

POLITICAL EXTRACTS.

SPIRIT OF THE BRITISH JOURNALS.

LONDON TIMES.—Russia, Turkey, and England.—Whenever we for half an hour withdraw our attention from the details of domestic policy, and look beyond the geographical limits of these islands, the quarter to which the eye almost unconsciously turns is the East of Europe, and in the East, the dominant, nay, the single object, is Russia. Were the Russian Government inactive—were the Czar to remain motionless in the position to which the last three or four years have raised him, still must every man in England who feels for the security of his own country, and for the repose of Europe, view with distrust and apprehension the offensive attitude which that Sovereign has chosen to assume, and consider as almost in the nature of a direct aggression upon each individual State in Christendom the new and very formidable relation in which Russia has placed herself towards them all.

But the Russian Cabinet is not inactive; our lagging vigilance is frequently roused by some fresh demonstration on the part of Nicholas or his servants, of the venom by which the Muscovite counsels have never ceased to be actuated. Scarcely a day passes without producing some proof of the deep-rooted jealousy and mortal hatred which, circumspect as in general Russia is, drives her almost headlong into collision with this country—not in Europe only, but in distant quarters of the earth. Scarcely does a foreign journal appear, without containing some article indicative of the fixed and all-pervading hostility between Russian aggrandizement and British power. In every paragraph the defensive spirit of Englishmen (measures of their Government, alas! there are none), manifested on all occasions against the positive encroachments of Russia, forms a text for grave reproach or insolent derision; the *Algemeine Zeitung*, the *Austrian Observer*, letters from Berlin, from the Inn, the Vistula, the Danube, all teem with attacks upon the resistance (as yet no more than moral resistance) presented by the British nation to the grand scheme of Russian supremacy over the east of Europe. Vexation and malignity, but dogged stubbornness of purpose, are apparent in every line. The German papers have within the last three days brought one of these effusions, dated 'Prussia,' wherein the obvious aim of the writer, in contrasting the conduct of the British and French Governments at different periods of the last twelve months with each other, is to weaken the influence of their alleged union of sentiment upon public opinion throughout Europe, and thereby to add greater weight to whatever attempts may be made by Russia to coerce the secondary Powers every where into an acquiescence in her own arrogant and meddling practices. It assumes that the English press "has abandoned its suspicions on the views of Russia with respect to the Porte," as a peg whereon to hang an impertinence against the press of France, for picking up such suspicions, dropped as it were by England. It was necessary to assume the relinquishment of the hostile feeling before expressed by most of the English journals towards the last iniquitous and fraudulent treaty of July between Russia and Turkey, to make the false charge of disunion between France and England intelligible; but if on the part of Great Britain and her press (we can at present say nothing of her Government), an absolute and indignant denial be given to the assertion that this country has abated one jot of her just resentment at the foul play shown by Russia, and an assurance that in all that has been, and all that can be, urged by France in reprobation of such conduct, we heartily and entirely concur, what becomes of the coxcombical flourish as to a discrepancy of sentiment between these two countries, and a corresponding shock experienced by their political alliance?

The contemptuous language held in the above article with regard to France and the French Ministers, we leave to the parties interested to requite as it deserves; but when the Russian paragraph writer charges an evening English journal, said to be under the sway of His Majesty's Government, with "being now satisfied with the Convention of St. Petersburg," the necessity comes nearer home for some resolute disavowal of an acquiescence in any English breast so disgraceful, and more especially when ascribed to official influence. What is that same Convention of St. Petersburg, at which the English journal in question is said to declare its "satisfaction?" It is one which for the first time in the history of the world makes the admission of English men of war to Constantinople and the whole of the Black Sea contingent upon the gracious assent and condescension of Russia, avowing that Turkey is a tributary and vassal of the Czar, and placing in the hands of the latter despot the keys of the commercial intercourse between the Mediterranean and the Euxine. It is a Convention which transfers to Russia the virtual sovereignty of the Turkish empire, and establishes precisely the same relations between them as if Constantinople had been taken by assault, and Nicholas was in military possession of the whole territory from the mouths of the Danube to the western extremity of the Dardanelles. Now, is that a change in the condition of human affairs, which, if brought about by a Russian army, England and France would for a moment tolerate? Let us ask, therefore, is it one to be permitted when brought about by a diplomatic fraud? We use this strong expression advisedly. When the Court of St. Petersburg took credit with Western Europe for having withdrawn her troops and her squadron of men of war from Constantinople, the fair and honest understanding was, that after the retreat of her forces, she should stand in exactly the same situation with regard to Great Britain and France, and by consequence in the same situation towards Turkey, as before she had undertaken the expedition to the Turkish capital. The plain sense of the thing was, that when she engaged to the other Powers to withdraw her troops, she implied an engagement to abstain from exacting any price for that withdrawal which should operate as an advantage to herself, obtained without the

