

The Rakhito Writes History, Great Britain's Campaign against Rosetta in 1807, in Light of British Archives Documents

Mahmoud Ahmed Darwish

Professor of Archaeology
Faculty of Arts – Minia University – Egypt
prof.mdarwish@gmail.com

Abstract: *This paper provides a review of the Rakhito Writes History, Great Britain's Campaign against Rosetta in 1807 in Light of British Archives Documents, which was published in October 2020. This book, which bears the name of Rakhito, which is the name that the inhabitants of Rosetta took over since the Pharaonic era. The Egyptian people, and the book highlights the preference of the people of Rosetta in repelling the invasion and defeating the British army. This book is an addition to the Arab Library, as it refutes the historical events of the British campaign from both the Arab and British viewpoints, and although the Arab point of view is marred by some ambiguity or lack of truth, the British point of view carries a truth proven by historical documents that cannot be discussed. And the reports of the enemy, who had no choice but to admit their utter failure and defeat, which wished the honor of the British Empire by the recognition of the leaders themselves, proved the failure of planning, lack of experience and vanity.*

Keywords: Rakhito, Rosetta, British Campaign, 1807 Campaign, British Army, Fraser, Ali Bey Al Salanikli, Hassan Create, Campaign against Alexandria.

First: the book's sources

1. Al-Jabarti¹

Despite the abundance of writings in Arab sources and references about the campaign launched by the British Empire's army against Alexandria and Rosetta, in the introduction to the invasion and occupation of Egypt in 1807, it relied in the history of events on the narration of Abd al-Rahman bin Hassan Burhan al-Din Al-Jabrati [1-2-3], in the book of the great "Wonders of Archeology in the translations and the news" [4], which we must refer to in this regard, as it is a basic reference for that period. However, the seeker of truth should be familiar with all the sources that dealt with this campaign, especially the documents that were preserved in the British archives, the most important of which of course are the letters and reports that were exchanged between the military leaders of the campaign, as well as diplomats, ministers, ambassadors and members of the British government. By the nature of the circumstances in which it was sent, it was mostly confidential.

Before I indulged through these historical investigations, and busy myself with achieving its points and adjusting its materials, as befits a sincere historian, I thought that an Arab writer had hovered around the fever, and in this period close to us had fulfilled something of its historical right, but I did not see one of those who put up the huge volumes. He exhausted himself and cost her hundreds of correct research, indicating sincerity in the service of history. I saw them all relying on Sheikh al-Jabarti, and they quoted him letter by letter without estimating the man's circumstances and competence, and without regard to the fact that he wrote his history, not from the sources, nor from fixed papers of the same. An archaeological value, rather his reliance on what he reached from the mouths of people and news narrators, and their mistake was more than their righteousness, in addition to that Sheikh Al-Jabarti admits in his book that he began to collect and coordinate it in the year 1226 AH (1811 AD).

That is, ten years after the departure of the French and thirteen after their entry, and four years after the British left Egypt as well, and there is no doubt that he has surrounded a lot of news of the country and the people, which made him - to a certain extent - the truthful judgments, accurate in analyzing matters, absorbing every small and big. From the life of the Egyptian people in the period he talked about and dealt with. It must have made many mistakes, and one of the least duties of historians was to resort to French and English sources, and to complete what was lacking from them, or to compare them with what he contradicted from his words.

Many writers and people of credit do not appreciate Sheikh Abdul Rahman al-Jabarti's book as a great historical monument, a glorious literary work, and a daily diary of great value for the historian, and the reason for looking at it in this eye is that people do not tend to this kind of style on the one hand. And because it is a collection of stories and incidents that are not mixed and inconsistent, on the other hand. But those who do not take matters into their appearances, and those who delve into the search for the events of those days, their circumstances and conditions, cannot help but admire that great book and its creators, so al-Jabarti is without dispute the historian of this period and the compiler of all its news, with sincerity and great effort, but he is its faithful writer, who would otherwise the history of this period remained a blank sheet, especially in the Arabic language.

Al-Jabarti kept busy collecting and restricting his news until he was surprised and all Egyptians were surprised by the French campaign against Egypt in 1798, and he was forty-four years old, and therefore he did not stop during the period of the French stay in Egypt from recording their actions, monitoring their movements, and commenting on their words and deeds, and he was most of the scholars. He meticulously recorded his notes on the society of French soldiers and their methods of organizing their lives, and described that important period of the French campaign in detail in his book, which is an essential reference.

