Saunders D. [A Russian Consul in Newcastle upon Tyne: Baron Al'fonsovich Geiking \(1860-1930\) and Anglo-Russian Connections at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century](#). *Slavonica* 2016, 20(2).

Copyright:

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Slavonica on 16-06-2016, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/13617427.2015.1119455>

Date deposited:

22/06/2016

Embargo release date:

16 December 2017

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 3.0 Unported License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/)

A Russian Consul in Newcastle upon Tyne: Baron Al'fons Al'fonsovich Geiking (1860-1930) and Anglo-Russian Connections at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century*

David Saunders

Despite the depth of his reflections on the Anglo-Russian relationship, the tsarist consul Al'fons Al'fonsovich Geiking has not attracted much attention even from specialists. A relevant recent book, for example, mentions him only occasionally (and says that he died in 1918 rather than 1930).¹ For at least three reasons, however, his many publications warrant attention. First, they reflected on the purpose and value of consular services, which have not often been subjects of investigation. Second, his 688-page magnum opus, *England*, derived much of its individuality from the fact that he wrote most of it in Newcastle upon Tyne.² Third, the book appeared in print at a turning point in the history of relations between Britain and Russia, just after the Entente of 1907, and perhaps for that reason embodied a strong sense of the ambivalence which has always characterized the two countries' dealings with one another.

Having put down roots at the end of the fifteenth century at Mitau (now Jelgava in central Latvia), Geiking's family remained prominent there until German-speaking aristocrats lost their authority on the south-eastern shores of the Baltic in the first half of the twentieth century. Members of the family figured prominently in the tsarist empire, imperial Germany, and under the Nazis. At the end of the eighteenth century, Karl fon Geiking was a favourite and then a

victim of Paul I;³ when serving as a police official in Kiev in the 1870s, Gustav von Geiking was one of the first tsarist officials to be assassinated by populists;⁴ in 1903, a novel by Elisabeth von Heyking, *Letters Which Did Not Reach Him*, briefly became 'the talk of every literary salon from St. Petersburg to New York, and from Stockholm to Calcutta';⁵ after being captured by the British in Belgium in 1944, a Nazi airforce general, Rüdiger von Heyking, spent more than a decade in British, American, and Soviet captivity.⁶ It was no surprise that, as a member of a family like this, Al'fons Al'fonsovich Geiking entered tsarist service.

In his brief period as Russian Consul-General at Bombay in 1908, one of his subordinates, Sergei Chirkin, found him pedantic, supercilious and vain. According to Chirkin, Geiking complained about the effect the Indian climate was having on his hair. His knowledge of Russian, Chirkin said, was imperfect. He did all the consular work himself, using juniors only for the transcription of his reports. He judged staff not by their everyday performance but on the basis of the number of articles they published in the consular service's in-house journal. Keen to find an accompanist for the songs he liked to sing, he sent a servant to a nearby house where somebody was playing the piano and imposed himself on the music-makers, only to forsake them after deciding that they were not his sort of people. He applied for the Consul-Generalship in London as soon as it fell vacant, and expressed displeasure when Chirkin sent him the proceeds of the sale of his Bombay possessions in the form of a banker's draft rather than in gold.⁷

His political opinions also left a good deal to be desired, for he was anti-semitic, an assistant of police agencies, an admirer of Nicholas II, and an apologist for the German-speakers of inter-war Latvia after they lost the privileged position they had occupied under the tsar. He believed that 'Jewish emigrants from Russia' often took the lead among 'Russian revolutionary agitators who try to incite [Russian sailors in British ports] to disobey their captains and rebel against the present state and social order'.⁸ He thought Russia's imperial regime was justified in prosecuting Mendel Beilis for ritual murder.⁹ He felt that Britain's readiness to allow the immigration of Jews from Russia impeded the further development of Anglo-Russian relations.¹⁰ When a letter from a Latvian revolutionary fell into his hands by accident in 1906, he passed it to the British authorities.¹¹ When a Russian told him he had information about some Latvians who had broken into a jeweller's in London and then been cornered in the 'siege of Sidney Street' at the turn of 1910 and 1911, he told him to hand it over to the British police.¹² Sergei Svatikov, the emissary whom the Provisional Government sent to Russia's embassies in western Europe in the middle of 1917 to purge them of staff who were unsympathetic to the February Revolution, engineered his dismissal as Consul-General in London on the grounds that he had collaborated with the foreign agency of the tsarist Okhrana.¹³ He wrote sympathetically about Nicholas II more than a year after the tsar's abdication.¹⁴ When objecting to the way in which Latvians and Estonians claimed precedence in the polities which took their names in 1918, he argued that 'If the Lettish and Estonian peoples assume a privileged attitude on the strength of the fact that they came to the Baltic lands

before the Baltic minorities, by the same process of argument, the Gaelic natives of the British Isles should demand precedence of the Anglo-Saxons and Normans'.¹⁵

These personal characteristics and political views have to be borne in mind in the evaluation of Geiking's publications, but the publications nevertheless repay study. In the first place, they reflect on the purpose and value of consular services. Neither British nor Russian consuls have received much scholarly attention. There seem to be only two synoptic books on British consuls.¹⁶ Michael Hughes has called British consular reports from tsarist Russia a 'surprisingly neglected source'.¹⁷ Although a recent article sketches the controversial career of a British consul who served in St Petersburg in the 1860s and 1870s,¹⁸ the best realization of the life of a British consul in Russia is not an academic account but the diary kept by Reader Bullard when he was consul in Moscow and Leningrad in the early 1930s.¹⁹ Russian consuls appear to have been even less well served than their British counterparts. Geiking pointed out how little Russian-language work there was on them prior to his own publications.²⁰ An entry on tsarist consular services in a multi-volume post-Soviet guide to the machinery of the tsarist state does not refer to any recent scholarship on them.²¹ Although, according to the website of the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Geiking called the imperial consular service 'one of the glories of Russia',²² his contention is hard to validate on the basis of recent scholarly literature.²³

Geiking wrote about consuls and related matters throughout his career. As a young man he published *Extraterritoriality*, a book about two sorts of people,

those who represent their country overseas and those who form communities of co-nationals in countries other than their own.²⁴ In Britain, in the first two decades of the twentieth century, he published two editions of *A Practical Guide for Russian Consular Officers*.²⁵ After the fall of the tsarist state, he published a large volume of essays which considered, among other things, the possibilities for consuls in the wake of the Russian Revolution.²⁶ Towards the end of his life he wrote a book and a course of lectures on the principles and practice of consular services.²⁷

For the most part, these methodological or systematically analytical publications are of only technical interest. They deal with things like the origin of the idea of consuls; the difference between 'elective' (or 'honorary') and 'state' (or 'career') consuls; the notarial, information-gathering, and other day-to-day duties of consuls; and the many different ways in which consuls were regarded and treated by the administrations of the countries in which they served. In places, however, they emphasize the attractions of working as a consul and show that Geiking was trying to improve consuls' standing and insist on their dignity. His last book ended with a paean of praise to consular life.²⁸ One way in which he tried to promote consuls' dignity was by emphasizing that they were not 'maids of all work'. Although he acknowledged, for example, that it was the duty of consuls to give information to the people who applied to them for help, he rejected the idea that they always had to leap into action on applicants' behalf. He did not speak well of two monoglot Russians who embarked at Odessa for Colombo in 1908 in the expectation that Russian consuls would solve their practical problems, or of the Russian from Archangel who, having

made his way via Grimsby to London with the intention of proceeding to America, thought that it was the duty of the Russian Consul-General in London to find cheaper deals for him when he discovered that the prices he was expected to pay were beyond his means.²⁹