privity of the parties whose demand she had promised to comply with. But how stands the fact? The troops retired; but in the mean-time Count Orloff had appeared, and as the secret price of the ostensible fulfillment by Nicholas of his engagements with France and England—a price which these Powers would never have permitted beforehand the Ottoman Porte to incur—be actually by a stroke of the pen shut out all Europe from the navigation of the Euxine, hitherto an open sea, save only at the will and pleasure of his Muscovite Majesty.

This whole transaction is admirably described in the concluding article of the last number of the Foreign Quarterly Review. The article is entitled *Turkey, Egypt, Russia*; the crisis in the East. We have no time at present to touch on any other of its extensive topics but that of the policy pursued of late by Russia, and must therefore omit to notice the striking and interesting narrative which it offers of the war between Mehemet Ali and the Sultan. But throughout the whole article, and eminently in his acute development of the intrigues and subtleties of the Russian Cabinet, the author exhibits a knowledge of his subject at once intimate, sound, and well-digested. We agree with him in the deprecation of hasty or ill-considered measures by this country, however justified on every ground of self-defence and of the law of nations; but that without a bold and masculine policy,—one for which, we fear, recourse must be had, more to acknowledge principle than to any precedent discoverable in the history of England during the last few years,—the projects of unjust supremacy disclosed by Russia can be so much as even momentarily checked in their execution, we are not chimerical enough to entertain the slightest hope. We must defer to a future day the concluding observations of the writer, which are extremely valuable, as expositions of the general character and designs of Russia, and limit ourselves now to a short extract, illustrative of the dishonest proceedings which terminated in the convention of July:

"True it is, however, that on the very day after the return of the Russian officer who had seen the passage of Ibrahim's army across the Taurus, the Russian commander requested permission of the Turkish Government for his troops to return to their own country, which being granted, they actually embarked and sailed. Nobody on the spot thought it probable that they would go; nobody, indeed, would believe that they had gone until the last vessel had rounded the Synplegades; then all at once burst forth a general chorus in praise of Russian honour! The sincerity of the Emperor's professions and the loyalty of his conduct were every where vaunted. Had Russia, indeed, acting in the spirit of her engagement, withdrawn her troops without obtaining any recompense; had she not taken advantage of the weakness of her ally to further her own selfish ends; then, though she would have acted only with common honour and honesty, yet looking at the general course of her policy, we should have acknowledged with praise that in this instance she had pursued a straightforward course. But this—true to herself—she has not left it in our power to do. The Europeans at Constantinople had not recovered from their surprise at seeing Russia, with openness and readiness, fulfilling her engagements, when a report arose—hardly credited at first, as originating with the dishonest dragomans—that the long interviews between Count Orloff and the Reis Effendi, and subsequently with the Sultan, had not been without result. A treaty was talked of, of what kind does the reader think?—a treaty of mutual protection between Russia and Turkey! The report was confirmed, and as no secret in that land of corruption may not be discovered, a copy of it, though not for some time officially given, was soon obtained by the alarmed ambassadors of other countries, who, innocent themselves, thinking no ill where no ill seemed, had been rejoicing over the termination of their embarrassments, the moment they saw the Russian squadron sailing up the Bosphorus.

"The basis of this treaty (of July 8) is declared to be that of reciprocal defence; its object being the protection of the two contracting parties against all attacks, whether foreign or domestic; and each engages to give the other such effective aid and assistance as will ensure that object; and that the auxiliary forces, whether by sea or land, which circumstances may compel either party to require by virtue of this treaty, shall not be at the expense of the party who asks for the assistance, except in the supply of provisions. By a separate article, the Porte, 'acting in the spirit of this treaty, and to promote its object,' engages to close, in case of need, the straits of the Dardanelles. The intention of the contracting parties is, that this treaty should last for ever, but for the present its duration is limited to eight years. All preceding treaties are confirmed, especially, amongst others, the treaty of Adrianople, and the parties pledge themselves to everlasting peace and amity.

