr. Gladstone more inquiring he would know who Edib Effendi is, or at least think twice before he put the evidence of an adventurer above that of a Commissioner of a power with which Her Most Gracious Majesty is not only at peace but in alliance. Mr. Gladstone may think that because "King Mob" listens patiently to his strong English, Her Majesty is no longer Queen of Great Britain and Ireland, and of course never can be Empress of India. But, unfortunately, Lord Beaconsfield, who has to consult Her Majesty's pleasure before asking working men, fresh from the pot-house, what their Royal folly may dictate, cannot and must not as a loyal servant of her Crown consider the unofficial evidence of a friend of General Tchernayeff and correspondent to the Russki Mir, or that of a daily penny paper, more material than that of the Commissioner of his Majesty the Sultan. No! not until folly has replaced sound logic, and the howl of a mob has stifled dignity and courtesy—nay honour—out of the relations between courts and nations!

### III.

Having seen what Mr. Gladstone's historical and actual knowledge of Turkey is like, let us now see what his foreign mob-driven policy might lead to. King Mob must thank him and his party for past feats of acrobatic policy which have cost the British nation dearly, and not King Mob, because King Mob is not the British nation, and having no money cannot pay the millions which the penny-wise and pound-foolish policy of a stingy and ignorant party cost to England in the shape of the Alabama claims.

To ruin capital, that "horrid capital," which oppresses the labouring classes by forcing them to earn their daily bread by working in factories which cost millions to keep up; that capital which brings raw material and even bread to England, which does not admit of a man gaining a position by merely spouting to ignorant assemblies—to ruin capital is a generous, civilised, and humanitarian act! Yes; charge it with Alabama claims; tear the Turkish coupon from the widow, and ask her besides to pay a subscription towards the Bulgarian fund; tear away India, which makes the hard-working English people live—is a meritorious and humanitarian act, in King Mob's opinion! and our Great Man courts it!

According to Mr. Gladstone, there is no infallible Pope, but there is an infallible Self; and another fatally infallible and ignorant power—that of King Mob.

Now these two powers have in their great wisdom declared—

1st. That Lord Beaconsfield is a traitor to Mr. Gladstone. 2nd. That Mr. Gladstone is the prophet of King Mob! Now for their programme:—

Mr. Gladstone would impeach Lord Beaconsfield for high treason, because of his conspiracy against the Liberal party, and the humanitarian principles of the ex-Premier.

A few, a very few examples of truly Whig—that is to say, fidgetty and chancy—policy, will not be uninteresting to record.

The Alabama case is very instructive indeed. Humanitarianism worked out the cry against slavery. This cry had an echo in the United States. This cry becomes the pretext of the war between the Slave and Free States of America. But, just as the North begins to act on the principles so dear to the Liberal heart, their sympathies fly to the south—to the rebels. England is made to violate international law in reclaiming Messrs. Slidell and Mason, and in permitting the departure of privateers from British ports.

These very Liberals who signed the Declaration of Paris, which has crippled the naval power of England, on the plea that the use of privateers is barbarous, burst into extacies of sympathy at the gallant deeds of a privateer belonging to rebels who had not the benefit of belligerent rights, and therefore a pirate! So much for the logic of a policy based on sentimentality! Then comes the bill to be paid—the Alabama claims; and thus the economical Liberals, who have made retrenchments by cutting short the boots and tunics of Her Majesty's soldiers, have to pay a lump sum more than they ever did or ever will save by choking the administration of the country, as a penalty for their sentimental make-shift policy.

Another example of political ability is to be found in Lord

Russell's acrobatic feats in 1862-63. We have first the Gotha note of the 24th of September, 1862,\* which opens the Danish question. Then comes the Blairgowry speech. Then the note sent to St Petersburg, and stopped half-way, because Count Bernsdorf assures the Chief of the Foreign Office that if the Emperor of Russia is declared to have forfeited his rights to the Crown of Poland, Germany might declare that the King of Denmark had forfeited his sovereign rights over the Duchies. Then Lord Russell, after fidgetting a deal, sacrifices both Denmark and Poland to keep office. The whigs dearly love office.

The cession of the Ionian Islands without reason or logic, which causes on one side the Cretan rebellion, and on the other making Count Bismarck use these terrible words about England:—"England does no longer enter into my calculations; a country which ceases to take and begins to give without reason is done for."

The conduct of England during and after the Franco-German war, and denaturalization of the Black Sea—that is to say, the violation of the Treaty of Paris—the concocting of which had cost England so dear, and which enslaved England owing to an *honest* Whig, who then signed away British maritime right without Her Majesty's permission. And, lastly, the extraordinary negotiations with Count Schouvaloff with respect to Central Asia. These two last feats of Mr. Gladstone are most curious—because they show us the man in the light in which he appears *most to advantage*—and bears immediately upon the "good man's" present harum-scarum would-to-be salvation policy.

Mr. Gladstone, being busy making some new political brew in the country, let the Black Sea slip into Russia's power. Why should he fear Russia? Was not Russia a Christian power? Then, when Count Schouvaloff proposed, not the partition—no, not—but the extension of Russian territory to a certain vague limit in Asia, Mr. Gladstone agreed at once. What did he know of Central Asia?† What cared he even to know anything more than that it was inhabited by barbarian Mussulmans, and that the Russians were Christians? True, there were no Bulgarians to save in Khiva, but these wild Khivan heathens might be transformed into pious peace-loving Christians by being drilled into Cossacks. So thought the infallible man of progress! Besides, what had he to fear from Russia? Was not Russia a Christian power; one which ever and anon kept its word—a Christian word?

\* It advocates German interference in Schleswig-Holstein.

† He now proves his utter ignorance of Turkey. How could he know even as much about Khiva and Bukhara?



And so we saw the extraordinary sight of a religious and peaceable Government of England signing away entire states to unprovoked and unjustifiable aggression, and whole populations to slaughter, violence, and destruction! States and peoples with whom we were on friendly terms. States and peoples who were independent, and over whom we had no right.

And the "gude man" believed in Russia—and still does believe in Russia—because Russia is his only chance of being Premier.

This summary sketch of antecedents will suffice to show the forethought, the morality, and the truly patriotic tendencies of the Cabinet which handed over an England—abject, dishonoured, and discarded, to a man, who *knew*!

