

PARLIAMENTARY INVESTIGATIONS IN BRITAIN DURING THE CRIMEAN WAR

© *Elena K. Sklyarova, Olga N. Kamalova*

Rostov State Medical University, Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation
science-almanac@mail.ru

In this research, parliamentary investigations in the UK during the Crimean War (1853-1856) are under consideration. On the basis of the historical-genetic method of research, the features of the domestic and foreign policy of the government of Aberdeen, which was dismissed after the end of the war, are analyzed. It is shown that there were disagreements in the government regarding the country's entry into the war, the organization of medical and military departments. The war became part of a factional and cross-party struggle for power. During the Crimean War, soldiers of the British army died in military hospitals from epidemics of typhus and cholera, lack of food and medical supplies. The military expedition to the Crimea, undertaken by Great Britain using funds insufficient to carry out military operations, became the reason for parliamentary investigations and the resignation of the British government. The object of criticism of the parliament was the lack of vehicles, the outdated system of military training, medical and food security. Corruption in the British government and the army, the commission system was named as the reason for the death of British soldiers in the Crimea. Parliamentary investigations were considered a national affair, which was supposed to lead to a restructuring of the state system. The consequences of the war were the reorganization of the administration of the army and the care of the wounded, an attempt to overcome corruption in Britain and the resignation of the government.

Key words: Crimean War, Great Britain, Russian Empire, Ottoman Empire, public health, corruption.

[Е.К. Склярова, О.Н. Камалова Парламентские расследования в Великобритании в период Крымской войны]

Рассматриваются парламентские расследования в Великобритании в период Крымской войны (1853 – 1856). На основе историко-генетического метода исследования анализируются особенности внутренней и внешней политики правительства Абердина, которое было отправлено в отставку после окончания войны. Показано, что в правительстве существовали разногласия в отношении вступления страны в войну, устройства медицинских и военных департаментов. Война стала частью фракционной и межпартийной борьбы за власть. В период Крымской войны солдаты британской армии умирали в военных госпиталях от эпидемий тифа и холеры, недостатков продовольственного и медицинского обеспечения. Военная экспедиция в Крым, предпринятая Великобританией с использованием средств, недостаточных для выполнения военных операций, стала причиной парламентских расследований и отставки британского правительства. Объектом критики парламента стало отсутствие транспортных средств, устаревшая система военной подготовки, медицинского и продовольственного обеспечения. Коррупция в британском правительстве и армии, система назначения на военную службу за комиссионные назывались как причина гибели английских солдат в Крыму. Парламентские расследования считались национальным делом, которое должно было привести к перестройке государственной системы. Следствием войны явилась реорганизация управления армии и ухода за ранеными, попытка преодолеть коррупцию в Великобритании и отставка правительства.

Ключевые слова: Крымская война, Великобритания, Российская империя, Османская империя, общественное здравоохранение, коррупция.

Elena K. Sklyarova – Ph.D. (Advanced Doctorate) in History, Professor, Southern Federal University, Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation.

Olga N. Kamalova – Ph.D. in Philosophy, Associate Professor, Rostov State Medical University, Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation.

Склярова Елена Константиновна – доктор исторических наук, профессор, Южный федеральный университет, г. Ростов-на-Дону, Российская Федерация.

Камалова Ольга Николаевна – кандидат философских наук, доцент, Ростовский государственный медицинский университет, г. Ростов-на-Дону, Российская Федерация.

The Crimean War entered the history of the Black Sea countries as a military conflict in which the Ottoman and Russian empires, as well as France and England, took part. However, how was distant "Foggy Albion" involved in the events unfolding in the Crimea? What are the consequences of the war for the military-political prestige of Great Britain? The relevance of the study of the features of this war is due to the scientific, practical and political significance of the topic. An analysis of parliamentary debates as a reflection of domestic and foreign policy makes it possible to reveal more deeply the specifics of Britain's participation in this war. Who is responsible for the decisions that undermined the prestige of the UK?