"Looking at the state of the relations between Turkey and Russia previously to this treaty, we shall find that the latter Power had secured too firm and solid a footing in the other to be easily shaken. By the 9th article of the treaty of Adrianople, Turkey acknowledged a debt of nearly £5,000,000 sterling, as an indemnity for the war. It was subsequently agreed that this sum should be paid by regular instalments in ten years, during which time Russia was to hold the principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia as security for the payment. We need hardly add that Turkey never will, never can discharge this debt; and she has the less inducement to do so, since Russia has, by other regulations of the same treaty, so far taken the principalities under her protection, and deprived the Turks of all advantages from them, that the nominal suzerainty of the Porte, and the equally nominal tribute, cannot be worth possessing, certainly less so than the large sum which must be paid to recover them. By the same treaty it is agreed that the commerce of Russian subjects is not to be checked in any case, or under any pretence, by any prohibition, restriction, regulation, or measure, whether of administration or legislation. Russian vessels are never, under any pretext, to be visited or

spoken to, or interfered with in any way, by the Ottoman authorities; and Russian subjects who, be it mentioned, have of late greatly increased in Turkey, are placed throughout that country under the exclusive jurisdiction and police of the Ministers and Consuls of Russia. By this last treaty of Constantinople the Porte not only binds itself to have the same friends and enemies as Russia, but to close the Dardanelles against the vessels of every country, in case of need, which means, it has any meaning, at her request. Is it not little else than delusion, under these circumstances, to call Turkey an independent country?"

SCHEDIASMA.

MIRAMICHI:
TUESDAY MORNING, MAY 13, 1834.

EUROPEAN NEWS.—By the attention of Captain Oliver, we were in the early part of the week, put in possession of Liverpool papers to the 7th April; and the arrival at Halifax of H. M. Packet Swallow, has furnished us with London dates to the 6th of the same month: from these sources we have gleaned a number of extracts.

Since the above paragraph was put in type, we have been obligingly favoured by Mr Ingram, with London papers to the 7th, and Liverpool to the 3th April, from which we have hurriedly made the following extracts:

EXPRESS FROM PARIS.

We received last night, by express, the Papers of Saturday and Saturday evening. They bring at length the completion of the new Ministerial arrangements.

The *Moniteur* promulgates Royal Ordonnances, by which M. Persil, Deputy Procureur General of the Royal Court, is appointed Keeper of the Seals and minister of Justice and of Worship, in the room of M. Barthe, who is created a Peer of France, and made First President of the Court of Accounts, in the room of M. Barbe Marbois, who resigns, but who is invested with the dignity of Honorary First President of the Court of Accounts.

M. Thiers, Deputy Minister of Commerce and Public Works, is appointed Minister of the Interior, in the room of Count d'Argout, who is made Governor of the Bank of France in the place of the Duke of Gaete.

M. Duchatel, Deputy, is nominated Minister of Commerce in the room of M. Thiers.

The separation of the attributions of the Ministers of the Interior and of Commerce will be hereafter determined by a special Ordonnance.

Vice-Admiral Count de Rigny, Deputy, and Minister of the Marine and Colonies, is appointed Minister of Foreign Affairs, in the room of the Duke de Broglie.

Vice-Admiral Baron Roussin, Ambassador at Constantinople, is named Minister of the Marine, in the room of Admiral de Rigny, who, however, will continue to exercise the functions of his late office till the arrival of Admiral Roussin.

M. Martin du Nord, Deputy, and Advocate-General of the Court of Cassation, is appointed Procureur-General of the Royal Court, in the room of M. Persil. It will be seen, therefore, that the Ministers who retain their previous offices are Marshal Soult, President of Council and Minister of War; M. Humann, Minister of Finance; and M. Guizot, Minister of Public Instruction.

The Duke d'Orante has resigned his post as sub-Chief of the Staff of the National Guards, but his resignation is foreign to politics.

It would appear that much difficulty was experienced in making those arrangements, and that many individuals had been contemplated or applied to by Government, who were subsequently rejected, or who refused office. The Ministerial Journals of Saturday are anxious that the world should believe that although a change of men had occurred, none of measures nor of policy would take place. This was, however, deemed an assertion, made merely with a view to calm the public mind in France, and to lull any suspicions that might arise abroad that the *Doctrinaire* system had received injury by the retirement from Government of four of its authors and supporters.

It was rumoured also, that Lord Durham's visit had somehow or other, occasioned alarm in the heart of the French Government. That serious fears were entertained that Great Britain was, at length, in earnest in its resolve to control Russian ambition, and that, consequently, France must decide, and immediately too, on the part she would take in the negotiation of the contest, whatever should arise between this country and Russia.

The news from Spain contained in these Papers is not of a later date than our own letters from thence, and contains no new facts of importance. Our Bayonne letters state that the wives of the Carlist Chiefs Zumalacarrégu and Sagastiveris had taken refuge in France.