In view of Geiking's apparently self-centred personality and illiberal political opinions, it is not surprising, perhaps, to discover that he approved of his chosen career and thought consuls ought to be rated more highly than they tended to be. It might be argued, indeed, that he wrote his general books to convince himself that working as a consul did not demean a Baltic German aristocrat. When he accused diplomats (whom he distinguished from consuls) of 'snobbishness',³⁰ perhaps the snobbishness was really his own. Britain seems to have appealed to him partly because it was 'the one civilized country in the world in which the aristocratic principle has retained its social, state and national significance'.³¹

Geiking may have been right, however, when he argued that consuls knew more than diplomats about the world around them. Diplomats, he felt, were remote. Because consuls were often, even usually, in places where there were not enough people from their own countries to form a community, they had to mingle with local people. Because they often served in towns in which there were only a few dignitaries from foreign countries, they were courted by local society. When there were no diplomats in the places in which they were working, they could act on their own initiative. Because French, the *lingua franca* of diplomats, was not usually sufficient to enable consuls to do their work, consuls tended to be better than diplomats at languages. For reasons

such as these, Geiking felt that consuls understood foreign countries better than their fellow countrymen in embassies.³² In his last book, Geiking distinguished between consuls and diplomats by claiming that it was not possible to understand why states behaved as they did without 'studying the details of contemporary life'. Consular services were 'extremely useful' in the accumulation of such details. Because, ten years after the end of the First World War, politics had less to do with the interests of dynasties than with the interests of people in general, diplomats had to open their minds to considerations that, in the past, they had not thought of as part of their work; in other words, they had to start thinking about the sort of activities that were once the preserve of consuls. 'The time has gone,' Geiking said, 'when one could have thought of consuls as diplomatic "small beer".' Although he conceded that the multi-volume memoirs of Maurice Paléologue, France's ambassador in Russia between 1914 and May 1917, displayed an intimate knowledge of life at the Russian court, the tsar's ministers, and the empire's upper classes, he thought that they also showed Paléologue had failed to grasp the war-weariness of the great majority of Russia's inhabitants and that 'the disaster of the revolution could have been avoided by deferring to the will of the people in good time'. Unfortunately, Geiking pointed out, 'The ambassador did not know Russian and could not or would not enter into contact with the people who were on the verge of deciding Russia's fate independently of the imperial court and the government'. Paléologue would have been well advised, Geiking implied, to listen to people who had the ear of ordinary Russians. Among these, Geiking would certainly have included French consuls.³³

Geiking's *England* reflected his general beliefs about consular work by concentrating on what might be called 'non-ambassadorial' rather than 'patrician' Britain. After a brief prefatory chapter entitled 'England as the teacher of nations', in which he declared that he was neither an Anglophile nor an Anglophobe and acknowledged that the British could have an unduly high opinion of themselves but informed his Russian readers that there was much they could learn from them (especially now that, in the wake of the 1905 revolution, their own country had acquired a constitution),³⁴ the book's first substantial chapter, 'Domestic and Social Life in England', dealt with the everyday life of ordinary British people, observing, among other things, that they got up early in the morning, washed thoroughly, lived in small two-floor houses with unheated bedrooms upstairs and dayrooms heated by fireplaces downstairs, did not need Russian-style stoves, and slept with the windows half-open.³⁵ This was not an opening likely to interest an ambassadorial reader.

Nor did much of the rest of the book have a great deal to say to an imaginary 'ambassadorial' reader. Only three of the nineteen chapters ('The Aristocratic Principle in England's State and Social System', 'The Democratic Movement in England's State and Social System', and 'Anglo-Russian Political Relations') spoke of political parties, central government, and the sort of high-level affairs in which diplomats rather than consuls engaged.³⁶ Admittedly, the first two of these chapters demonstrated views that a tsarist ambassador might have been expected to admire, for, as we have seen, 'The Aristocratic Principle' praised Britain for continuing to set store by aristocracy, and although 'The Democratic Movement' provided a broadly sympathetic account of the history of

the British parliament, it admired Britain's retention of a property qualification for the vote, condemned socialism, expressed the opinion that the principle of 'one man, one vote' would lead to 'the dictatorship of the proletariat' (and perhaps Britain's decline), rejected the idea that Russia should imitate Britain's political system to the extent of making the tsar's ministers responsible to the Duma, and spoke enthusiastically of the principle of a 'balance of powers' among the various agencies of government. Thus Geiking made clear his lack of sympathy for radical political change.

Politics, however, were not his principal concern. Apart from the three obviously political chapters of *England* and a chapter about the structure and practice of the consular profession ('The Russian Consular Service by Comparison with Others'³⁷), the book was essentially about economic matters. In respect of these, Geiking was in a privileged position, for, as a consul, one of his main duties was to promote trade between Russia and the countries in which he served. He wrote reports not only for the tsarist Ministry of Foreign Affairs but also for the Ministry of Trade and Industry.³⁸ After his dismissal from the consular service in the summer of 1917, he applied unavailingly to the Russian Ministry of Trade for appointment as its London agent.³⁹ The greater part of *England* demonstrated how well-suited he would have been for such a role. Collectively, the book's chapters on coal-mining, the British iron industry, industrial inventions, the co-operative movement, 'The workers' question and socialism in Great Britain', landholding, the physical movement of the population ('The Migration Question'), the circulation of cheques, Britain's trade policy, 'Russian Commercial Seafaring in British Waters' and 'Ways of Increasing

Russian Exports to Britain' forged a picture of early twentieth-century Britain that depended on a consul's rather than a diplomat's experience of the country.⁴⁰ No tsarist ambassador could have written these chapters.