Al-Jabarti was criticized for his stance towards the Egyptians and the French as well. The Egyptians accused him of cooperating

with the French and loyalty to them in the context of his history, and the French accused him of intolerance against the manifestations of modern civilization that they claim to present to the Islamic world and the Egyptian society, but he won great praise among the people and from Turkish rulers.

Al-Jabarti compiled the history of Egypt, which he had been busy with for fifteen years, into one book. Therefore, he resolved to write the complete history of Egypt, making his book (The Appearance of Sanctification with the Demise of the State of Francis)² [5] as one of its main chapters, so he divided the book into three parts: the first part until the last year (1189 AH) / 1775 AD), the second until the end of the year (1212 AH / 1797 AD), and the third until the end of the year (1220 AH / 1805 AD), and he called it "Wonder of Archeology" in translations and news, which is known as "The History of Al-Jabarti".

Al-Jabarti pushed his work to write his history by stopping the position of opposition to the rule of Mohamed Ali Pasha since the beginning of his rule of Egypt, and his split against the Ottoman Empire, and he kept years waiting for the events that will follow during the era of this man, and during that he monitored everything, recorded the incidents and miscellaneous, and attributed everything he says It is reported to a source of trust or an eyewitness who witnessed the event or heard about it. And he was keen to examine the public events himself in order to be honest and avoid reporting false news, and in the context of that he presented everything, as he mentioned economic conditions, commercial relations and social life, as well as exposure to religious and cultural life and news of prominent writers and scholars and prominent sheikhs, and he remained diligent in his work until a year 1237 AH (1823 AD), when the tragic killing of his son Khalil surprised him, because of his opposing position on the rule of Mohamed Ali and his revolution against the Ottoman Empire, and then he did not find the ability to complete his history, and lost his drive to complete the journey that he had started, and Al-Jabarti faithfully referred in his accounts of the English campaign in more than Subject to the different narrators in narrating the event, and presenting the various narratives that contradicted them about what happened in Alexandria, and he died in 1240 AH (1824 AD).

Al-Jabarti was complaining about the ambiguity of the past hundred years about him, that is, from 1070 until 1170 AH (1757-1660 AD), because these years precede his life, he made sure to write down the names from the official bureaus, but after that it is easy. Al-Jabarti says in explaining this: She intrigues me (the last hundred to the seventieth year), and as for what follows it, things that I have seen, and people I know, that I will tour the graves (graves) and read the inscriptions on the graves, and try my best to contact the relatives of those who have died, so that I see vacations Elders are among their heirs, and review their papers if they have papers, and ask centenarians what they know about those who lived with them. Although al-Jabarti was accurate, he did not write about an incident until he was sure of its authenticity, and he might delay the recording until he surrounded the sources that correct it, either by frequency or testimony.

In truth, a confusion occurred in Al-Jabarti's novel about the English campaign, which was reflected in the Arabic writings in one way or another, and the reliance on one source in historical writing was mainly based on the novel in which it was insane on the historical fact, as al-Jabarti did not possess the tools of modern-day historians, whether from documents Turkish or British or others, which can give the historian a complete picture of the historical event according to objectivity and impartiality, whether by the analytical or narrative method of presenting the events.

It is not easy to know how al-Jabarti was writing his memoirs, but it is reasonable to deduce from many of his accounts that he was sitting for himself after a few days, without what he appreciated, heard, or reached his knowledge, and he admits in the introduction to his book and says: "I have blackened papers in Incidents of the end of the twelfth century, the following and the beginning of the thirteenth century in which we are, in which some sites were collected in total, others were detailed verified, and most of them were tribulations that I realized, and things that I witnessed, and within that I went back to the precedents that I heard, and from the mouths of the sheikh that I received, so I liked to reunite them and restrict their ions. In the papers coordinated by the system, arranged over the years and years, and afterwards to the ninetieth, things we saw and then we forgot and remembered, and from them to our time are matters that we rationalized, restricted and enumerated, and we will mention that God Almighty wills what we perceive from the facts, according to the possibility and freedom from obstacles, until the command of God comes And that our reference is to God, and I did not mean by collecting it the service of a great leader or obedience to a minister or a prince, and a state has not been denounced in it by hypocrisy, praise or defamation of morals, for a psychological inclination, or a bodily purpose".