To know how to prepare "repeal" in Ireland, "Chartism" in England, continued snubs in foreign policy, to know how to pinch every department of Government to the lowest penny, to know how to pay the just claims of an offended State amounting to a heavy war indemnity without defeat, without other cause than the folly of fidgetty sentimentalism; to know how to cringe and flatter that State, after having insulted it, in the hopes that because one was instrumental in handing over England's savings to this State in the shape of Alabama claims, it will support the party which did so; to know how to speak to mobs about "atrocities"—is not to know.

To know is to know Russia! Mr. Disraeli knew Russia, and Mr. Gladstone does not even now know that he is the tool of Russia.

#### IV.

Less than two months ago Mr. Gladstone's hobgoblin was in great danger. General Ignatieff had upset Prince Gortchakoff's political scheme. This is so curious a piece of contemporary secret diplomatic history, that before proceeding with the would-be Premier's schemings and ravings, we must sketch it.

Prince Alexander Michaelowitch Gortchakoff was the Man of Russia until Sedan. He was adored by the Russians as the man who humbled Austria and succeeded in getting France to work for Russia in Turkey. His scheme was admirably well prepared, well planned, and executed as Russia ever executes clever and well-prepared plans, that is to say, by other's hands. "*Tirer les marions avec la patte du chat*" has ever been Russia's able principal policy. Whilst Europe was convulsed and European Cabinets confused, the great game was played in Turkey. Debt grew from the effect of insurrection. The effects of the Hatti Houmayoun, and its sequel, the Vilayet system, destroyed the economical and governmental state



of Turkey, and the oppressed Mussulmans groaned under the weight of Rayah-planned abuses.

One man, however, opposed Alexander Michaelowitch, it was the Man of Pekin. General Ignatieff was for violent action, but he had not his way, because Prince G. was all-powerful. The attempt made by the General to convulse Bulgaria in 1867 caused him to receive a severe reprimand from his all-powerful chief. And Mahmoud Pasha almost spoilt the games of both Chancellor and Ambassador by granting autonomy to the Bulgarian Church, which severed them for ever from the Greeks. English palace influence, however, re-established Russia's game by overthrowing Mahmoud, and thereby throwing the only statesman of Turkey into the arms of Russia.

However, until the great Franco-German War, Alexander Michaelowitch was the hero of Russia, and it was only when France fell prostrate and "Tolle Bismarck" became the man of Europe, that the Russian Party saw into what deep water their Chancellor had led their country, through his philo-German and anti-Austrian European policy. Since then M. Ignatieff became a power almost equal to that of Prince Gortchakoff; a power which, although in a subordinate office, could defy diplomatic discipline; a power which enabled an Ambassador to tear up a dispatch from his chief, and cry out, "I will never obey such orders." True, that the orders were to pacify the Herzegovina (!); in other words, to cause M. Ignatieff to abandon his policy of cutting the Sick Man's throat "instantly," and to return to the slow but sure policy of Prince Gortchakoff.

There has been ever since war between Chancellor and Ambassador; but that has not endangered Russia, because Russia is clever, but endangered Europe, and especially England, because Europe, and England especially, is governed, not by a policy of deep knowledge and cunning forethought, but by the sentimentality of mobs! Thus it is that if M. Ignatieff's policy fails, the Chancellor will step in as he now does with his, and if Turkey is saved, some one else—and we know who—will "pay the piper."

M. Ignatieff had his work cut and dry. He could refuse to obey a dispatch of his chief because he had cleverly prepared the fatal blow. Servia, drilled ever since 1856, organized as an army long before Prussia was so, was then armed and ready to strike; Montenegro, always thirsty of Turkish blood and of yellow gold; Bulgaria, M. Ignatieff's pet champion, worked upon by the new clergy, ready to play its part; secret societies enlisted in the cause; the repudiation choking European sympathy for Turkey; a Grand Vizier who was the General's tool; a Sultan demented, and only dreaming of placing his son on the throne contrary to the Ottoman Constitution, and looking

to Russia for support in that scheme ; Greek volunteers being organized in Stamboul to inundate Crete with blood.\* Prince Gortchakoff saw in these elements of disorder a way towards using the Sultan's spiritual powers in India. But the General, who is of the Young Russian Party, wished to show his work at once to his panting Slavs, and begin by destroying Turkey, leaving the Indian question for the second act of the bloody drama of the Anglo-Russian War which is now being fought in the East.

Alexander Michaelowitch had to give in to what we will term politely, "Russian national feeling," and General Ignatieff was allowed to work out his bloody scheme. This failed, we would say ridiculously, had not blood, and innocent blood, rendered the infamous scheme of Young Russia and the Omalamia hideous. The Servian rebel army, which was to march triumphantly to Constantinople between two rows of Mussulmen's heads, was soon crippled and forced to be on the defensive ; Bulgaria was strewn with corpses, and Montenegro could not even cause poor Muktar, with his battalions of 60 men, to capitulate, notwithstanding, and possibly because of the hideous cruelty and treachery of these bandits.† The whole scheme ended in destruction of life and property, and in a material and ostensible proof of the stern vitality of the Turks.

General Ignatieff was called to Russia. He was a lost man when he bethought himself of what a Russian statesman said to the present Turkish Ambassador at Berlin, that Europe was the toy of a mercenary press, and that two millions of roubles would cause it to control the ideas of Europe at Russia's pleasure.

Besides there were petty ambitions which General Ignatieff had sounded during their effort at notoriety and fortune last winter at Constantinople. There were other ambitions and interests besides ready to furnish the public mind with sensational stuff. He was, however, afraid to palm off his hysterical stories on matter of fact John Bull, and he, an Ambassador to a friendly power, so much forgot and demeaned himself as to dictate an article to M. Ivan de Westyne, an unknown correspondent of a semi-comic Parisian paper,

---

\*These volunteers were faced by a man who dared to do so ;—were told the truth, and instead of going to Crete, volunteered into the Turkish service. Sir H. Elliott, being apprised of the matter, answered, "I do not fancy that Turks would accept volunteers." Poor innocent Sir Henry, whom people now accuse of connivance with the Turk ! Of course their services were refused, but Crete did not rebel.