A pronounced bias in the direction of economic affairs was only one of the book's distinctive features. A second (and the second reason why the present article claims that Geiking's publications repay study) was its regional flavour. For most of the decade prior to the publication of *England*, Geiking was based in Newcastle upon Tyne, nearly three hundred miles north of London and fewer than eighty miles south of Scotland. His official title between 1899 and 1908, 'Russian Consul for Scotland and the Northern Counties of England',⁴¹ indicated responsibility for Russian interests in the English north-east and nearby regions that, in some cases, differed from each other almost as much as they differed from the southern parts of the United Kingdom. As an ethnic German from a part of the Russian Empire whose population was predominantly Latvian, Geiking possessed a native sense of geographical and ethnic diversity, but his geographical base in the years when he was writing *England* probably inclined him to think even harder about the differences between the different parts of the United Kingdom than he would have done anyway. Some other non-British writers about early twentieth-century Britain were much more London-centred.⁴²

Geiking provided his most general discussion of the variety of the United Kingdom in a chapter of *England* entitled 'Patriotism, Nationalism and Decentralization in England by Comparison with Russia', which argued that Britain's and the British Empire's approach to geographical and ethnic diversity was more enlightened than that of the Russian Empire.⁴³ The chapter opened

by conceding that British patriotism was very deeply rooted. 'In Archangel,' Geiking averred, 'there are Englishmen whose forebears were summoned thither by Peter the Great but who have retained their English nationality up to the present.'⁴⁴ British patriotism was not unthinking, however, for the British thought about what was best for the state as well as about what was best for a particular ethnic group. The Russian Empire, by contrast, tended to prioritize Great Russians, even in contexts in which non-Russians might be preferable. English people did not distinguish between the pure-bred English and English people of non-English descent. A pure-bred Jew, Geiking said, became Lord Mayor of London in 1905. Scots had served the British state very well. Russians, therefore, ought not to slight non-Russian inhabitants of the Russian Empire. Most of the Russian Empire's non-Russians had become subjects of the tsar only because Russia had conquered them. Russian Germans, Geiking's own ethnic group, posed no threat to the rulers of the Russian Empire. On the contrary, '[T]he qualities of Russian Germans ... are rooted ... in their civilized consciousness of their organic legal bond with the state of which they are subjects, and in the statist spirit which has distinguished the Germanic peoples from of old in world history'.⁴⁵ According to Geiking, both Britain and Russia were made up of combinations of Germanic and Slavonic elements, but Britain, he implied, had dealt with the mix better than Russia had. Although he said he was 'very far from intending to promote non-Russians to the detriment of the Great Russian tribe',⁴⁶ he wanted non-Russians to be treated with greater consideration in the Russian Empire. The importance of 'the principle of nationality', he felt, had been exaggerated in the life of states in the nineteenth

century.⁴⁷ 'Great Russian nationalists' thought it reasonable that, although Russians constituted only 43.5% of the total population of the Russian Empire, they had the right to 'stamp their ethnographic particularity' on the other 56.5%.⁴⁸ In Geiking's opinion, this view was unacceptable. What the Russian Empire needed was decentralization. Russians could learn from the experience of British-ruled Canada and South Africa that 'Enforced Russification and the administrative oppression of outlying parts of the empire by the centre are harmful and dangerous'.⁴⁹ Anglo-Saxons had enjoyed success in both hemispheres of the globe because, except in Ireland, Britain placed no emphasis whatever on the principle of 'tribal origin'.

If emphasis on economic affairs and sympathy for ethnic and regional diversity were key features of Geiking's *England*, more striking than either was the way in which, at many points, it brought the two features together. Without first-hand experience of north-east England, Geiking could not have devoted so much of his principal book to the particular sorts of economic activity on which he concentrated.

From the point of view of a Russian official whose duty was to promote trade, the Newcastle area had two advantages, geographical orientation and productive capacity. Because it looked east across the North Sea in the direction of the Baltic, it was more likely than most parts of Britain to send goods to Russia. In 1908, one of Geiking's fellow Russian consuls said of Liverpool that it 'participates in trade with Russia to a lesser extent than the eastern English ports turned in our direction – London, Hull and Newcastle upon Tyne'.⁵⁰ Even more importantly, at the time Geiking was in north-east England

the region was a world-leader in iron, steel, coal, and shipbuilding. By number of workers, Armstrong's Elswick Works on the western edge of Newcastle was probably the second-largest manufacturing plant in Britain.⁵¹ A Russian survey of the world's shipbuilding published in the same year as Geiking's *England* observed that 'Few succeed in their own lifetimes and thanks only to their personal talents and hard work in creating such a colossal business as that set up by Lord Armstrong on the banks of the Tyne'.⁵² Ships built in the Newcastle area for late-imperial Russia included the icebreakers *Ermak* and *Sviatogor* (at Armstrong's Low Walker shipyard) and many vessels for the Russian Volunteer Fleet (at Hawthorn Leslie's shipyard on the south side of the Tyne at Hebburn).⁵³ Between 1893 and 1913, the River Tyne despatched some six or seven hundred thousand tons of coal to Russia each year.⁵⁴ A table of Russian ships and Russian tonnage in British ports in the years 1911 and 1912 had Newcastle at the top and the nearby ports of Blyth, Middlesbrough, Hartlepool, and Sunderland not far behind.⁵⁵ When Germany prevented seaborne delivery of British coal to northern Russia in the First World War, Russia suffered.⁵⁶ Representatives of the Russian Duma who came to Britain to inspect civilian contributions to the war effort in 1916 made Newcastle one of their stops for the sake of 'the important naval and military work' at Armstrong's.⁵⁷

Tsarist Russia had had representatives in Newcastle long before Geiking.⁵⁸ Although, for most of the nineteenth century, they were of the 'elective' rather than the 'state' variety (British subjects rather than subjects of the tsar), one of them inspired a remarkable degree of Russophilia in a junior employee who grew up to be a famous campaigning journalist.⁵⁹ In 1893, in the

wake of discussions at State-Council level of 'the need to increase the number of Russian consular workers abroad',⁶⁰ Russia opened a 'state' consulate in Newcastle.⁶¹ Seven subjects of the tsar were to work as consuls in the city in the next twenty-five years.

The three who held the position before Geiking's appointment in 1899 differed in the use they made of the position. Iurii Sergeevich Kartsov interests scholars today because of his right-wing geopolitical views.⁶² Newcastle probably did not appeal to him very much. Although appointment as consul there offered him a way back into overseas service (he had had to leave Bulgaria after the rupture in Russian-Bulgarian relations in the later 1880s), and although it enabled him to improve his material circumstances, his wife wrote that she and her husband found life in the city 'dreadfully expensive, there is no comfort, the food is impossibly wretched'.⁶³ To judge by the complaints which the British Foreign Office received from the Newcastle Chamber of Commerce about the short opening hours of the Russian consulate in the period of Kartsov's consulship,⁶⁴ he did not take his official duties very seriously. On the other hand, his wife said of him when they were in Newcastle that he 'reads and studies the country' and that 'For him, a period in Newcastle has been positively useful'.⁶⁵ A year after returning to Russia, under cover of anonymity, he published a long pamphlet or short book entitled *Radical England: Its Economic Crisis and Claims to World Domination* which foreshadowed the Anglophobia he was to express more openly after resigning from the Russian foreign service in 1902.⁶⁶ In short, he seems to have devoted his time in Newcastle to developing his geopolitical opinions, not to the mundane duties of a consul.