And Sheikh Al-Jabarti himself admits in his book that he began collecting and coordinating his book papers in the twenty-sixth year after the two hundred and thousand (1811). That is, ten years after the French left Egypt, and four years after the English campaign, so we must reflect on the amount of mistakes made by a man who collects his scattered papers after these years have passed since the incidents he writes about.

Regarding the relationship of the book of al-Jabarti with this book that is in our hands today, what concerns us in his book is what is related to this campaign and the development of events during this period, and our mission in this book is limited to the value of the news contained in it and the veracity of the documents kept in it such as publications, instructions, etc., and the proximity of that or Its distance from the historical truth, and there is absolutely no hesitation in judging that the truth in the novel was the pioneer of the Sheikh in everything he wrote.

As for the point of view that the Book of Wonders of Archeology is a historical book, there is no escaping the admission that it is not from history, according to its correct style in anything, but rather memoirs and narrations that the author restricted its parts, without arrangement or coordination, suitable for being a material for the historian, along with something more than a few Difficulty and trouble. Al-Jabarti is considered a historical phenomenon that does not have a clear explanation, especially since the historical writing has deteriorated during that period [6], and thus, the book of al-Jabarti can only be used if it is treated, searched, sifted, compared and interviewed, and this is only facilitated by painstakingly and comparing it with the sources. The

other, in foreign languages, especially with regard to the campaign's notes, writings, and official papers.

1. Douin, Georges et E. C. Fawtier-Jones (1928). *L'Angleterre et L'Égypte, La campagne de 1807*, Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale Pour la Société Royale de Géographie d'Égypte, pour la Société Royale de Géographie d'Égypte, Le Caire.

There is no doubt that the valuable book written by historian Georges Douin is one of the references that dealt with this campaign in terms of its introductions that begin since the French campaign, the political conditions in Europe and the conflicts that took place in the period from 1801 to the arrival of this campaign in 1807. This book relied on English sources related to the history of modern Egypt, besides many Arabic references that relied on al-Jabarti and foreign references, the documents contained in it come almost entirely from the Public Records Office, and belong to the rich archives that belong to the War Office, Foreign Office, and Admiralty.

3. British documents relating to campaign correspondence, represent a great importance in revealing many historical facts and expressing another viewpoint in the events of this campaign. The documents are divided into two parts [7]:

The first section: It starts from the departure of the French in 1801 until the start of preparation for the invasion of Egypt in 1806, and includes:

The documents pertaining to the war offices, including the following portfolios:

The English Archives of the War Office (W. O. 1-345, 1-346, 1-347, 6-183, 6-56).

External administration documents, including the following portfolios:

The English Archives of the Foreign Office (F. O. 24-2, 42-1, 42-2, 68-38, 78-50, 78-31, 78-32, 78-33, 78-35, 78-37, 78-39, 78-40, 78-41, 78-42, 78-43, 78-46, 78-49, 78-51).

The second section: From the start of preparation for the campaign in 1806 until the post-withdrawal phase from Egypt in October 1807, and includes:

1. The documents pertaining to the war offices. 120 documents were referred to in the following governorates:

(The English Archives of the War Office (W. O.), 1-303, 304, 305, 348, 6-56)

A. Portfolio No. (W. O. 1-303) contains eleven documents.

B. Portfolio No. (W. O. 1-304) contains twenty-four documents.

C. Portfolio No. (W. O. 1-305) contains five documents.

D. Portfolio No. (W. O. 1-348) contains sixty-seven documents.

E. Portfolio No. (W. O. 6-56) contains four documents.

- The documents of the external administration, including one document in the following portfolio:

The English Archives of the Foreign Office (F. O.), 24-3.

- Admiralty documents (Ad): 1-413, 2-1364, and include two portfolios:

A. Portfolio No. (Ad. 1-413) contains eighteen documents.

B. Portfolio No. (Ad. 1-413), has two documents.

- A Selected Collection of General Correspondence by Lord Collingwood, Deputy Admiral of the British Fleet, Royal Navy, by Newnhan Collingwood, in two volumes, London, (1828), and includes three documents.

Collingwood, Newnhan (1828). A Selection from the public and private correspondence of Vice- Admiral Lord Collingwood, 2, London.

- Paget Papers: Diplomatic and other correspondence of His Highness Sir Arthur Paget, British Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, edited by Augustus Paget, containing two documents.