† We have reports of the atrocities of these as well, especially of the so-called Herzegovine insurgents, and from Russian sources too. Fatko Paulowics praying for noses is admirably described by the correspondent of the "*La Patrie*," who gathered his information from a Russian officer who served with that chief.



and it was only after the Bravo case ended without anyone being hung that the bloodthirsty humanitarian public of England were served with the relish of "Bulgarian horrors. Then, and only then, it was that Mr. Gladstone was unconsciously enlisted in the cause of the atrocity plot, and that is how he has become a tool not merely of Russia, but of General Ignatieff. In this case Prince Gortchakoff would have preferred to obtain Bulgaria intact, but if Mr. Gladstone hands it to him soiled with blood, he will not refuse it. Mr. Gladstone's efforts at proving that territorial integrity could be preserved, and still his friends in Russia satisfied, does not bear the comment of an infant. Serbia (take her only as an example) was a vassal State: this vassal State has waged clandestine warfare upon her Suzerain Lord for a year, and open warfare for nearly four months, and the Powers, the discordant concord, Mr. Gladstone wishes us to join in order to do what—he knows not, and possibly he cares not—these very concordantly discordant Powers who guaranteed Servian vassalage and the performance of duties incumbent on a vassal State (duties fulfilled by Egypt), and which are the conditions of autonomy and of the cession of Belgrade and other fortresses in Serbia; these Powers I say, tear up their contract as far as Turkey is concerned, and observe it as far as Serbia and Montenegro rebels are concerned, and ignore the rights, the just rights of Turkey! Now all the felony, not only of vassal States, but of Bulgaria, is excused by Mr. Gladstone, on the plea that we must follow the current of Russia's, nay, General Ignatieff's plot, and King Mob's foreign policy, because of what? Of atrocities in Bulgaria, the origin of which is attributable to General Ignatieff's conspiracy!

When we once know what the atrocities' scheme was meant to perpetrate, that is to say, wholesale murder and devastation in Bulgaria, and that only in order to dement England, through her sentimental folly, we shall understand the deep horror of the plot of General Ignatieff, and of the Secret Society at work in this plot, which was meant to result finally in a so-called independent or vassal Bulgaria, that is to say at the least a new autonomous State paying nominal tribute to the Porte, and being virtually Russia's vassal, just as Serbia is; the Caliph of Islam to be thereby coerced into becoming the tool of Russia in the East, just as Mr. Gladstone is at present her unconscious tool in England.

Mr. Gladstone has now only one excuse for his treasonable sayings and doings towards England, and that is that he should, at England's expense, render Bulgarians happy, just as he rendered Americans proud, and negroes paupers, at the expense of not King Mob, but of the healthy portion of the British public.

Now let us see how the would-be premier intends to render Bulgarians happy, at the expense of British money, power and honour; and here again, King Mob's premier renders himself powerless through sheer ignorance.

As to the atrocities committed in Bulgaria—in accordance with Lord Lyndhurst's decision\*—we are at liberty only to consider Edib Effendi's report as the one which we can act upon without committing a misdemeanour; we may further take cognizance of Mr. Baring's mosaic of statements; but we can neither admit of the "Daily News", nor of other groundless reports as true or official; nor even can we admit as official evidence that of a pamphlet printed by Diprose, Bateman & Co., which, however, is the only piece of print which gives a plausible explanation of what happened in Thrace during May last.

Horrors there were committed; yes, abominable horrors! But no evidence is given as to whom the guilty party was; of course even Mr. Baring, notwithstanding his fear of hurting public opinion, dares not imitate Mr. Gladstone and lay the odium of the crime upon the Ottoman Government. He says:—

"The infamous conduct of those agitators who, to serve the selfish ends of States, whose only object is territorial aggrandisement, have not shrunk from exciting poor ignorant peasants to revolt, thus desolating thousands of homes, and leaving to a fine rich province a legacy of tears, should not be allowed to escape without their share of public execration." Mr. Baring, who is sent to Turkey against all rules of international courtesy to inquire into the doings of an allied Power, nevertheless is a gentleman, and stigmatises the dealings of the secret agents of revolution, and of Russia.†

Now if the hobgoblin could inundate Bulgaria, Servia, Herzegovina, Bosnia, and Montenegro with blood to please a simple ambassador, what can it not do in India to satisfy the wishes and objects of a Chancellor!‡ But reflection is not Gladstonian—Gladstonian is impulse!

Now, then, as to horrors. Yes; there were horrors! As Lord Derby well said: "It was not a case of lambs and wolves, but of *some savage races*, fighting in a peculiarly savage manner."|| Out of official evidence we can gather but little, and that is because official evidence is prejudiced on one side and desirous of courting public opinion on the other. I do not write in political party or Turkish

---

\* *Vide* Appendix C. † *Vide* Appendix E.

‡ Shere Ali has been tampered with already.

|| "People" instead would have been more correct, because those who committed crimes were brigands—such secret agents fighting against both Turks and Bulgarians.



spirit. I write as an honest man and as a dutiful subject of Her Majesty, and I can, owing to my full knowledge of Bulgaria, advance the opinion that the only explanation of what happened there, I mean so far as actual slaughter was concerned, is given by unfortunately an anonymous pamphlet.\* Brigands did a deal I know. Having once succeeded in checking both Bulgarian risings and brigandage, with the aid of Ali Pasha, I can see that the pamphlet in question, although possibly not quite correct in details, is truthful and correct as to one fact—and that is that most of the atrocities on both sides were not committed by either Bulgarian or Musulman peasants, but by the Banditti which came from abroad or from the mountain. One act alone can be laid to the charge of Turkish officials—that of engaging Bashi-Bazonks from spurious sources—but considering that Russia had enlisted Bandittis in Servia, Wallachia and elsewhere to convulse Bulgaria, Turkish officials considering the state of panic prevailing—which Mr. Baring so ably describes—were more or less justified in doing so. The only act reprehensible in a Turkish commander was the attack and taking of Boyadiyk. True, he had the excuse of their having refused to parley with their legal chief the Kamakam of Jamboli, still it appears (I wont say is) a cruel and wanton act of destruction. As to what happened at Batak, &c., atrocious has been the effect of a state of things incomprehensible in a country not as yet subjected to the horrors of chartism, terrorism, and communism, working at the bidding of Russia's communist agents.†

How to save, not Bulgaria, but England, is the question, and the man who can save her now is Her Majesty's Prime Minister. However, Mobs would like a change, they can't have that until Parliament is gulled into adopting Mr. Gladstone's policy, but, in the meantime, King Mob is not idle. One word more. Mr. Gladstone would serve Bulgaria and please Russia at England's expense. Let us see whither his scheme would lead the Bulgarians.