In the works of Russian scientists, various aspects of this war are considered in the context of "health care of the army" [8, p.109]. It was "a military conflict in which the Russian Empire opposed the alliance of the Ottoman Empire, France, Great Britain and Sardinia" [11, p.63]. There are conflicting assessments of Lord Herbert's activities, where it is noted that the Minister of War "considered" the actions of the Russian Empire during the years of the Crimean War as usurpation, and its army formidable in numbers, and the military expedition to the Crimea was undertaken by Britain using funds insufficient to carry out military operations " [4, p.117].

During the Crimean War in Britain, "militaristic and anti-Russian sentiments grew" [17, p.83]. The Economist magazine, fueling militaristic sentiments, wrote: "We hope to take Sevastopol, revolutionize Georgia" [20]. Russian studies have noted that Lord Palmerston is "one of the main culprits of the Crimean War. Then his name became known in Russia: both in the peasant hut and in the barracks of the working people" [1, p. 182]. Speaking in Parliament in 1855, the Lord declared that the nation was unanimous in its determination to wage war vigorously, because it was convinced of the justice of the cause" [13, p. 1222-1227].

The government of the country during the years of the Crimean War was headed by Prime Minister J. Aberdeen. A native of Edinburgh was one of the leaders of the Tory party, the Minister of the Colonies, the Minister of Foreign Affairs. A few years before the war, he led a coalition government of Whigs and Peelites, becoming the 34th Prime Minister (1852 - 1855). The country was drawn into the Crimean War, after which, as a result of the resignation of the government on February 1, 1855, he was forced to hand over the seal to Queen Victoria, receiving, however, the Order of the Garter. Having entered the war, disagreements in the government on the question of war grew "as a result of internal political rivalry." Lord Aberdeen "did not support the Crimean War. But he could not resist the pressure exerted on him by Lord Palmerston's faction" [14, p. 68]. It was noted that when war became imminent, Lord Aberdeen wrote to Lord Russell that "the calamities of any war are inevitable" and decisions about Britain's participation in the war might "be unwise. My conscience reproaches me", because "in Downing Street it could have been prevented" [19, p. 204].

To protect the interests of Britain, Lord Aberdeen sent an envoy to the Ottoman Empire. Lord Stratford de Radcliffe, as a diplomat with extensive experience, carried out the instructions of the government in Turkey. A native of Ireland, a cousin of Prime Minister J. Canning first became ambassador to the Ottoman Empire in 1825, and then in 1842-1858. continued his service, earning the reputation of the "Grand Ambassador" [10] Researchers linked the responsibility for Britain's entry into the war with his activities [22, p. 501]. E.V. Tarle called him "the generous patron and savior of the Ottoman Empire" [7, p.158].

Lord Aberdeen, at the head of the government, sought to take advantage of the differences between Lords Russell and Palmerston" [9, p. 175-177]. Lord Russell in 1854 expressed his dissatisfaction with the way in which the affairs of the War Department were being managed, suggesting that the management be transferred from the hands of the Duke of Newcastle to Lord Palmerston. Deputy F. Baring noted that "Personal friendship

or personal feelings should not matter. It was the imperative duty of Lord Aberdeen to place the management of what was considered the most difficult and important post in government into competent hands" [13, p. 1158-1159]. The "Eastern Question" was discussed in the Admiralty, where, under the leadership of Aberdeen, members of the government gathered: J. Graham, Newcastle, W. Gladstone. According to the report of Captain Drummond, the Russian fleet was not in Sevastopol, but in the Kaffa Bay, which dominated the coast of Circassia, Batum and Trebizond. Lord Russell noted that "the British and French ambassadors wanted the admirals to leave Beikos Bay and enter the Black Sea. The admirals believed that if two squadrons remained in the Black Sea for two months, this would be a way to realize the wishes of the Emperor of Russia that the British and French fleets be put out of action. Therefore, the British fleet returned to Constantinople" [12, p. 402-403].