The next two Russian consuls in Newcastle took their duties more seriously. Dmitrii Ostrovskii arrived with instructions to investigate whether a Russian 'state' vice-consulate might be established at nearby Sunderland, which, in due course, it was.⁶⁷ Nikolai Brunner attended the launch of Admiral Makarov's *Ermak* at Low Walker to the east of Newcastle city centre in October 1898 and wrote articles about British industry on the basis of his work in the region.⁶⁸

Whatever they made of Newcastle, however, none of Russia's first three state consuls stayed there very long. Geiking, on the other hand, stayed for more than eight years and became a significant presence in the region. He asked to see Lord Armstrong's estate and factory shortly after his arrival.⁶⁹ He attended many local functions.⁷⁰ He played a significant part in saving the life of a Russian sailor whom a local court had sentenced to death for murder.⁷¹ He presented medals to seven coastguards and members of the Tynemouth Volunteer Life Brigade for rescuing a Russian sailor.⁷² He wrote to a Newcastle newspaper about technical matters to do with the import of Russian butter and grain.⁷³ Just before he went to India as Russian Consul-General, the local university awarded him an honorary degree.⁷⁴ After he came back to Britain to be Consul-General in London, north-east England continued to play a part in his life. He attended the London marriage of the daughter of the Russian ambassador to a son of Viscount Ridley (one of the north-east's most prominent inhabitants).⁷⁵ He kept in touch with the Russian who had been condemned to death for murder in north-east England.⁷⁶ He received support from many north-easterners after his dismissal as Consul-General in London in the summer of

1917.⁷⁷ In short, he exemplified the view he to which he gave voice in his methodological analyses of consular work, that consuls who executed their duties conscientiously tended to be fully engaged with the places in which they served.

He was close, above all, to the economic life of north-east England. All the main chapters of *England*, those which centre on economic affairs, took as their points of departure industrial activities in or near Newcastle. To take the most striking example, the book's chapter about coal opened with a detailed description of a visit Geiking made to the mine at Seaton Delaval, half an hour by train from Newcastle (from which, he said, significant quantities of coal went to Russia). The mine employed 3,000 workers, produced 2,000 tons of coal a day, cost the bosses £250,000 a year in wages, and paid £12,800 in rent per year to the owner of the land beneath which it was located. It contained 'no fewer than sixteen sheets of coal, separated by layers of rock, of which,' Geiking said, 'only the two richest have been worked so far'.⁷⁸ Mining operations, Geiking pointed out, did not necessarily start at the top and work down, for sometimes the most valuable coal was at a low level. 'In County Durham,' he said, 'the most valuable coal, so-called gas coal, from which gas for lighting comes, lies significantly lower than the other coal layers which give material for heating. For this reason the working of the coal there begins from the lowest layers'.⁷⁹ Although the work of stone-breakers in mines was actually harder than that of miners, any work at 500-600 metres below ground was unpleasant. People did it because they got used to it and because it was fairly remunerative. Because miners were paid not by the day but by the number of

coal wagons they filled, they took their children underground with them to fill the wagons (provided the children were at least twelve years old). As a result, mining became a sort of hereditary occupation and mining communities became very tight-knit. In the village of Seaton Delaval, all the houses belonged to the local coal company. Whereas the work of the ordinary miner had not been mechanized to any great degree and remained rather traditional, the work of the head of the mine was sophisticated, because it involved understanding new technical developments as well as the ramifications of world trade. By contrast with other branches of industry, not many ordinary miners rose to be heads of mines; they did not have much incentive to do so, for their wages had been going up steeply since 1895.

Geiking's chapter on the British iron industry depended on evidence from north-east England to an even greater extent than his chapter on coal, for more than half of it narrated the history of Newcastle's principal industrial establishment, Armstrong's.⁸⁰ Geiking told his readers of the company's foundation in the 1840s, its initial concentration on hydraulic cranes, its move in the direction of gun-making, William Armstrong's surrender of his gun patent in return for official honours and orders, the end of the official orders and the company's consequent need to find overseas buyers, its turn to shipbuilding in 1868 and merger with the local shipbuilder Charles Mitchell in 1882, the two men's construction of a new shipbuilding yard at the west end of Newcastle in 1883, their conversion of the firm into a joint-stock company, improvements to Armstrong's guns, the company's establishment of a branch at Pozzuoli near Naples in 1885, its merger with Whitworth of Manchester in the 1890s, its plans

for a big increase in the size of the ships it could build, its 23,000 current employees (scheduled to go up to 25,000), and the enormous range of products the firm was capable of producing. As Geiking said, among manufacturers of iron and steel Armstrong's was second only to Krupp's. Having occupied only 5.5 acres in 1847, in the early twentieth century its main site in the Newcastle suburb of Elswick occupied 130. Despite the fact that its wages bill was about £37,000 per week, between 1899 and 1906 it paid dividends of 15 or 20 per cent.

The general title of the next chapter of the book, 'Industrial Inventions in England', concealed the fact that it too owed a very great deal to Geiking's experience of Newcastle.⁸¹ Like much of the chapter on Armstrong's, it related mostly to shipbuilding. The key feature it sought to convey was the recent appearance in north-east England of 'steam turbine engines, successfully applied in the sphere of shipbuilding technology'.⁸² Only after speaking mostly about ships did it turn to a sort of invention in which the north-east of England did not figure prominently, the automatic coupling of railway carriages. The chapter began by telling readers that Charles Parsons had had the idea of applying steam power to turbines in Newcastle in 1884. The basic difference between turbines and the sort of steam engine that preceded them was that, instead of cylinders, turbines had screw-shaped blades on shafts. The inventor had set up the Parsons Marine Steam Turbine Company in an eastern suburb of Newcastle in 1894. He constructed *Turbinia*, the world's first ship driven by steam turbine, in the same year. Until 1901, turbines were used only in small ships, because they made big ships difficult to steer. Then Parsons solved the

problem and in 1901-2 Denny of Dumbarton (in Scotland rather than north-east England, but also in the consular district for which Geiking was responsible) built the first big turbine-driven passenger steamships. In 1906, Geiking reported, no fewer than ten ships under construction in Britain were to be driven by steam turbines, including Cunard's massive *Lusitania* (which was built in northern Ireland) and *Mauretania* (the biggest ship ever built on the River Tyne). The first turbine-driven warship was the third-class cruiser *Amethyst*, launched in Newcastle in 1904. Because it had proved a success, the British government had decided to install steam turbines in *Dreadnought*, 'the biggest ironclad of the English fleet',⁸³ which was finished in 1906. Meanwhile, Geiking said, other shipbuilding developments were afoot. In Sunderland (just to the south of Newcastle, where consul Ostrovskii had overseen the creation of a Russian state vice-consulate), Doxford and Sons had come up with the idea of 'merchant ships with tower-like decks',⁸⁴ which permitted the removal of their internal decks without loss of stability and so made loading easier. Because ships of this kind did not have keels but were flat-bottomed, they displaced less water and could dock in shallower harbours. An engineer was experimenting with new hull shapes in Newcastle. His 'Monitor Shipping Corporation', so called because of the Monitor class of vessel that had become well known forty years earlier in the American Civil War, designed ships whose decks were narrower than their hulls. Palmer's of Jarrow (not far from Newcastle, on the south bank of the River Tyne) was manufacturing this type of vessel. Swan Hunter and Wigham Richardson of Wallsend (just to the east of Newcastle) were building new sorts of collier. James Lang of Sunderland had come up with the idea of

repair ships, 'the floating shipbuilding factory'.⁸⁵ British inventiveness, the overall theme of this chapter of the book, found outstanding expression in the particular part of the United Kingdom in which Geiking was based.