## V.

Whilst Mr. Gladstone's supporter—the labouring man of England,—can hardly and direly afford to get drunk on Saturday nights, that is to say, 52 times a year, the Bulgarian is not sober, and can afford to be not sober, for at least, 183 days “per annum;” the working man of England has but his hands as his only capital, and Mr. Gladstone does not furnish him with land, pasture ground, and forest, to destroy (Gladstonian style) which the Sultan gives to his Rayah

\* “The Question of the Day.”

† General Miloutine said, “We could destroy you with chartism and communism let loose, we assure you:” a good warning to London.

the Bulgar, but merely with eloquent although wild talk, and then wishes him further to pay for the entertainment by subscribing to Lady Strangford's Fund! To carry the comparison further, we see the working man of England locked up if he dares get drunk, or violate law. He can neither kick his wife, nor rebel against the Crown, without being either imprisoned or hanged for doing so. Now the Bulgarian can, thanks to the Sultan's leniency, never cease to be drunk the whole year round, kick his wife, and is allowed to rebel three times\* before he is punished for his misdeeds! Now I say, as charity begins at home, before Mr. Gladstone attempts to force the "Porte" into granting autonomy to Bulgarians, why does he not coerce Her Majesty into granting 182 days free drunkenness at Government expense and impunity for all crimes to King Mob?†

I am certain King Mob would be far more pleased with such legislation than even with universal suffrage and other Republican institutions, or seeing the army dressed in pea-green coats.

Could our poor people exchange their civilised but miserable condition against that of the humblest Rayah, how they would bless that barbarian government of the Sultan, which allows any man who will work—field, meadow and forest, gratis—how that noble generosity of the Turkish state, and that real and hearty hospitality of the Turkish people, would contrast with what he sees at home, where charity is insulting and humanity verbose and interested!

But Mr. Gladstone has given up for the present, at least, his muddling and messing legislative interior policy—free and independent Ireland—a general dismemberment of the British Empire by the mother country casting adrift or ceding all her colonies—King Mob enthroned in Buckingham Palace—and all his home dreams have made place for another Scherfeé, that of coercing England into establishing an autonomous Bulgaria. Here again, Mr. Gladstone shews us what he is.

Poor Lord Strangford had already been made to believe that a Bulgarian nation did really exist; and the sickly little man, being convinced that Turkey could not live because *others told him so* fancied that he had found the philosopher's stone of the Eastern question in the Bulgarian nation of Ortakein.

Other Englishmen hearing that there were half-a-dozen Bulgarian protestants, and listening to broken English spoken by Christian Kalmouks,‡ believed in Mr. Ignatieff's myth!

\* This is the third insurrection, and the only bloody one, the others were disarmed by Bashi Bouzouks without bloodshed.

† The Rayah drinks, on an average, two gallons of wine per diem. ‡ Bulgarians are of Kalmouk or Turanian origin.

Now, that Bulgaria discovered by Lord Strangford is to be made into a vassal aggressor of the Sultan by Mr. Gladstone.

Nationality presupposes a geographical delineation. Now where does Bulgaria begin and where does it end?

Mr. Gladstone could not more define Bulgaria than anyone could define Gipsies' Land. Bulgarians rove to and fro, and neither of the places which Mr. Schuyler designates as having been the centres of Bulgarian insurrection are situated geographically within Mr. Gladstone's Bulgaria, which lies, according to *the infallible man*, north of the Balkan range; but what are termed the "horrors" happened on what was to be General Tchernayeff's line of march upon Constantinople,—that is to say in Thrace.

What he calls Bulgaria is the vilayet of Rustchouk, in this we find (1875-76) a male population of

Pure Turks . . . . .	457,018
Other Mussulmans . . . . .	104,639
<hr/>	
Mussulmans (males) . . . . .	561,647
Armenians . . . . .	2,128
Wallachians and Greeks . . . . .	56,647
Gipseys . . . . .	8,220
Jews . . . . .	5,847
<hr/>	
Non-Bulgarians . . . . .	634,469
Against a so-called Bulgarian population of	639,813

Considering that a Turk is worth—either as a labourer or a soldier—five Bulgarians, it would be difficult to constitute a Bulgaria out of such elements as the Viceroyalty of Rustchouk contains. In short, Bulgaria is no geographical fact at all.

Is it a moral fact? A nationality fit to govern itself?

It is *not*!

Bulgaria has neither a nobility nor a gentry, nor any cementing class. Its notables are usurers, its clergy the only real oppressors of the poor, and "Turbator Cuori" of the land.

To erect a Bulgaria out of such elements is like building an edifice without either stone, cement, or timber—it is the erection of a castle in the air. But what matters if the castle exists or not, as long as Lord Beaconsfield throws up office?

There is in Wallachia and Moldavia an ancient and a cultured nobility—and still autonomy has ruined those proverbially rich Danubian provinces!

There is in Servia a homogenous mass of swine herds, over



which rule some men who handle the stick freely; but has that noble country not shown its impotent folly?

Montenegro has been ever since creation inhabited by brave and fierce banditti; but can it live without plunder?

Bulgaria is to be made; but where are the elements out of which Mr. Gladstone is to constitute it?

The only governing elements can be,—either the bigoted and morally degraded clergy, who have aided and abetted the foreign chiefs of a hideous plot, or the usurious notable, who concocted the report which Mr. Gladstone denounces a disgraceful document,\* and whom Mr. Baring calls mendacious by nature. Those who sell their country, cringe before Mussulmans, and induce the peasants to rebel. Whom else can Mr. Gladstone find? possibly the insurgent chiefs, and the honest committeemen of Bucharest; those scoundrels who have planned to get office, position and dignity, and especially money, by causing poor idiotic peasants to rise, knowing that such rising, attended as it was by hideous crimes (*vide Appendix D*, which gives details of some of them on most reliable evidence), could only lead to a massacre; but massacre was their object; it was intended, desired, prepared;† and for this hideous crime Mr. Gladstone is prepared to reward them at the expense of England!