The Paget papers: diplomatic and other correspondence of the R. H. Sir (Arthur Paget) G. 3. B. (1794-1807), edited by the R. H. Sir Augustus Paget, 2, London, (1896).

- Additional Manuscripts Series of the British Museum, which includes one document. The British Museum's Additional Manuscripts series (B. M. add. Mss. 37050).

Therefore, we tried in this study to combine these British documents with what was mentioned in the Arabic sources, especially Al-Jabarti, an addition that I believe has brought new in the field of historical research in what was mentioned in these British documents, as it became clear that there are fundamental differences in many events. From what was mentioned in the narrations of Al-Jabarti, which was the original source for many Arabic references in writing the historical event of this period. The published documents also give a sincere picture of events, and we should not conclude that there are no gaps: the archives always provide them, which researchers may fill more than we do.

4. We reprinted notes on an expedition to Alexandria in 1807³, "Notes on an expedition to Alexandria, 1807", which were published in 1837 and 1838, in the United Service Journal and The United Service Magazine, and the author has not been identified. He is signed under the pseudonym "Miles" [8-9-10]. It is an eyewitness story that narrates part of the events, like all the stories of the leaders participating in the campaign, such as the general correspondence of the Marine Corps Lord Collingwood and Sir Arthur Paget, but it is accurate and vivid individually, which complements, through this very fact, what the official reports were, obliged to exceed it.

Second: The most important points of difference between what was mentioned in Al-Jabarti and British documents

The most important points of difference between what was mentioned in Al-Jabarti and what was mentioned in the British documents can be summarized as follows:

Al-Jabarti replied that the goal of the English campaign led by Major General MacKenzie Fraser was the assumption of Muhammad Bey al-Alfi as governor of Egypt as a substitute for Mohamed Ali, as for the fact confirmed by British documents

that the military campaign was sent to Egypt through the strategy of the international conflict in the Mediterranean, to achieve British national security, and it was its goal, as specified by the orders issued to Fraser, is to seize Alexandria only, at the beginning, and to turn it into a naval military base - Mediterranean to confront France in the ongoing conflict in the areas of influence in the Mediterranean, and to secure the navigational route to India through Egypt, and the British ambitions later extended to Rosetta and Damietta, and after them, the whole of Egypt.

When Al-Jabarti wrote about the Mamluk division led by Shaheen Bey and the rest of the groups rejecting Mohamed Ali, and about their contacts with the British Consul in Egypt Missett, al-Jabarti imagined that the English would help them in the conquest of Cairo, but the truth is Missett needed the help of the Mamelukes in seizing Alexandria and its surroundings. To secure the strategic depth of the British forces, because the campaign came to Egypt with forces of no more than (6604) men in order to occupy Alexandria only, and there were no instructions from the British leadership permanently to bypass Alexandria, especially in the first phase of the campaign [11].

Al-Jabarti mentioned different and contradictory accounts of what he heard about rumors about the resistance of Alexandria at one time and its surrender without being resurrected at other times, and he concluded that Alexandria did not resist neither a people nor an Ottoman garrison, and some Arab references followed the same approach, and some even reached the point of saying that the city surrendered without launching one bullet, and the truth is that the people of Alexandria, according to the British documents, were mobilized to fight and were in revolt. And that the garrison resisted and inflicted some losses on the British, but the battle was between unequal forces, in numbers, in equipment, and in the arts of war.

Accusations were raised about Amin Agha, the governor of the city of Alexandria appointed by a royal decree, that he handed over the city without a fight in exchange for a bribe of money from the British, and Mohamed Ali accused him - as mentioned in al-Jabarti - he and Sheikh Muhammad al-Messiri of handing over the city, and some Arab authorities followed this accusation, indeed, she accused him of being a traitor, and the truth is that the governor of the city, when he met with the English officers who delivered him a Fraser warning to surrender, rejected the British ultimatum, and sent seeking help from the Cairo government, closed the city gates, and placed barricades behind it, and the Alexandria people went out in revolt against the English, and prepared for resistance [11].

However, many factors caused Amin Agha and the people of Alexandria to accept the surrender, the most important of which was that the British warning period was only 48 hours, and no rescue forces arrived from Cairo, and the heavy artillery shelling appeared against the garrison, whose number did not exceed 467 men, and the front defenses collapsed, and it is no secret that the artillery The English were at an advanced level and their fire was intense, and one of the main factors that helped the surrender was the withdrawal of the Ottoman garrison, and the surrender of the Ottoman naval ships charged with the maritime defense of the city without clashing with the British fleet, which would have been in a very critical position if these Ottoman battleships fired upon it. That is why Amin chose the safety of the residents and the city, and was realistic in front of these difficult circumstances [11].