The chapters on coal, iron, and inventions were by no means the only parts of *England* in which Geiking drew on his experience of industrial north-east England. A chapter on 'The Worker Question and Socialism in Great Britain' referred to strikes of engineers there in 1871 and 1897-8.⁸⁶ A chapter about ways of increasing Russian exports to Great Britain in the wake of the Anglo-Russian Entente in 1907 centred on a questionnaire the consul had sent to firms in, among other places, Newcastle, Leith, and Middlesbrough, all towns in his consular district.⁸⁷ The section of a chapter on 'Russian merchant seagoing in English waters' which spoke of the need to set up reading rooms for Russian sailors (to occupy them when they were far from home) turned entirely on the need to provide one on the Tyne, where, Geiking reminded his readers, 'roughly 200 ships sailing under the Russian flag call ... in the course of a year'.⁸⁸

In short, Geiking's *England* was a report on industrial rather than metropolitan Britain, on working-class Britain rather than British intellectual life, on the northern reaches of the country rather than London and the south, on Britain's productive and inventive capacity rather than its literary, artistic and musical culture. Because of the author's long residence in north-east England, his book differed from the publications of other foreign observers.

It was by no means uncritical. Although Geiking felt that Britain produced things Russia needed and admired Britain's innovations (not only the steam

turbine but also the system of paying for things by cheque, which he felt Russia ought to adopt⁸⁹), and although he acknowledged that the country offered a large potential market for Russian goods, he sensed that the prospects for its main products were declining. Britain, he hinted, was at a turning-point in its history. The country's relative economic power was diminishing. By implication, Russia might be well advised to consider training its sights on other countries or even occupying spaces that Britain would one day vacate.

These notes of caution surfaced at many points in Geiking's book. The chapter on iron, for example, pointed out that Armstrong's of Newcastle was unusual in Britain, for the USA and Germany were overtaking the United Kingdom in respect of many sorts of industrial production. This chapter claimed that, because coal and iron were running out in the parts of the world where the Industrial Revolution had begun, industrial leadership might shift in the future to European and Asiatic Russia and to China.⁹⁰ Having opened with a glowing description of the mine at Seaton Delaval, Geiking's chapter on coal went on to speak less enthusiastically about the prospects of the British coal industry as a whole. Although a commission of 1902-4 had concluded that Britain had 400 years' supply at an extraction rate of 230 million tons a year, this large quantity would not do Britain much good if coal could be procured more cheaply elsewhere. Britain was obliged to maximize her exports of coal, because otherwise she would not be able to pay for food and other imports. Although she was exporting about a quarter of the coal she mined, 'The unusual development of the world coal industry is one of the most notable economic events of our time'.⁹¹ The USA was producing more coal than Britain and could market it

more cheaply. Mainly because of strikes, the price of British coal fluctuated a good deal. America would capture Britain's markets if British coal became too expensive or if coal-traders concluded that predicting the price of British coal was too difficult. Thus Britain's apparent strength in coal might not last indefinitely. It was also possible that coal might one day be sidelined by other sources of energy, for the arrival of oil and electricity posed a potential threat to its primacy.

If, in his appraisal of British iron and coal, Geiking saw both pluses and minuses, in some parts of *England* he saw only minuses. He was strongly opposed, for example, to Britain's trade policy.⁹² The idea of free trade, he thought, was misconceived. Britain's industrial and commercial efflorescence had resulted not from free trade but from protectionism. The country had espoused free trade in the middle of the nineteenth century not on principle, but because advocating its adoption throughout the world was the best way of maintaining British economic dominance. Even at that juncture, Britain had not pursued a policy of free trade across the board. In the late nineteenth century many states had responded to Britain's commercial pre-eminence by turning to protectionism, thereby closing their markets to Britain and becoming more productive themselves. Some people in Britain and many people in the British Empire had responded with the notion of 'imperial preference', but this version of protectionism would work only so long as Britain's colonies did not start producing finished goods of their own. Britain was also going to lose her pre-eminence in the marine carrying trade because of the rise of German, Japanese, and North American shipping.

Underlying these critical remarks was suspicion or jealousy of Britain's empire, which Geiking believed to be unsustainable. His chapter on 'England's Future' went back as far as the Phoenicians to show that empires had a tendency to break up. Would Britain have the power to defend the closer integration of her empire to which, in the form of 'imperial preference', she had apparently now committed herself? 'The whole question of England's future,' Geiking concluded, 'boils down to ... whether she will emerge victorious from the forthcoming struggle for world supremacy'.⁹³ Many parts of *England* gave the impression that Geiking thought Britain would not come out on top in this 'forthcoming struggle'. 'England's Future' repeated the view that British industry was slowing down, claimed that the British were becoming 'a nation of shopkeepers' (rather than producers), and expressed the view that they were experiencing a loss of manliness as a result of urbanization (for, according to Geiking, 'Movement into towns has an unwelcome effect on the general physical standard of the people').⁹⁴ Other parts of the book, notably the chapters on Britain's co-operative movement and 'The Worker Question and Socialism in Great Britain',⁹⁵ expressed doubts about some striking features of British society which urbanization had engendered. The basic purpose of co-operatives, for example – 'to eliminate concern for personal advantage and replace it with the pursuit of the common good'⁹⁶ – Geiking thought worthy but impractical. Co-operatives had many drawbacks. They did not involve either the well-off or the really poor. Because they did not produce for the open market, let alone for export, they did not make much money. They were not viable in spheres of activity which depended on personal initiative and independence.

Co-operators held the reprehensible view that economic competition was an 'absolute evil'.⁹⁷ The British working classes, meanwhile, were misguided in their attachment to payment on the basis of the hours they worked rather than the number of items they produced, to the nine-hour and then the eight-hour day, to trade unions (which Geiking thought damaging on the grounds that they lowered productivity), and to their various political movements and organizations (Chartism, the Independent Labour Party, the Labour Representation Committee, the Labour Party). In Geiking's opinion, 'a complete peace-making and the cessation of antagonism between capitalists and workers is possible only if workers themselves become capitalists'.⁹⁸ Although he admitted that 'for the achievement of that much has been done in England already',⁹⁹ his tone left readers in no doubt that the achievement had been despite rather than because of workers' concerns.

On the basis of Geiking's chapter about 'Landownership in England and the "Small Holdings Act" of 1907',¹⁰⁰ one would be forgiven for concluding that the concerns of industrial workers were not really of any interest to him, for it gives the impression that his ideal society was one in which small-scale farming was rated much more highly than industrial activity of any kind. Multiple smallholdings, Geiking believed, generated a large and reliably conservative class of commoners. He was not in favour of large landholdings, for 'the accumulation of land in the hands of a few big landowners has a damaging influence on the state'.¹⁰¹ Russia, on the other hand, was to be complimented on her various rules about the non-fragmentation and non-alienation of peasant land, for they 'differ sharply from the disastrous *laissez-faire* from which

England's plutocratically orientated landownership has suffered until now'.¹⁰²

Clearly, Geiking rated rural economic activity more highly than urbanization, worker co-operatives, and socialist political movements.