At the height of the Crimean War, diarrhea, dysentery, cholera, smallpox led to death in the army and hospitals of Britain located in the Crimea. The formation of the health care system on the eve of the war showed the need for reform in the army. Inspection, control and ventilation of military hospitals were to become an indispensable element of naval operations. During the war, the army was led by the Minister of War, Lord Herbert. He already had experience as Minister of War in 1845-1846. The reformers sought to "equip military hospitals with new systems of ventilation, water supply, the introduction of medical statistics with the help of Lord Herbert" [5, p. 165].

Corruption in the troops and the government of Britain was so obvious that even the founder of public health E. Chadwick, the Economist magazine suggested sending him to Russia after the Crimean War because he criticized corruption [20]. During the war years, "the British press, supporting Chadwick's retirement, offered to send him to the Russian Empire" [6, p. 1108]. At the same time, members of parliament did not want to take into account the merits of the reformer to the kingdom in the country's health care. During the war years, corruption led to the resignation of the reformer, who was sent into retirement "for criticizing the use of commercial facilities that are harmful to the health of the nation" [21, p. 1625]. F. Nightingale, developing Chadwick's sanitary ideas, worked in the British army hospitals in the Black Sea region, solving the problems of unsanitary conditions. According to Lord Stratford, "the success of Secretary of War Herbert was the dispatch of nurses. Success has been achieved as a result of this excellent measure" [13, p. 1123-1227].

Military actions and mortality in Crimea became the object of attention of the Parliament. Investigations have begun. The losses of the British army from epidemics were so great that Parliament was forced to appoint a committee to inquire into the condition of the army. It was proposed to introduce control of the medical department of the armies in Constantinople and the Crimea. The commission to investigate the state of affairs in Scutari, the hospitals of Constantinople was considered not connected with the government. The object of investigation and comparison was the departments whose duties included providing for the army, the hospitals of French soldiers, which were better equipped and provided. The French government provided them with mules for transportation. The disadvantage of the transport service of Britain was that, while the orderlies fell ill during transport, and the soldiers were abandoned. The dead were washed ashore on the embankment at the hospital in Scutari, where Lord Stafford "found cleanliness and ventilation, supplies of beds and blankets, amenities for the sick, that he was ashamed of the contrast in the condition of English and French hospitals. It seemed as if the French were there for 10 years, and the British came the day before, the state of the hospitals of the two armies was so different. Speaking in Parliament, he noted that a French officer remarked to him that the British were following "the system of the Middle Ages, and not the principles of modern military science." Lord posed the question "whether the system that produced

such calamity and suffering should be abolished." Visiting the hospital in Abydos, he noted that it was "a well-built hospital, but the fund for its provision has come to an end." The hospital in Scutari attracted public attention because there were "radical vices", "the hospital was unhealthy. There were no beds, the soldiers slept on mattresses, "excreting feces on the tile floor, which was not washed", calling these details "disgusting". "No one entered this hospital, whether it was a chaplain or a doctor, because he was sure that he would catch the disease." He "was forced to donate his money to the elimination of vices, the existence of which the doctors recognized." In Balaclava, he "did not find ventilation, cleanliness, no sheets, no pillowcases. Patients picked up a new disease, entering the hospital. They were wrapped in blankets "infested with parasites". And before that, "a corpse was removed from the blanket. There were no medical facilities, the wounded lay on the floor. The orderlies denounced the doctors, and the doctors denounced the orderlies, the patients died. In the Crimea, he saw a procession of wounded English soldiers being carried on French mules, and in some cases on French ambulances" [13, p. 1221-1232].

Parliament criticized the headquarters of the British army and its entire military system. The question was raised about uniting artillery units, horse guards and commissariat under one leadership, as well as replacing ministers, restructuring the entire military system, which was compared with the French one. Liberal MP and Secretary of the Admiralty Bernal Osborne said that "In France, the headquarters was considered the head of the army, and only those officers who had knowledge of military science were appointed to it. And in England, an officer was appointed not for merit and ability, but for connections. "It was impossible for any man with any talent for command to join the army unless he could contribute a large sum of money." The commissions of a lieutenant colonel of the cavalry are "£6,175, sometimes £15,000, and a lieutenant colonel of the infantry, £4,500... this refers to a system that is rotten... we have come to a crisis. The security of our entire army is at stake" [13, p. 1136-1137].