Now, does Mr. Gladstone for a moment fancy that the Bulgarian masses would be thankful to him for having been handed over to such people's rule? So you see, that were even Mr. Gladstone to drive the Turk out of the country he could not constitute a Bulgaria. But to drive the Turk out of that province, the yell of a mob does not suffice. King Mob may howl himself hoarse, but will not cause those who are the descendants of the conquerors of the land to leave the dear old graveyard, where the tombstones of ancestors loom white under shady oak trees. No, better lie by them! Die like men in resisting the most hideous plot that ever soiled humanity!

Mr. Gladstone may consider international law as obsolete—the

\*It is a French translation of a Report on the Bulgarian events, dated July 22, presented to the Ottoman Government by a commission of Mussulman and Christian notables, and approved by the Administrative Council of Philippopolis:—

“I hope it will, for the sake of justice, be extensively read. Others may think differently of it from myself. I cannot but at once denounce it as a disgraceful document.”—Gladstone.

†It was the avowed object of the insurrection of '67. Mr. Rayski found the document which was sent to the Porte in Ali Pasha's time; it must be there still.



Turks do not—he may fancy the Turkish rule to be dying out, but I assure him that Turks will die hard. It is only over mountains of corpses that the aggressor will ever penetrate into Bulgaria—and then he will possess what? A desert studded with black ruins and red with gore. Humanitarianism without knowledge is often a greater crime than even that perpetrated in Bulgaria by brigands.

The brigand at least risked his life when he deprived a fellow creature of existence; Mr. Gladstone risks nothing in exciting the people of England to act against her sworn faith, her honour, her interests, and against that law of nations which is part of our common law, in order to cause Bulgaria to become the slaughterhouse of Turks and Bulgarians. No! I must not imitate the hero of Blackheath. I must not let indignation (in this case real indignation) master facts. No; let us argue out Mr. Gladstone's plan with as much coolness as a man is in dignity bound to do. Now, even did Mr. Gladstone succeed in driving the Turks out of Bulgaria, he could not constitute a Bulgaria; but how is he to drive the Turks out of their homes, or how is he to coerce the superior race to submit to be ruled by usurers, felon priests and bandits? Such is the question which we must solve. Mr. Gladstone having only power to assert and not to instruct, we must say how he would plan his "eviction of Mussulmans."

There is the Porte to coerce; a second illegal Firman to be wrenched from the Sultan under the pressure of the guns of the Besika Bay fleet, but such a firman would be but so much waste paper!

A nation that deposes a Sultan because his dealings have been unjust, could never obey a Sultan who would sign away the life and property of his subjects.

No, no! Never would such an order be obeyed!

Then what?

The sore sight of a British fleet conveying Russian troops to Varna, is it? But our fleet cannot land 60,000 Russians in Varna in less than a month, and before that nefarious month would be out, the Mussulmans would have cleared the decks for action, that is to say, sent all the Christians across to Wallachia, or (I shudder at the idea) across the Styx! No! the plan is insane and culpable! criminal! not merely because it is illegal and unjust and ruinous to England, but because it is only executable through murder, slaughter, and devastation unparalleled.

"His declaration is a gross wrong inadvertently done to  
"the peoples of Bulgaria."

## POSTSCRIPT.

What ought to be done?

1st.—For England.

2nd.—For Bulgaria.

Mr. Gladstone's plan, is to sacrifice England, in order to sacrifice Bulgaria! Had he the knowledge of a Turkish school boy, he would see that the two interests are the same, provided we are just and honest.

The most curious part of Mr. Gladstone's policy, is that he cannot ruin Bulgaria without causing England to be unconstitutional; felonious towards Turkey and herself; and above all unjust and foolish! The duty of an English statesman would be on the contrary to advise.

1st. That England should stand by the law of nations, which is part of our common law, and use its fleet and power to see that such law is not violated in the East.

2nd. That consequently Montenegro and Servia be disarmed and the fortresses in both rebel States, which by treaty are Turkish, be occupied by troops of the Constitution, of which hereafter.

3rd. Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Bulgaria to be organised upon a system similar to that of the late "Grantz Corps" of Austria. Every one, Mussulman or Christian, serving in the ranks of territorial militia, and that militia garrisoning the fortresses of Servia and of Montenegro, until those countries are relieved from the losses sustained in a wanton war.

4th. Abolishing the Servian and Montenegrin armies, and letting these people become rich again.

5th. Usurers and trading Vice-Consuls to be punished severely for their pillage and conspiracy against both State and people by the new military authority and commission, which will see claims, &c., justly settled, and which will consist of

*a.* A delegate from each power who has signed and **NOT** violated the Treaty of Paris.

*b.* Of chiefs of militia in equal number.

*c.* Of one delegate for every village in these provinces.

This Commission to have alone the power to dictate the new institutions, but these to have force of law only after they have been approved of by every village in these provinces.

6th. The Rayahs and Turks of these provinces obliged to serve 3 years in the regular army of Turkey and 17 years in the militia,

both Mussulmans and Christians, between the ages of 20 and 40, to pay down £200 if they refuse to fulfil these duties.

7th. No war indemnity on Servia or other vassal states.

8th. But one fixed on the culprit power, amounting to all the evil done.

9th. No further interference in the internal affairs of Turkey.

10th. These rules gradually to extend to Armenia and other Asiatic provinces of Turkey.

Such is the salutary, and only salutary remedy proposed by, not a friend of Turkey, but by a devoted and loyal subject of Her Royal and Imperial Majesty, my Sovereign.

S. G. B. ST. CLAIR.

THIS CAN BE DONE!

But to re-constitute a country against its wish, CANNOT be done!