In the light of his doubts about the sustainability of Britain's industrial society and his antipathy to some of the economic, social, and political developments which it engendered, it is tempting to conclude that, despite his claim at the beginning of *England* to be neither an Anglophile nor an Anglophobe, Geiking leant in the direction of Anglophobia. The present article claims, however, that the third reason for taking his publications seriously is that he was justified in his claim to be neither wholly sympathetic nor wholly hostile to Britain; that his magnum opus, in other words, embodied a particularly marked sense of the ambivalence which has long been a feature of the Anglo-Russian relationship. Thus, although the early parts of its chapter on 'Anglo-Russian political interactions' support the impression of hostility to Britain (in that the first two of the three periods into which Geiking divided this narrative of the Anglo-Russian relationship centred on what he believed to be British mercantile exploitation of Russia in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, and then on British antagonism to Russia in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries), the last part of the chapter was upbeat. Here, Geiking pointed out that Britain had made a 'sharp turn in the direction of Russia' after the Russo-Japanese war of 1904-5.¹⁰³ If Britain was pleased that the war weakened Russia in Asia (because of its concern for the security of its imperial possessions), it did not want its former enemy to be weakened unduly because

it needed a counterweight to Germany in Europe. As a result, it signed the Entente with Russia of 1907.

From the point of view of economics, Geiking approved of the Entente. Britain, he said, derived great advantage from its investments in early twentieth-century Russia. It would benefit hugely from Russia's oil reserves. Russia's strength in agriculture had been of particular assistance to Britain in 1904, when it had been unable to get as much grain as it needed from the USA. In return, Britain sold manufactured products to Russia. From Britain's point of view, therefore, an Anglo-Russian alliance was 'not only profitable, but natural in all respects'.¹⁰⁴ It could even serve Britain's purposes in respect of geopolitics, for Russia did not have imperial ambitions which conflicted with Britain's. The so-called 'Testament of Peter the Great', a supposedly early eighteenth-century plan to launch Russia on the outside world, was a fiction, invented by a certain Nikolai Shavrov in the second half of the nineteenth century. In reality, Geiking claimed, Russia had never had any ambitions in the direction of British India except under the short-lived late eighteenth-century tsar Paul I, who, he said (no doubt recalling the way in Paul had turned on Karl von Geiking), was insane. Far from threatening British possessions in Asia, Russia could help Britain to consolidate its hold on them. All that Russia asked in return was access to the open sea, which Britain could allow because, since the opening of the Suez Canal, it did not need to be so concerned about Constantinople as it used to be.

Geiking realized that, however sound the economic and diplomatic reasons for Anglo-Russian friendship, British people were not very well disposed to Russia's political order. He admitted that every time he had given

British people awards from the Imperial Russian Society of Sea Rescue, the recipients had made a point of telling him that they had not saved Russian sailors 'out of sympathy for Russia'.¹⁰⁵ The English press and the English stage, he said, tended to be anti-Russian.¹⁰⁶ He did not approve of these attitudes. He believed that Britain would not hesitate to suppress an insurrectionary movement 'in India or any corner of the British islands'.¹⁰⁷ Consequently, British sympathy for Russian revolutionaries was deplorable. 'The English apparently do not want to grasp the essence of the Russian revolution, which is struggling not for freedom but for the power of the mob'.¹⁰⁸ Geiking fell back on his anti-semitism to explain Britain's lack of insight into Russian politics. British public opinion about Russia, he claimed, was often directed by Jews. Jews in Britain were few in number, but Britain would have to take steps to defend itself against them as their numbers increased. The British 'Aliens Act' of 1905 would not prove a sufficiently strong bulwark. In view of the fact that the protestant Church of England was state-approved, Britain clearly thought of its members as superior to Jews. It would have to make its views in this regard clearer.¹⁰⁹

Sentiments of this kind do not incline one to read Geiking's *England* for its insights into British politics. His insights into diplomatic affairs were also somewhat blinkered, for, although he welcomed the Anglo-Russian Entente of 1907, he rejected one of the reasons why Britain had entered into it. In Geiking's opinion, Russia could not accept diplomatic relations with Britain whose purpose, even in part, was to restrain Germany, for Russia, he said, was 'connected with her powerful western neighbour by important reciprocal mercantile and industrial interests, the close relationship between the Romanov

and Hohenzollern ruling houses, and the historical traditions of her foreign policy'; she also had to 'reckon with her geographical position'.¹¹⁰

Politics and diplomatic affairs, however, were not Geiking's areas of specialism. As a consul, he knew most about economics. In the economic sphere, he had worthwhile things to say. Collectively, the economic chapters of his principal book captured Britain at a turning point in its history. He saw that, although Britain was still economically powerful, it was losing ground to Germany and the United States. He knew that Britain was still, in economic terms, a powerhouse from which Russia had much to learn. He was anxious, indeed, to make clear to Russian readers that Britain offered improved opportunities in the wake of the Entente of 1907. On the other hand, he also argued cogently that, economically speaking, the international balance of power was changing. This was the principal message of his book. Although he did not, for example, recommend that Russia stop buying British coal (on the contrary, he concluded his chapter on the subject with suggestions about 'the way in which Russia buys coal in Great Britain and a way of improving this method to benefit us'¹¹¹), he understood and pointed out that British coal might not be as important to Russia in the future as it was at the time he was writing.

Geiking's authority in this and other aspects of Anglo-Russian economic relations derived in general terms from the fact that employment as a consul required him to be well informed about them. That he gave voice to the particular insights of consuls, a voice not often heard, is one of the three main reasons for rescuing him from oblivion. The others are that his knowledge of the British economy rested on first-hand experience of one of Britain's principal

industrial regions, and that his magnum opus, *England*, came out just after the Anglo-Russian Entente of 1907, a time when Britain and Russia were thinking particularly hard about the ambivalence which seems to be a permanent feature of their relationship.

*I am very grateful to an anonymous reviewer for comments on the structure of of this article.

¹ I. R. Chikalova, *Anglovedenie v imperatorskoi Rossii v imenakh i publikatsiakh 1801-1917* (Saint Petersburg: Aleteiia, 2013), pp. 151, 159, 239. For Geiking's death see *The Times*, 24 April 1930, pp. 1, 14.

² Bar. A. Geiking, *Angliia, ee gosudarstvennyi, obshchestvennyi i ekonomicheskii stroi: Issledovaniia i nabliudeniia na imperatorskoi konsul'skoi sluzhbe* (St Petersburg: M. M. Stasiulevich, 1909).

³ Anon, *Tsareubiistvo 11 marta 1801 goda: zapiski uchastnikov i sovremennikov* (2nd edn, St Petersburg: A. S. Suvorin, 1908), p. 291.

⁴ Deborah Hardy, *Land and Freedom: The Origins of Russian Terrorism, 1876-1879* (New York, Westport, CT, and London: Greenwood Press, 1987), p. 63; Iu. Rzhevtsev, 'Puli terroristov-revoliutsionerov', *Beloe delo* (Vladivostok), 2011 № 6 (34), pp. 30-5.

⁵ Mary Rhiel, 'A Colonialist Laments the New Imperialism', *Colloquia Germanica* 41 (2008), № 2, p. 131.

⁶ *The Times*, 7 September 1944, p. 4. ; Sönke Neitzel, *Tapping Hitler's Generals: Transcripts of Secret Conversations, 1942-45*, trans. by Geoffrey

Brooks (London: Frontline Books, 2013), p. 298; Samuel W. Mitcham, *Retreat to the Reich: The German Defeat in France, 1944* (Mechanicsburg, PA: Stackpole Books, 2007), p. 247, n. 21.