Before the war, the government talked about uniting the leadership in the army, emphasizing the shortcomings of the railroad and shipping companies, disagreements among high-ranking and lower officials, and mismanagement. But "the late Duke of Wellington was opposed to any innovation in the military system, and consequently there were no improvements." Lord Raglan's first dispatch after landing in the Crimea stated that he could not get the horses needed to pitch the army's tents. Deputy Henley asked, "Isn't this the Admiralty's fault? Did government emigration commissioners take 27,000 out of 60,000 emigrants to Australia in a year without finding a lack of transport? The government did not use the country's resources without providing funds for the successful completion of the Crimean campaign. The question was raised why there were no proper measures to move the army, although the material resources of the country are great. It was believed that "the investigation will be a national matter, leading to a restructuring of the government, preventing the repetition of mistakes in the future." J. Henley was the oldest member of Parliament and the House of Commons, served as President of the Board of Trade in the governments of Derby, was a member of the Privy Council. In his opinion, "the government is negligent in its duties, sending troops abroad without the most common necessities. Highly educated people with special training were required." At the same time, it was emphasized that "the proposals were put forward "not only from factional motives" [13, p. 1138-1145].

Admirals of the British Army, defending the Admiralty, to whose department they belonged, declared that "everything was wrong and rotten in the Horse Guards." The Conservative Party deputy from the City of London, W. Beresford, as a former secretary for war, accusing the government of "dirty miserable economy", believed that "the army of England was rotten, its position in Sevastopol was heartbreaking." He defended Lord Raglan, who throughout his career was Wellington's trusted secretary: "Raglan was slandered,

presented in a false light, and the expedition to the Crimea was undertaken against the advice of Lord Raglan, who was against the military operation in the Crimea" [13, c.1147–1153].

MPs called on the government to take measures to consolidate and save on army management. According to E. Rice, "The War Department is responsible for all the negligence and misfortunes that occurred between Balaklava and Sevastopol. The lack of mules, carriages, fresh meat - all this must be attributed to the War Office. Their first duty was to see to it that the valiant men who fought in our battles did not die a miserable death because of our neglect." Deputy Bentik expressed doubts "about the incompetence with which the war was fought. The result of a split in the government could be the removal of executive power." At the same time, he said "about the dexterity of political intrigues than the impulses of political patriotism. The course of the coalition government was a continuous struggle for place and power. The aim of the part of the Cabinet, headed by Lord Aberdeen, "was not to fight to defeat Russia in the Crimea, but to defeat the Whigs. The disasters that befell the army should be attributed to the negligence and incompetence of the coalition government" [13, p. 1156-1163].

Member of Parliament Rich emphasized that "the military reputation of the country in the eyes of the whole world and the remnants of our gallant army are involved in the debate. There was a question of replacing the Duke of Newcastle. But Lord Aberdeen did not." If it were not for the free press in Crimea, the army could have suffered even greater hardships, and the public would have remained in the dark." The press raised the national feeling in every village of the country by publishing letters from all the ranks of the army. He condemned the accusations of the admirals, believing that "Admiral C. Napier brought one of the best fleets that we have ever sent to the sea, returning the fleet back, going through difficult navigation, without losing a single ship" [13, p. 1164-1167].

In the middle of the 19th century, Odessa was considered an open and accessible city for Russian troops from all sides with a population of 140,000 people. Many MPs had close relatives among the victims. Member of Parliament B. Lytton noted that "The British public underestimated the power of Russia. Odessa lay in front of them, taken by surprise and almost defenseless - this is a large warehouse of the Russian enemy, ammunition, provisions, troops. He asked, "Have Odessa been spared for the sake of humanity? Odessa was the breadwinner of Sevastopol. To spare the arsenals, the granaries, the marketplace, the nursery of an enemy stronghold, was the greatest inhumanity towards the British army, which was rotting before the walls of the city. If Odessa were your base and not Russian, if you found that you could not invade the Crimea until the end of September, you would postpone this expedition until spring instead of sending your troops to decompose piecemeal" [13, p. 1168-1172].