It seems that those who quoted al-Jabarti on this point did not have a complete picture in the British documents, and it is no secret that al-Jabarti, when he referred to the incident of surrender, quoted Mohamed Ali Pasha as saying this accusation, and there were disagreements between Mohamed Ali and Amin Agha for not being subordinate to the Pasha. To the Wali of Egypt, and Mohamed Ali sought to be the subordination of all the land of Egypt to him, especially since the ports were one of the most important economic resources of the state, and it was directly affiliated with Istanbul and not affiliated with the governor of Egypt, until these events [11].

This is in addition to the details of the battles that took place between the fighters of Rosetta and the British forces in the two campaigns, and the documents mentioned secrets that al-Jabarti or anyone else did not mention, and the letters revealed the size of the defeat that the campaign received, and what it dealt with about the echo of the defeat on the British king, the government, the House of Commons, and the political and military leaders. In any case, these were the most important essential points, the place of disagreement and confusion in historical writing, which unleashed the justification of the rapid surrender of the city of Alexandria and its easy fall, and underestimated the size of the victory of the people of Rosetta to the extent that Arab historians attributed the campaign to Fraser and not to the British army, as happened in the percentage of the French campaign to France, not to Napoleon Bonaparte [11].

There are many matters and events that Al-Jabarti did not touch upon, which were highlighted in this book, especially with regard to the courage and strength of the popular resistance in Rosetta, and the role of the Egyptian people in Cairo and the Delta in the resistance that astonished the British leadership, and made Major General Frazer frustrated and made him ask his government to withdraw from Alexandria, the extent of the sorrow of the military and politicians in Britain as a result of the defeat in Rosetta, and forcing the campaign to withdraw quickly before the British military honor is stained with a heavy defeat, if the popular and military crowd advances from Rosetta to Alexandria.

Despite the large number of historical facts that took place on the land of Egypt, the popularity of some facts overwhelmed others, despite the fact that some of these facts took place in one place and in a close period of time. Rosetta and their role in defeating the soldiers of the English campaign led by Frazer in March 1807, knowing that nine years before this date, in the city of Rosetta and its suburbs, Idku and Edfina, there was strong popular resistance against the French campaign, especially since the fall of the city in the hands of the French after the Mamelukes fled from it, was ushering in the flame of the popular resistance and its steadfastness in facing the campaign.

So why was the incident of the defeat of the British in Rosetta known, and why was the popular resistance movement against the French not so famous? Is it because the defeat of the British took place at the beginning of Mohamed Ali's reign and at a time

when he began to impose his control on the country, and then the events of that campaign were recorded to indicate the importance of its occurrence during his reign? Or is the popular resistance to the Fraser campaign famous for its methods of defense, resistance, and the use of deception and surprise that the people have devised? And is the lack of popularity of the popular resistance of the French campaign against Rosetta also due to the fact that that period witnessed resistance movements all over the country, so that no village or city was empty of resistance, so the resistance in Rosetta became like other resistance movements spread in the country converging in its characteristics in terms of enthusiasm, patriotism, steadfastness and valor? [11].

Third: Presenting the book

This book deals with the military campaign directed by Britain to Egypt [11], which resulted in the occupation of Alexandria, whose defenses and fortifications were neglected by the Ottomans and reduced the defending forces, to the point of toppling the city that was unable to confront the forces of the campaign, and the battle that took place on the land of Rosetta, which was between unequal forces. Between the people of Rosetta led by Ali Bey Al-Salanikli, the governor of the city, Hassan Create, the leader of the popular resistance, and the British Empire, led by Major General MacKenzie Fraser, in which the people of Rosetta won a landslide victory, and achieved the most severe defeats in the history of the British military, and resolved the global conflict between the great powers at that time. It aroused regret in the hearts of political and military leaders that a small town like Rosetta was fighting and defeating the army of the British Empire, they said.