## APPENDIX A.

“How does Russia act in time of peace towards those who violate no laws? It is well-known that the Turks do not trouble themselves about the religious concerns of their Christian subjects, unless moved to do so, for interested reasons, by others. All who fulfil their civil obligations towards the State are unmolested, or rather are protected. Is this the case in Russia? By the fifth article of the treaty of partition, 1773, Russia expressly binds herself to ‘leave the Catholics of *both rites* in *statu quo*, that is, in the free exercise of their worship (culte) and discipline, and never to avail itself of its rights of supremacy to the prejudice of the *status in quo* of the Roman Catholic Church.’ Has this solemn obligation been fulfilled? From the very outset it is notorious that the imperial agents devoted themselves to suppress Catholicity, especially among the Uniates. Catherine, first, and subsequently Nicholas, forced millions into schism through horrid cruelties. Minsk is a name which will not be easily forgotten. Lately the present Tsar, who has the reputation of being a mild-mannered man, took upon himself to complete the unfinished work of forcing every Catholic of the Greek rite into the ranks of the schism. How this has been done is only too well-known. The property of the unfortunate peasantry who were to be ‘converted’ was ruined by dragonnades, the poor people were driven with whips, cudgels, musket-blows, bayonet-thrusts, into the schismatic churches, and then entered in the registers of the ‘orthodox.’ At Dreln, Pratulin, Prolubice, places in the Government of Siedlec, occurrences happened which were, on a small



“scale, an anticipation of Bulgaria. Men, and even women were killed, others were thrown into prison, and many were sent off into Siberia, not for any crime, but merely because they would not be ‘converted.’ The peasants paid the contributions charged upon them; they submitted to their cattle being taken away in discharge of fines and penalties; but into the schismatic churches they will not set their feet. When this movement of sympathy towards the Christian Slaves of Turkey began to spread, the notion seems to have occurred to some among these poor persecuted Poles that perhaps the Russian Government would relent in its treatment of themselves, who are Christians and Slavs as much as those at the other side of the Danube. Some of them began again to practice their own forms of worship. What took place? The correspondent of the *Neue Frei Presse* of Vienna—not a Catholic paper be it remembered—writing from the scene on August 18 (only a fortnight ago, and while the flood of Russian sympathy for the Turkish Slavs threatened to break down all the barriers of international propriety), tells us that those persons were attacked by the military ‘for opposing themselves to the religious arrangements of the Russian Government. There were many killed and wounded. . . . Many women also were killed. . . . About one hundred peasants, twenty peasant women, and four clergymen have been taken prisoners to the fortress of Warsaw. The arrests have not yet ceased.’ And these persons suffered thus, not because they were insurgents, or for any offence against public order or the laws, but for practising a form of Christian worship which Russia swore to protect when first she seized upon Poland.”

---

## APPENDIX B.

\* \* \* \* \*

We know that the Slav is of a migratory nature. The Bulgarian, especially, is restless and eternally on the move—never satisfied with his abode, shifting his quarters whenever he can. \* \* \* But if Europe ignores the great principles of Ottoman rule which have succeeded to preserve to this very day a society in which no lower and abject classes do exist, where no paupers are to be found, the rayah knows it thoroughly well, and, knowing it, is the last man to desire a change. The Bulgarian usurer, who feels instinctively that if the present Government is left alone and not interfered with



by Europe, his misdeeds will shortly be visited by a summary justice.

In the blue book, Turkey, No. 2. page 34, we find the following account of a rayah family's taxes of ten members, which are estimated by the writer of the anonymous pamphlet at a sum of 2,700 piastres:—

18. Poll Tax on five males .. .. .	145
19. Rad, or labour tax .. .. .	75
20. Road work, 3 men .. .. .	300
21. Share in extortions of tithes, farmer, &c. ..	100
<hr/>	
Total piastres .. .. .	2,791½

This is again reduced to 10 per cent. in lieu of 12½.

“ But accounting for the income which these taxes represent, we have—

	Piastres.
1. Tithes, representative income of .. .. .	4,000
2. Hay, do. .. .. .	484
3. Cabbage, do. .. .. .	440
4. Potatoes, do. .. .. .	960
5. Musk, do. .. .. .	1,600
6. Wine, do. .. .. .	2,000
7. Brandy, do. .. .. .	500
8. Tobacco, do. .. .. .	2,400
10. Dyes, do. .. .. .	100
13 and 14. Twenty-five head of cattle, income yearly .. .. .	1,500
15. Agram, or Beylyk, &c., on 100 sheep ..	5,000
16. Two hogs or sows, 200 each .. .. .	400
17. Ten beehives, at 50 each .. .. .	500
<hr/>	
Total piastres .. .. .	14,284

Or, roughly, £140 a year, for which he pays rent, taxes and abuses, the sum of roughly £27. This is not exorbitant. But there is a mistake in the calculation—a grievous one, and one killing to the whole calculation. The grain grown only represents 40 loads. This gives us as seed employed about eight loads; to the sowing, ploughing, &c., of which eight loads only, 60 days' labour of one man and one pair of oxen, were required. The potatoes, fields, vineyards, &c., cannot be calculated to have absorbed more than 30 to 40 days' labour, of which half was borne by the female members of the family. We have, according to the calculation, two junior males to look after the cattle and sheep. We have therefore three adult males and 15 pairs of oxen, and, allowing each only 250 days' work per year, we obtain this calculation:—

	Piastres.
250 days' labour of three men, at 10 piastres per day ... ..	7,000
250 days' labour of five pairs of oxen, at 10 piastres per day ... ..	12,500
<hr/>	
A rough income of men's and oxen's labour amounting to piastres ... ..	19,500
To deduct from this—	
Labour in fields, 60, at 20 piastres ...	1,200
Labour in vineyards, potato fields, 20 with oxen, at 20 piastres ... ..	400
Road making ... ..	300
	<hr/> 1,900
<hr/>	
Remain piastres ... ..	17,600

Now where is this sum? Here is 17,600 piastres worth of labour, for which the author of the supposed-to-be truthful pamphlet—since it has the honour of publication in the blue book—does not account for.

Now we know that land is in plenty, and can be had by merely asking for it; we also know that in agricultural enterprise, even of the most primitive kind, the value of labour employed in the field is trebled in value of produce. If, therefore, the 17,600 piastres of labour now unaccounted for had been expended in field labour, the result would have been an increase of revenue of 52,800 piastres. But why is this large sum lost? The author does not say, simply because he dare not say the truth. I will account for it. In the first place, we have 183 days consecrated to the numberless saints of the Greek calendar, which would leave 182 labour days, instead of the moderate amount of 250. There are, besides, days consecrated to occult powers, and not Greek orthodox feast days, such as the days of the serpents, the dogs, the rats, of thunder, of the old woman Mart (March). These are estimated roughly at 20. Our labour days are thus reduced to 162. But we must further remember that on feast days people do not go to church except for a moment, and only to smoke a friendly cigarette within its walls, to light a candle, kiss a favourite image, or make half a dozen signs of the cross. This only occupies a few minutes, and then all repair to the meham (the public-house), and there they remain till they roll themselves on the village dung-heap if they are aged and respected elders of the village, or dance until dawn, half muddled with drink, if young. Thus it is that