⁷ S. V. Chirkin, *Dvadtsat' let sluzhby na Vostoke: Zapiski tsarskogo diplomata* (Moscow: Russkii put', 2006) , pp. 155-66.

⁸ Baron A. Geiking, 'Zadachi russkoi blagotvoritel'nosti v Londone: Donesenie general'nogo konsula v Londone', *Sbornik konsul'skikh donesenii*, 1910 № 1, p. 27.

⁹ A. Heyking, 'The Jews And The "Blood Accusation" ', *The Times*, 8 May 1912, p. 5.

¹⁰ A. Heyking, 'Anglo-Russian Progress', *Fortnightly Review*, new series, 91 (1912), pp. 111-14.

¹¹ London, The National Archives (TNA), Public Record Office (PRO), FO 371/122, folios (ff.) 548-50 ('Russian revolutionaries at Newcastle on Tyne').

¹² S. G. Svatikov, *Russkii politicheskii sysk za granitse* (Moscow: X-History, 2002), p. 153.

¹³ C. Nabokoff, *The Ordeal of a Diplomat* (London: Duckworth, 1921), pp. 90-1.

¹⁴ Baron A. Heyking, *Problems Confronting Russia and Affecting Russo-British Political and Economic Intercourse: A Retrospect & Forecast* (London: P. S. King, 1918), pp. 210-13.

¹⁵ Baron A. Heyking, *The Main Issues Confronting the Minorities of Latvia and Eesti* (London: P. S. King, 1922), p. 17. For Geiking in the context of interwar

Latvian politics, see John Hiden, *Defender of Minorities: Paul Schiemann, 1876-1944* (London: Hurst, 2004), p. 80.

¹⁶ D. C. M. Platt, *The Cinderella Service: British Consuls Since 1825* (London: Longman, 1971); John Dickie, *The British Consul: Heir to a Great Tradition* (London: Hurst, 2007).

¹⁷ Michael Hughes, 'British Diplomats in Russia on the Eve of War and Revolution', *European History Quarterly* 24 (1994), № 3, p. 351.

¹⁸ David Saunders, 'An Anglo-Russian Critic of the Abolition of Serfdom', *Slavonic and East European Review* 92 (2014), № 2, pp. 256-84.

¹⁹ *Inside Stalin's Russia: The Diaries of Reader Bullard 1930-1934*, ed. by Julian and Margaret Bullard (Charlbury: Day Books, 2000).

²⁰ Baron A. A. Geiking, *Chetvert' veka: Na rossiiskoi konsul'skoi sluzhbe 1892-1917* (Berlin: Puttkammer & Mühlbrecht, 1921), p. 8.

²¹ N. I. Khimina, 'Konsul'stvo', in *Gosudarstvennost' Rossii: Slovar'-spravochnik*, ed. by V. P. Kozlov et al. (5 vols in 7 books, Moscow: Nauka, 1996-2009), ii. 394-6.

²² 'Istoriia konsul'skoi sluzhby', www.kdmid.ru (the website of the Russian Federation's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, last accessed 7 July 2015).

²³ With the exception of A. Ia. Massov and M. Pollard, eds, *Rossiiskaia konsul'skaia sluzhba v Avstralii 1857-1917gg. (sbornik dokumentov)* (Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia, 2014).

²⁴ Le Baron Alphonse de Heyking, *L'Exterritorialité* (Berlin: Puttkammer & Mühlbrecht, 1889).

²⁵ Baron A. Heyking, *A Practical Guide for Russian Consular Officers and Private Persons having Relations with Russia* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1904, and P. S. King, 1916).

²⁶ Geiking, *Chetvert' veka*.

²⁷ Le Baron Alphonse de Heyking, *Les Principes et la Pratique des Services Consulaires: Cours professé à la Faculté de droit de l'Université de Genève en 1927-28* (Paris: Rousseau et C^{ie}, 1928); Le baron Alphonse Heyking, 'La théorie et la pratique des services consulaires', *Académie de Droit International, Recueil des cours* 34 (1930), pp. 811-911.

²⁸ Heyking, *Les Principes et la Pratique*, pp. 201-6.

²⁹ Heyking, 'La théorie et la pratique', pp. 896-7.

³⁰ *Les Principes et la Pratique*, pp. 204-5.

³¹ Geiking, *Angliia*, p. 77.

³² Geiking, *Angliia*, p. 634; Heyking, *Les Principes et la Pratique*, pp. 203-6; idem, 'La théorie et la pratique', p. 827.

³³ Heyking, *Les Principes et la Pratique*, pp. 24-6 (pages to which a contemporary reviewer paid particular attention: Arthur K. Kuhn, *The American Journal of International Law* 23 [1929], № 2, p. 482).

³⁴ Geiking, *Angliia*, pp. 1-6.

³⁵ Ibid., pp. 7-71.

³⁶ Ibid., pp. 72-107, 108-69, 539-69.

³⁷ Ibid., pp. 631-80.

³⁸ St Petersburg, Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv (RGIA), *fond* (f.) 23, *opis'* (op.) 11, *delo* (d.) 154, 'Po doneseniiam General'nogo Konsula nashego v Londone' (147 folios).

³⁹ RGIA, f. 23, op. 11, d. 775, *listy* (ll.) 163-4, Geiking to the Head of the Department of Trade of the Ministry of Trade and Industry, London, 21 August / 3 September 1917.

⁴⁰ Geiking, *Angliia*, pp. 170-450, 570-630.

⁴¹ Heyking, *Practical Guide* (1904 edn), title page.

⁴² See, for example, 'This England Is So Different ...': *Italo Svevo's London Writings*, ed. and trans. by John Gatt-Rutter and Brian Moloney (Market Harborough: Troubador, 2003), and Natsume Soseki, *The Tower of London: Tales of Victorian London*, trans. by Damian Flanagan (London and Chester Springs: Peter Owen, 2005).

⁴³ Geiking, *Angliia*, pp. 494-538.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 499.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 507.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 514.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 515.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 528.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 533.

⁵⁰ A. Miller, 'Russkaia trgovlia v Liverpule i v Irlandii', *Sbornik konsul'skikh donesenii*, 1908 № 1, p. 184.