Despite the great importance of al-Jabarti's history to researchers, because of its accuracy and fairness, in addition to mentioning deaths and translations of flags, facts and events, al-Jabarti's method of writing and authoring was distinguished by accuracy in investigating incidents, and by the objectivity that we perceive from his assertion that he was writing the truth and history. He realized the importance of using documents in writing history, and he listed many of them and included his history, but this book, which was an important source for a contemporary era, most of which was aware of the contemporary of the era before his birth, as he relied on a large number of stories that proved to be incorrect.

Although the book of al-Jabarti was printed several editions at an early time and is still being printed to this day, it turns out that this historical encyclopedia was printed with an amputation incomplete due to mysterious circumstances. There are many facts that Al-Jabarti did not mention, which will be mentioned at the time, in addition to the fact that the British documents have settled a number of issues that were discussed in a great controversy in the book Al-Jabarti⁴.

The letters show the preparations for the invasion of Egypt, which began with the occupation of Egyptian ports, the first of which was Alexandria, followed by Rosetta, and then Damietta, and the possibility of controlling the country after that in a colonial campaign that was not decided by an individual. Egypt, as well as the role that Petrucci, the British Consul in Alexandria and Rosetta, played in preparing for this campaign in its various stages, as they were sending information about the strength and condition of the forces in the city and the state of batteries and defenses as well. By claiming that the aim of the campaign is not the conquest of Egypt, but rather the mere seizure of Alexandria for the purpose of preventing the French from regaining their position in it. However, the leaders' assertion of providing security and protection to all parties that must remain on friendly relations with Britain, confirms its colonial role, which included the occupation of Egypt. And put the Mamelukes on the seat of government to be part of the British Empire.

The documents confirmed that the arrogance and arrogance enjoyed by the leaders of the campaign and the British government and with them the British king made them fully convinced that an army of more than 6,000 fighters, most of them mercenaries, would be sufficient to establish a garrison in Alexandria and occupy Egypt, as if the leaders were not aware that the French campaign that was forming of more than 35 thousand soldiers, carried by 300 ships and guarded by a French war fleet of 55 ships, their presence in Egypt did not last for more than three years. And they thought that they would not find significant resistance in Egypt because of the unrest that tore it apart, and they were certain that the Mamluk army would join them based on the millennial promises of Muhammad Bey, and that the Ottoman army had been explicitly ordered to leave them the land without resistance after Britain's agreement with the Bab. Therefore, they did not accompany them with a sufficient force of knights, contenting themselves with what their Mameluke craftsmen demonstrate, and they believed that they would soon set foot on the land of Egypt until the Mamelukes from across the country rushed to them to meet them and join them, so when they entered Alexandria and did not see a trace of them, the English Consul sent them to ask of their leaders come to meet their saviors and protectors. However, they overlooked the power of the Egyptians, who disappointed the British, and inflicted a terrible defeat on the empire's army, completely changing the course of the international conflict [11].

The fear that befell the Mamluk leaders from leaving Cairo for fear of their families and their Albanian wives and Mohamed Ali, with the justification that Mohamed Ali committed a crime against their families, and that they were content with waiting for the British army, until it arrived in Cairo to hand them over to power, as well as Mohamed Ali's fear of leaving Cairo so that the Mamelukes would not jump to power, as well as the war between them and the garrison and the Albanians being emptied together to participate in the battles, he made everyone fail to come to the aid of Alexandria and Rosetta.

What confirms the agreement between Britain and the Ottoman Sultan is the proposals submitted to President Effendi, that it would be appropriate for the Ottoman government to submit a petition to His Majesty to send an English force without delay to Alexandria, and the purpose is to maintain public security and defend Egypt against the attack by France, and included Stratton's letter Secretary of the British Embassy in Constantinople to Lord Hawkesbury Minister of Foreign Affairs on January 21, 1804, the hypothesis of the occupation of Alexandria is presented here, not only as a measure to be taken in accordance with the Sublime Porte, but as a process that must be carried out against his will [11].

These letters also revealed the conspiratorial role of the Sublime Porte, which concluded an agreement with Britain allowing the occupation of the ports, which gave the green light to this campaign, and after that, after it was close to moving towards Egypt, he wanted to evade that, to appear to be opposing the campaign, as the order was issued to the governor in Egypt to put every weak part in a state of defense, and to resist the landing of the British forces by all possible means, although Alexandria does not follow the governor, but rather the Ottoman Sultan himself.