naturally the days following the feast days are cut short by half, and that the 162 days' labour only virtually represents 81 days of hard work. Such is the explanation of this loss of valuable labour in a country where land calls for the plough. As I have watched this process for years, and kept a regular roster of labour days of villages, even of the poorest, for 12 consecutive years, you cannot deny my word, because such is the plain, simple, and observed truth—the fact. But to further convince you of the drunken habits of the rayah, I refer you to the official Ottoman budget of 1874-75. This gives you an idea of the amount of wine and spirits produced by Turkey, and as more wine and spirits are imported than exported, you will find that each rayah adult male has 600 piastres worth of wine and spirits to drink as his share yearly, which at local prices gives each adult rayah roughly two gallons of wine and one quart of spirits to drink per diem, unless he exports—which he does not. Allowing that the degenerate Mussulman drinks the quart of spirits, that the females and children consume one gallon of the rayah's daily ration, still he has a gallon of wine per diem as an average of intoxicating beverage, and uses it freely, or else Turkey would export wine and spirits, and not import such. This, this alone, is the reason why he has not become more prosperous under a rule so paternal as that of the Porte. We must now, to well understand the case, pass to the other sort of rayah—to the Mussulman. Here drink is rare, and idleness impossible. The family of 10 Mussulman members has to fight against another calamity—not a self-imposed one, as that of drink, but a patriotic one—military service. On the whole this family has the same taxes to pay as the rayah. The only items less are the wine tax (the excise) and the “Bedel askirech” or exemption tax. This diminishes the tax of the same family, supposing it produced as little grain as the supposed rayah family—which is not the case or else they would die of starvation—to 2,586½ piastres against 2,790½ paid by a similarly-situated rayah family; it is a small difference of 204 piastres, but then the Mussulman has not the advantage of being able to grow 2,400 piastres' worth of wine and brandy. This prevention throws him forcibly into a more developed and better system of grain-growing. The Mussulman uses manure to better the condition of his fields, whilst the rayah only looks upon his dung heap as a soft place to fall upon when down with drink. Thus the Turk's field yields more, and although forbidden the advantages accruing from the culture of the vine he makes his field produce more. But labour as he may, he is checkmated in his laborious attempts by military service. Each member of the Mussulman family labours



not 250 days, but 300 days in the year, only this family loses the labour of two male adult members, or else has to exempt them from military service. If they are exempted (and exemption is so advantageous that all well-to-do Mussulman peasants do exempt themselves)—this exemption costs ready money down (which would greatly augment the amount) 5,000 piastres\* for the service in the line, and to exempt this man from service in the reserve or *redyff* the usual sum paid is 10,000 piastres. Therefore, for 10 years' actual service the Mussulman has to exempt himself at the rate of £150, or roughly at about 1,500 piastres yearly. This causes him to be taxed 20 to 25 times more heavily in this one respect alone than the *rayah*. This causes a loss of 30,000 piastres in labour to every Mussulman family of 10 members yearly. This is the whole secret of what you are puzzling your brain vainly about, the fact that a drunken, lazy population is more thriving than a sober, hard-working people! But to return to the subject. I have stated, and I do affirm, that the *rayah* is taxed less than the Mussulman in the proportion of roughly, 1 to 25 in the heaviest of all taxes; and roughly all considered, is as one to five. The conqueror is thus taxed five times more than the conquered race. This advantage, I say, is squandered by the latter in drunken revels and idleness consequent on such. I have not mentioned maladministration or abuses, as these weigh equally on all—on the Christian, or Mussulman, or *rayah*;—but these abuses must be seen to subdivide into two classes—1st. Those depending upon law; 2nd. Those depending upon abuse. Those depending upon law do not hurt the people, they only hurt the State. Those depending upon abuse only hurt the people slightly. Of course there is room for reform; space for developing the country; but how can that better the people? It cannot much, but it can better the State. To better the condition of the people at large the abuses must be changed, but in so doing the Government must face Eastern commerce. That is to say, force Europe to avow that Turkey has not only been swindled in its State financial transaction, but that the country is permanently swindled by its commerce; that it must do away with capitulations before it can either assess taxes justly, or prevent the plague of usury. Of course the State could get out of financial trouble by abolishing the "*Mira and Djebil-Ulbragh*," that is to say the waste lands of the empire; but it is too kind, too paternal,

---

(\*) It must be borne in mind that the Mussulman who exempts himself from the service in his army becomes, *ipso facto*, a soldier in the reserve; and if there is war must get some one to replace him.

too foolishly affectionate to its subjects to do so. I am positive this would not hurt the masses; on the contrary, save them—the only cause of ruin in Turkey being that land is too plentiful—but the State hesitates.

If, to resume, we take the position of a rayah-Turk or Christian we see him free to take and cultivate and appropriate as much land as he pleases. The supposed rayah family of 10 members we have taken as an example. Suppose it did labour, as a European family does, over 200 days in the year, it could earn, instead of 14,000 piastres, at least 80,000 piastres in grain alone. It has pasture land, forests, river rights—what not gratis besides—it can want nothing, and if usury were stopped it would be the most wealthy of families in Europe. It is neither the tithe farmer nor the tax collector, unless he is a rayah usurer, who hurts this family. No; it is drink—sheer drunkenness—and of late years rayahs no longer get drunk in their houses, but do so in the public-house. No; were the rayah to have autonomy he would become the slave of the usurer, and become a “labourer” instead of being a land-owner. To the peasant who knows this is so true, so palpable, that revolt could not spread in Turkey, notwithstanding the atrocities committed to cause it to spread. On this economical question I will write as soon as this sketch is in print.

ST. CLAIR.

---

## APPENDIX C.

“ If a number of British subjects were to combine and conspire together to excite revolt among the inhabitants of a friendly State —of a State united in alliance with us—and these persons, in pursuance of that conspiracy, were to issue manifestoes and proclamation for the purpose of carrying that object into effect; above all, *if they were to subscribe money for the purpose of purchasing arms* to give effect to that intended enterprise, I conceive, and I state with confidence, that each person would be guilty of a misdemeanor, and liable to suffer punishment by the laws of this country, inasmuch as their conduct would tend to embroil the two countries together, to lead to remonstrances by the one with the and ultimately, it might be, to war. The offence of endeavouring to excite revolt among the subjects of a neighbouring State, is an offence against the LAW OF NATIONS. No writer on the Law of Nations states otherwise. *But the Law of Nations, according to*

“the decisions of our greatest judges, is part of the Law of England.”—Lord Lyndhurst, in the House of Lords, on the 4th March, 1853.