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, defending the government against the accusations, said that in Britain the resignation of the government "is enough to cause a great party conflict and attract enormous public interest." He believed that the parliament should take into account the reasons for the state of the army in Crimea (health risk, climate), emphasizing that "it is impossible to introduce the army without health risk", and that he "does not believe in the stinginess of the parliament" and is not ready to admit that "£14,000,000 per year, which is about the average amount allocated during peace, is not enough to provide means of defense. As a member of the cabinet of the Earl of Aberdeen, defending the Secretary of War, Lord Raglan, the Medical Department, the Commissariat, the Department of Adjutant Generals concerned with the administration of the army, he was opposed to a vote of no confidence in the government, a procedure which "had no basis in the constitution, nor in the practice of previous parliaments", "useless and harmful to England" [13, p. 1178-1207].

B. Disraeli, supporting the need for an investigation and a chancellor, opposing the resignation of Newcastle and the appointment of Lord Palmerston, noted that "a great army perished in the distant country to which it was sent. It was an army of 54,000-56,000 and only 24,000 or 26,000 died. The reports that exist on this matter are conflicting. But unlike the Chancellor, he considered the "investigation to be constitutional." At the same time, he emphasized that he "will not participate in any movement in the House to select one member of the Cabinet and make him a scapegoat for a policy for which all his colleagues are equally responsible." B. Disraeli stressed that he had no doubt that "the Duke of Newcastle was appointed to a position with the most laborious duties", for which "he was not equal to all his colleagues... The Duke of Newcastle, as a politician, was brought up and brought up on the benches of conservatives, owed his appearance and his success in public life to this party." At the same time, he stressed that before the Crimean War, "England was the leading power in Europe, but is there even one person in this House who can pretend that she holds this position now?" [13, p. 1201-1220].

Lord Palmerston, supporting Disraeli, declared that he did not single out the Duke of Newcastle as one of the members of the Cabinet for special condemnation, but that the entire Cabinet, which are his colleagues, was also responsible with him. As for the head of the War Office, public opinion treated him unfairly. We have always thought about the balance of the party and rank ourselves according to the party to which we belong... We do not deny that there are circumstances related to the state of our army in Crimea that were catastrophic." Regarding military criticism, he said that "most of it had no basis ... What would be the position of our army in Odessa, an open and unfortified city, within reach of all the military resources of Russia?" Lord Palmerston considered that the resignation of the British government was a "dangerous precedent", a "disappointment for the nation", "does no honor to the House of Representatives, and will lead to inconvenient results abroad". He was against showing "Europe the sad spectacle of the country, with party and political struggle... We will not discredit parliamentary institutions, allowing the world to believe that we are not able to cope with the difficulties of the great crisis" [13, p. 1222-1226].

The Earl of Aberdeen, at the signing of the Paris Peace Treaty of 1856, noted that he sincerely wished to prevent the disasters of the war, rejoiced at the restoration of peace, considering it "worthy of the Crown of Her Majesty. The treaty following the results of the war corresponds to the goals for which the war was started, and will meet with the approval of the country. He believed that "there is no one who would not hesitate to say that this was one of the most unjust and unnecessary wars in which the country has ever participated ... And the general condemnation of the country on this occasion was clearly expressed." At the same time, he expressed doubts about how the article on the neutralization of the Black Sea, which is "open to the whole world," will work. Neutralizing it "will be almost impossible. The Turkish fleet can enter the Black Sea whenever it pleases... But if Russia had reason to fear an attack by the Turkish fleet and turn to you, then you must either guarantee her protection from any such attack, or allow her to prepare for her own defense. Or your neutralization "will lead to nothing" [15, p. 1947-2028].