- ⁵¹ Christine Shaw, 'The Large Manufacturing Employers of 1907', *Business History* 25 (1983), № 1, p. 47.
- ⁵² N. I. Dmitriev and V. V. Kolpychev, *Sudostroitel'nye zavody i sudostroenie v Rossii i za granitsej* (St Petersburg: Morskoe ministerstvo, 1909), p. 425.
- ⁵³ S. O. Makarov, "*Ermak*" *vo l'dakh* (St Petersburg: E. Evdokimov, 1901), pp. 119-50; Newcastle upon Tyne, Tyne & Wear Archives Services (TWAS), 130/1290, p. 60 (Armstrong-Whitworth's Shipyards Committee Minute Book 1912-16, minute of 8 February 1916: 'an order had been received for an improved "Ermack"'); M. Iu. Poggenpol', *Ocherk vozniknoveniia i deiatel'nosti dobrovol'nogo flota za vremia XXV-letnego ego sushchestvovaniia* (St Petersburg: A. Benke, 1903), pp. 232-44.
- ⁵⁴ N. R. Elliott, 'A Geographical Analysis of the Tyne Coal Trade', *Tijdeschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 59 (1968), № 2, p. 86.
- ⁵⁵ RGIA, f. 23, op. 11, d. 154, l. 47.
- ⁵⁶ I. V. Maevskii, *Ekonomika russkoi promyshlennosti v usloviakh pervoi mirovoi voiny* (Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1957), p. 210.
- ⁵⁷ *Newcastle Daily Journal*, 18 May 1916, p. 7.
- ⁵⁸ The earliest known to me is John Thomas Carr, who was appointed in 1833 (*Newcastle Journal*, 5 October 1833, p. 3).
- ⁵⁹ Joseph O. Baylen, 'W. T. Stead, Apologist for Imperial Russia, 1870-1880', *International Communication Gazette* 6 (1960), № 3, p. 281; *The Times*, 18 April 1912, p. 12.

⁶⁰ P. V. Erofeev, 'A. G. Rafalovich – agent Ministerstva finansov i predstavitel' delovykh krugov iuga Rossii', in *Otechestvennaia istoriia i istoricheskaiia mysl' v Rossii XIX-XX vekov: Sbornik statei k 75-letiiu Alekseia Nikolaevicha Tsamutali*, ed. by R. Sh. Ganelin (SPb: Nestor-Istoriia, 2006), p. 342.

⁶¹ TNA, PRO, FO65/1455, f. 213, Baron Staal' (Russian Ambassador in London) to Lord Rosebery (British Foreign Secretary), 6 September 1893, announcing the creation 'of two new consular posts in the States of the Queen, one of which is at Newcastle upon Tyne and the other at Melbourne'.

⁶² For Kartsov's main publications and some of the secondary literature about him see A. V. Repnikov, *Konservativnye kontseptsii pereustroistva Rossii* (Moscow: Academia, 2007), p. 264, n. 53. For his belief, in 1912, that Russia should align herself with Germany rather than Britain, see Iu. I. Kir'ianov, *Pravye partii v Rossii 1911-1917* (M: ROSSPEN, 2001), p. 153.

⁶³ E. M. Bukreeva, 'Kartsovy na diplomaticheskoi sluzhbe. Materialy k biografii', in Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Rossiiskoi Federatsii, *Velikii kniaz' Konstantin Nikolaevich i Russkii Ierusalim: k 150-letiiu hosnovaniia* (M: Indrik, 2012), p. 83.

⁶⁴ TWAS, 2401/1/12, minutes of meetings of the Newcastle Chamber of Commerce, May-July 1894; TNA, PRO, FO65/1481, ff. 141-2, 145, 170, 172, correspondence between the Foreign Office and the Russian Ambassador, May-July 1894.

⁶⁵ Bukreeva, 'Kartsovy', p. 83.

⁶⁶ See A. V. Repnikov, “‘Ne budem my zashchishchat’ grud’iu Evropu ot Azii” (geopoliticheskie proekty russkikh konservatorov)’, <http://www.hrono.ru/proekty/romanov/2rc43.php> (last accessed 1 August 2015).

⁶⁷ TNA, PRO, FO65/1500, f. 124, Staal to Salisbury, 14 November 1895; Heyking, *Practical Guide* (1904), p. 25.

⁶⁸ *Newcastle Daily Journal*, 31 October 1898, p. 5; Brunner, ‘Stachka angliiskikh mekhanikov (Iz donesenii konsula v N’iukastle na Taine N. Brunnera)’, *Sbornik konsul’skikh donesenii*, 1898 № 1, pp. 20-31; idem, ‘Sovremennoe torgovo-promyshlennoe polozhenie Anglii (Donesenie konsula v N’iukastle na Taine’, *ibid.*, 1899 № 1, pp. 69-79; idem, ‘Zametka o sovremennom polozhenii angliiskoi promyshlennosti’, *ibid.*, 1899 № 5, pp. 383-96.

⁶⁹ TWAS, DF/A/15/5, Heyking to W. A. Watson-Armstrong, 16/29 May and 24 May/6 June 1900.

⁷⁰ *Sunderland Daily Echo*, 11 September 1901, p. 5; *Morpeth Herald*, 9 August 1902, p. 5; *Berwickshire News*, 25 August 1903, p. 6; *Sunderland Daily Echo*, 30 January 1904, p. 3.

⁷¹ Heyking, *Practical Guide* (1904), p. 91; idem, *Practical Guide* (1916), p. 131; Geiking, *Chetvert’ veka*, pp. 407-8; TNA, PRO, FO65/1613, ff. 109-12, 125, 127, correspondence instigated by Geiking between the Russian Embassy in London and the British Foreign Office (November-December 1900); *Newcastle Daily Chronicle*, 27 November 1900, p. 3; *The Times*, 20 November 1900, p. 11, and 5 December 1900, p. 4.

⁷² *Shields Daily Gazette*, 28 March 1904, p. 6.

⁷³ *Newcastle Daily Chronicle*, 13 April 1905, p. 9, and 1 May 1905, p. 8.

⁷⁴ 'Convocation', *The Durham University Journal* 18 (1908-9), № 3 (25 March 1908), pp. 30-1.

⁷⁵ *The Times*, 28 April 1911, p. 11, and 29 April 1911, p. 13.

⁷⁶ Geiking, *Chetvert' veka*, pp. 408-13.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 462-5 (an address to Geiking in the wake of his dismissal from 154 people, many of them from the north-east); *The Times*, 3 October 1917, p. 8 (Geiking's thanks for the address).

⁷⁸ Geiking, *Angliia*, pp. 170-1.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 171.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 200-17. Modern accounts of Armstrong's include Kenneth Warren, *Armstrongs of Elswick: growth in engineering and armaments to the merger with Vickers* (London: Macmillan, 1989), and Marshall J. Bastable, *Arms and the State: Sir William Armstrong and the Remaking of British Naval Power, 1854-1914* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004).

⁸¹ Geiking, *Angliia*, pp. 218-42.

⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 218.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 223.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 224.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 231.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 275-335, esp. pp. 279-80.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 600-30, esp. pp. 602-4.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 595.

⁸⁹ Ibid., pp. 382-8.

⁹⁰ Ibid., pp. 211-17.

⁹¹ Ibid., p. 191.

⁹² Ibid., pp. 388-450.

⁹³ Ibid., p. 493.

⁹⁴ Ibid., pp. 466, 482, 487.

⁹⁵ Ibid., pp. 243-74 and 275-335.

⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 270.

⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 266.

⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 331.

⁹⁹ Loc. cit.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., pp. 336-58.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., p. 336.

¹⁰² Ibid., p. 338.

¹⁰³ Ibid., p. 554.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 569.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 559.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., pp. 560-1.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 562.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., p. 563.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., pp. 564-5, and see also pp. 370-4 for Geiking's view of Britain's Aliens Act of 1905.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., p. 569.

¹¹¹ Ibid., p. 194.