## APPENDIX D.

Here is what private Letters state and friends say,—

1. Les deux enfants Musulmans que les Bulgars de Bratchkowa avaient liés à un arbre et les *rotirent* par le feu, se nommaient Ismail fils de Moustafa et Mestan fils de Ismail.

Chacun d'eux avait 12 ans.

Quand Rechid Pacha, Hadji Ahmed Pacha, et Hasan Pacha arrivèrent avec leurs armées devant Bratchkowa, les parents des deux enfants apportèrent les deux cadavres *rotis* dans un panier et les exposèrent en publique.

2. La femme Musulmane que les Bulgars de Bratchkowa avaient exposée *nue* au publique pendant trois journées, se nomme Aïchêe, femme de Osman Munouny de la campagne de Yigha.

3. Le petit enfant, qui a pleuré et crié pendant que les Bulgars ont *hachés* son pere avec 15 autres Musulmans à Yeni-Keui, cet enfant a en le peau de la tête ecorché et puis tué après une torture pendant deux heures.

4. La fille Musulmane qui était tuée par les Bulgars avec torture à Ottonk-Keui, avait à peine 10 ans.

5. Les trois Pomaks qui étaient perdus par les Bulgars à Prochtintcha, ont été trouvés par Rechid Pacha dans un état horrible: les nez, les oreilles, et les *espe* coupées, et enterrés *vivants* dans un fosse.

Abdi, fils de Hasan a été trouvé, le nez et l'oeil mutilé, par les Bulgars à Bratchkowa.

“Quant aux atrocités commises par les musulmans, ce sont des mensonges; au contraire, les musulmans ont donné des exemples extraordinaires d'humanité. En voici un cas: Au commencement de l'insurrection, les habitants insurgés de la campagne de Prochtintcha envoyèrent des détachements contre Ostona, pour exterminer les musulmans de cette campagne; quand l'armée, sous le commandement de Rechid Pacha, arriva à Prochtintatch et au milieu d'un combat très-acharné, 430 insurgés, avec leurs femmes et leurs enfants, se réfugièrent dans la campagne d'Ostona, sous la protection des musulmans. Ces musulmans, bien que sachant que



“ces gens les avaient attaqués pour les exterminer, et bien qu'ils voyaient au milieu de ces insurgés la famille et les parents du premier atroce chef Sokoloski, les reçurent comme ils reçoivent des hôtes, et ils les soignèrent cinq jours, c'est-à-dire jusqu'à la fin de l'étouffement de l'insurrection; après quoi, ils les conduisirent au commandant de l'armée, qui les rétablit dans leur campagne et remercia les musulmans de l'humanité dont ils avaient fait preuve.

“Je vous citerai encore un autre exemple :

“Dans le village de Sotir, au début de l'insurrection, les habitants bulgares se retirèrent dans les Balkans à l'approche des Turcs. Avant de partir, ils massacrèrent quelques musulmans et mirent le feu au village. Leurs voisins les musulmans se précipitèrent pour éteindre le feu, l'éteignirent et gardèrent les maisons des insurgés avec tous les biens qu'elles contenaient jusqu'à la fin de l'insurrection, et quand les Bulgares revinrent des Balkans, ils trouvèrent tous leurs biens, auxquels ont-ils dit dans leur interrogatoire, il ne manquait pas une aiguille.”

AOLI SUAVI.

## APPENDIX E.

### *Extracts from Reports and Pamphlets.*

The Bulgarians of Dere Keuiy attacked the village of Galata and there murdered several Circassians, and, if I remember rightly, two women—stealing a large sum of money besides. As the real culprits got away to Wallachia, where they must have joined the patriotic “committees,” the relatives of the murdered Circassians applied to me, as to their old friend, to intercede in their name for the Bulgarians left in prison. This happened two years ago. In another case the Bulgarian jeunesse dorée of “Sudjoulou,” after a drunken revel, believing that their strayed horses had been stolen by Circassians; led by the priest, took their arms and set out. Meeting several Circassians who were returning from a fair, perfectly inoffensive and unarmed men, they shot them down. A short time after the Circassian relatives of the victims came to me to ask me to beg mercy for the murderers—“We can't restore them to life again, and we wish to see good neighbourhood between us and the Bulgarians.” So said they.

ST. CLAIR.

---

*Vide* extract from the “Question of the Day, by an Englishman.” London, Diprose, Bateman & Co., Lincoln's Inn-Fields, pages 23 to 30.—This pamphlet not being signed can not be admitted as evidence,

although to the mind of him who knows the country, it gives the explanation of the otherwise unaccountable crimes which have desolated Bulgaria. We must, however, quote one passage, because it does speak volumes, and seems so very true:—"The brigands of the mountains now formed themselves into bands, and went about the country pillaging, murdering and violating women and children. The ordinary name by which they were known was that of the Bashi-Bazouks; or rather they were generally confounded with those irregular troops."

In the part of the Balkans which I inhabit there has been no rising, although for a time bands of incendiary Bulgarians roved about the hills murdering travellers and burning isolated farms and mills; but, owing to the "old organisation," the villages were well guarded and patrols were continually beating the mountains. These bands melted away, and the misled Bulgars returned to their homes and their field work. Such were the effects of organisation. Had this been applied to the Philippopoli districts, the insurrection could never have begun, and, of course, there would have been no bloodshed. Had such an organisation not been prevented the Bulgars themselves would, as in 1868, have joined the volunteer corps and handed over the incendiary ruffians who came from abroad, to the local authorities, and the only way in which I can account for the insurrection is the disarmament of the Turks, the absence of troops, and the presence of Servian bands well armed and ready to commit any atrocity in order to exasperate both Turks and Bulgars, and cause those who have lived in good harmony for centuries to hate and fear each other. Just before the autumn outbreak, my friend General Mehmed Pasha, chief of the staff of the 2nd Army Corps, whilst employed in a topographical survey, was entreated by both Bulgars and Turks to cause troops to be sent in order to protect them against bands of banditti which were roaming in the hills.—*Morning Post*, July 15th.

ST. CLAIR.