After the Crimean War, Lord Herbert took up the creation of the Military Medical School, which was reorganized into the Royal Hospital for wounded soldiers and veterans of the Crimean War. On his initiative, the "Royal Commission for the Health of the Army" was created. Army health care was led by a member of the Royal Society of Surgeons Parks, under whose leadership the sisters of mercy cared for the sick and wounded in Renkyo [16, p. 441]. The Nightingale Museum became "a sociocultural phenomenon of the Victorian era" [2, p. 88]. Lord Stratford became the first career British diplomat to be honored with a statue in Westminster Abbey after his death. The anti-Russian politician played a significant role as ambassador to Constantinople in the events leading up to the Crimean War. His monument stands next to the statue of his cousin, Foreign Minister J. Canning. A

monument to the Minister of War, Lord Herbert, was erected in the 20th century. "F. Nightingale was awarded the Royal Red Cross. The famous nurse developed the ideas of E. Chadwick after the Crimean War, advocating the introduction of the institution of sisterhood and healthcare not only for the army, but also for the poor" [17, p. 26]. "The merits of E. Chadwick a century after the Crimean War are rightfully recognized in Great Britain, the USA and Russia" [3, p. 20].

As a result of the parliamentary session, the majority decided to establish a Commission to investigate the problems of the British army in the Crimea. MP Müntz, supporting the investigations, remarked that England was "in the hope of getting rid of a weak administration which had sacrificed their best blood, squandered their dearest treasure and dishonored their country". J. Roebuck indicated that ministers acknowledge that the state of the army was "heartbreaking." The ministers tried to defend themselves against the accusations by claiming that they had sent enough supplies to Balaklava to comfortably support the army. But we "entrusted to Her Majesty's Government the fate of a gallant army and a great nation. Finding out the state of our army becomes our duty. For every catastrophe that may occur in the future, we will be responsible" [13, p. 1227-1230].

Thus, during the Crimean War, there were disagreements in the British government regarding the need for the country to enter the war, the organization of the Admiralty, administrative, medical and military departments. The war became part of a factional and cross-party struggle for power. Members of Parliament insisted on a vote of no confidence in the British government, suggesting that the Minister of War and the government resign. The object of criticism of the parliament was the lack of vehicles, the outdated system of military training, medical and food security. Corruption in the British government and the army, the system of appointment for military service for commissions caused military failures. Parliamentary investigations were considered a national affair, which was supposed to lead to a restructuring of the state system and government, preventing the repetition of mistakes in the future. The military expedition to the Crimea, undertaken by Great Britain using funds insufficient to carry out military operations, became the cause of parliamentary investigations. The consequences of the war were the reorganization of the administration of the army and the care of the wounded, an attempt to overcome corruption in the government and the army, and the resignation of the British government.

Литература

1. *Виноградов В.Н.* Лорд Пальмерстон в европейской дипломатии // Новая и новейшая история. 2006. № 5. С. 182.
2. *Волкова Д.В., Склярова Е.К., Топчий И.В.* Музеи Великобритании как социокультурный феномен викторианской эпохи // Гуманитарные и социально-экономические науки. 2019. № 3 (106). С. 88.
3. *Гутиева М.А., Склярова Е.К.* Сравнительный анализ социальных реформ России и Великобритании в первой половине XIX века // Гуманитарные и социальные науки. 2015. № 1. С. 19.
4. Парламентская деятельность и политические взгляды военного министра Великобритании С. Герберта в годы Крымской войны / М.В. Михайлов, Е.К. Склярова, Р.М. Ахмедов, Ф.М. Мустафаев // Былые годы. 2022. № 17 (1). С. 117 – 125.
5. *Склярова Е.К., Переверзева Д.О., Камалова О.Н.* Флоренс Найтингейл и лорд Герберт в годы Крымской войны // Медики – герои войн и локальных конфликтов Материалы Всероссийской научно-практической конференции с международным участием. Ростов-на-Дону: Ростовский государственный медицинский университет, 2017. С. 164 – 165.

6. Становление системы общественного здравоохранения Российской империи и Великобритании в XIX – начале XX вв. // Склярова Е.К., Гутиева М.А., Камалова О.Н., Засеева Л.Т. // Былые годы. Российский исторический журнал. 2019. Т. 3. № 53. С.1106.
7. *Тарле Е. В.* Крымская война. Т.2. М.-Л.: 1944. С. 158.
8. *Харламов Е.В., Склярова Е.К., Киселёва О.Ф.* Милосердие как призвание. Ростов-на-Дону: Мини Тайп, 2017. С. 61, 109.
9. *Brown D.* Palmerston and the Politics of Foreign Policy, 1846 – 1855. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002. P. 175-177.
10. *Byrne L.* The great ambassador: a study of the diplomatic career of the Right Honorable Stratford Canning, KG, GCB, viscount Stratford de Radcliffe, and the epoch during which he served as the British ambassador to the Sublime Porte of the Ottoman Sultan. Ohio State University Press, 1964. P. v.
11. Sklyarova E.K., Gutieva M.A., Gafiyatullina G.Sh., Kamalova O.N. English Medium: History. Ростов-на-Дону. 2018. С. 63.
12. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates. 3-rd Series. 1855. Vol.136. с.1121– 1233.
13. Hansard Parliamentary Debates. 3-rd Series. 1855. Vol. 139. P. 954 – 1018.
14. *Krein D.* War and Reform: Russell, Palmerston and the Struggle for Power in the Aberdeen Cabinet // Maryland Historian. 1976. № 2. P. 68.
15. Order of the Day for the Consideration of the General Treaty between Great Britain, Austria, France, Prussia, Russia, Sardinia, and Turkey, for the Re-establishment of Peace // Hansard's Parliamentary Debates. 3-rd Series. 1856. Vol. 141. с. 1947 – 2028.
16. *Shepherd J. A.* The Crimean Doctors: a History of the British Medical Services in the Crimean War. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1991. Vol. 1. P. 441.
17. *Sklyarova E.K.* Crimean war and establishing of public health system in Great Britain. Научный альманах стран Причерноморья. 2017. № 1 (9). С. 25.
18. *Sklyarova E., Kamalova O.* Crimean War: Medical and Social Characteristics and Consequences // Научный альманах стран Причерноморья. 2020. № 4 (24). С. 83.
19. *Spencer W.* The Life of Lord John Russell. London, 1889. Vol. II. P. 204.
20. The Economist. 1854. Aug. 5.
21. *Sklyarova E.K., Sidorenko Y.A., Safronenko A.V., Butova E.N.* The evolution of public health during the Crimean War. Былые годы. 2019. № 54 (4). С. 1625.
22. *Temperley H.* Stratford de Radcliffe and the origins of the Crimean war // English Historical Review. 1933. № 48. P. 501.

References

1. *Vinogradov V.N.* Lord Palmerston v yevropeyskoy diplomatii [Lord Palmerston in European Diplomacy]. Novaya i noveyshaya istoriya. 2006. No. 5. 182 p (in Russian).
2. *Volkova D.V., Sklyarova Ye.K., Topchiy I.V.* Muzei Velikobritanii kak sotsiokulturnyy fenomen viktorskoy epokhi [Museums of Great Britain as a socio-cultural phenomenon of the Victorian era]. Gumanitarnyye i sotsialno-ekonomicheskiye nauki. 2019. No. 3 (106). 88 p. (in Russian).
3. *Gutieva M.A., Sklyarova E.K.* Srovnitelnyy analiz sotsialnykh reform Rossii i Velikobritanii v pervoy polovine XIX veka [The comparative analysis of social reforms of Russia and Great Britain in the first half of the 19th century]. Gumanitarnyye i sotsialno-ekonomicheskiye nauki. 2015. No. 1. 19 p. (in Russian).

4. Parlamentskaya deyatel'nost' i politicheskiye vzglyady voyennogo ministra Velikobritanii S. Gerberta v gody Krymskoy voyny [Parliamentary activity and political views of the British Minister of War S. Herbert during the Crimean War]. *Bylyye gody*. 2022. No. 17 (1). pp. 117-125 (in Russian).
5. *Sklyarova E.K., Pereverzeva D.O., Kamalova O.N.* Florens Naitingail i lord Gerbert v gody Krymskoi voyny. Mediki – geroi voyn i lokalnykh konfliktov. [Florence Nightingale and the lord Herbert in the years of the Crimean War. Physicians are heroes of wars and local conflicts. Materials of the All-Russian scientific and practical conference with the international participation.] Rostov-on-Don. 2017. 163 p. (in Russian).
6. Stanovleniye sistemy obshchestvennogo zdravookhraneniya Rossiyskoy imperii i Velikobritanii v XIX – nachale XX vv. [Formation of the public health system of the Russian Empire and Great Britain in the 19th - early 20th centuries]. *Sklyarova Ye.K., Gutiyeva M.A., Kamalova O.N., Zaseyeva L.T.* *Bylyye gody. Rossiyskiy istoricheskiy zhurnal*. 2019. V. 3. No. 53. 1106 p. (in Russian).
7. *Tarle E.V.* Krymskaya voyna [Crimean War]. Vol.2. Moscow-Leningrad. 1944. 158. p. (in Russian).
8. *Kharlamov E.V., Sklyarova E.K., Kiseleva O.F.* Miloserdie kak prizvanie. [Mercy as a calling]. 2017. 108 p. (in Russian).
9. *Brown D.* Palmerston and the Politics of Foreign Policy, 1846-1855. Manchester: Manchester University Press. 2002. pp. 175-177.
10. *Byrne L.* The great ambassador: a study of the diplomatic career of the Right Honorable Stratford Canning, KG, GCB, viscount Stratford de Radcliffe, and the epoch during which he served as the British ambassador to the Sublime Porte of the Ottoman Sultan. Ohio State University Press. 1964.
11. *Sklyarova E.K., Gutiyeva M.A., Gafiyatullina G.Sh., Kamalova O.N.* English Medium: History Rostov-on-Don. 2018. 63 p.
12. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates. 3-rd Series. 1855. Vol.136. pp.1121-1233.
13. Hansard Parliamentary Debates. 3-rd Series. 1855. Vol. 139. pp. 954-1018.
14. *Krein D.* War and Reform: Russell, Palmerston and the Struggle for Power in the Aberdeen Cabinet. *Maryland Historian*. 1976. No. 2. pp. 68.
15. Order of the Day for the Consideration of the General Treaty between Great Britain, Austria, France, Prussia, Russia, Sardinia, and Turkey, for the Reestablishment of Peace. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates. 3-rd Series. 1856. Vol. 141. pp. 1947-2028.
16. *Shepherd J.A.* The Crimean Doctors: A History of the British Medical Services in the Crimean War. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press. 1991. Vol. 1. 441 p.
17. *Sklyarova E.K.* Crimean war and establishing of public health system in Great Britain. *Scientific almanac of the Black Sea countries*. 2017. No. 1 (9). 25 p.
18. *Sklyarova E., Kamalova O.* Crimean War: Medical and Social Characteristics and Consequences. *Scientific almanac of the Black Sea countries*. 2020. No. 4 (24). 83 p.
19. *Spencer W.* The Life of Lord John Russell. London. 1889. Vol. II. 204 p.
20. *The Economist*. 1854. Aug. 5.
21. *Sklyarova E.K., Sidorenko Y.A., Safronenko A.V., Butova E.N.* The evolution of public health during the Crimean War. *Bylye Gody*. 2019. No. 54 (4). 1625 p.
22. *Temperley H.* Stratford de Radcliffe and the origins of the Crimean war. *English Historical Review*. 1933. No. 48. 501 p.