The documents revealed that the Sublime Port issued these orders after negotiations with the British ambassador and between him and Russia, which warn that measures should be taken to protect Turkish property. It is strange that these instructions did not reach the governor. It is of doubtful authenticity in the first place, so that the Sublime Porte appears to be against the campaign, but we will see blatant complicity when the Ottoman garrison and the Ottoman fleet were ordered to withdraw, in order to facilitate the campaign to seize Alexandria and Rosetta, and the British army seized the Ottoman ships, as they left the city to face the campaign without defenses except to a small extent. But the arrogance that swept the souls of the British leaders and the ignorance of the military bases and geography, the campaign fell into the trap of the resistance in Rosetta, to join them with a defeat that overturned all the parallelism and ended with disastrous results, not only on Britain but also on the Mamelukes and the Sublime Porte [11].

It is also noticeable that this campaign was hasty in choosing Major General Fraser at the beginning of February 1807 to lead and prepare for it in a short period, and this is ignorance of the military bases that are required to be adequately equipped, trained and prepared, as Lieutenant General Sir John Moore was nominated by Major Missett, who asked Windham, chief The British minister, sending him to lead this force, being the most efficient officer, and Fraser was a reserve, but his request was not met, and Fraser was nominated to lead the campaign, in response to the nomination of Major General Fox, one of the leaders in the British army, and they also gathered an army of mercenaries, Sicilians and Spaniards, and from around Different from Europe, and the British make up a small percentage. Ironically, in preparing for this campaign, Frazer directed on February 27, that is, a few days before its start, to obtain new recruits, and to give him the right to recruit men from any nation or country, in exchange for a reward of five pounds. It is interesting that in February 1807, before the start of the campaign, the British government proposed the application of a new law allowing Catholics to access all ranks in the armed forces in order to stimulate recruitment in the country. One of the documents reveals the directive to publish false reports that include an exaggeration in the number of British forces, to have a moral effect on the forces defending Alexandria, in order to end all hopes for resistance [11].

The Mamluks played an important role in this campaign, as their leader Muhammad Bey al-Alfi, Ibrahim Bey and Shaheen Bey, one of his followers, colluded with the British army, which confirms their conspiring role and betrayal in all its meanings, as their leaders were willing to sacrifice Egypt and hand it over to the British forces in return for their return to power, and the letters show the development of the relationship. Among the Mamluk leaders who were ready to cooperate militarily with the British army, however, the death of Muhammad Baig al-Alfi and the disintegration of the Mamluk parties had a bad impact on the campaign, which will become clear later, as the Mamelukes evaded their promises, and their role was limited to demanding their handover of power without participation. And they ended up backing down and retreating after the disastrous failure of the campaign, which ended in a humiliating defeat for the British forces, as well as the rejection of this cooperation by the Mamluks and confining their collusion to their leaders, and then the Mamluks retreated from supporting the occupier, and they showed willingness to cooperate with Mohamed Ali, who He harbored a clear evil for them that ended with their killing in a bloody massacre recorded in history [11].

The letters show the amount of submissiveness and employment of Mamluk leaders to the British forces, which is evidence of the weakness and humiliation they reached. Yes, he may live at a distance from the care and concerns of the mother and independent of that; but we must stop living, because we are deprived of protection and assistance from the British. " As for Ibrahim Bey, the sheikh of the country, he continues to submit when he describes the commander of the British army in Egypt, with the title "broad-minded and victorious".

Ismail Abd al-Latif Sheikh Desouk was a collaborator with the British army. In his letter to Brigadier General Stewart, on 7 Safar 1222 (April 16, 1807), he affirmed his joy for the arrival of the British forces, and he kept praying to God that Rosetta would fall into the hands of these forces soon, and he decided that he was with him. A thousand men carrying weapons, to join them, and that he was ready to do whatever he was asked of [11].

The letters revealed the role of the French agents in denouncing the British campaign, and that the aim of the French through their alliance with the Sublime Porte was to facilitate their possession of Egypt, so the British army hastened to occupy it with force to prevent it from falling into the hands of the French.

It also revealed the friendship and alliance between Ahmed Pasha Al-Jazzar, the former governor of Acre with Britain, who had prepared a report for the Sultan on how to invade Egypt, and that he was the leader of the campaign and the expected ruler, and that he was about to appoint a governor over Egypt, as a decree was issued from Astana to appoint him as its ruler. Had it not been for his death, he would have assumed the rule of Egypt before Mohamed Ali, and the response to the letter included the assertion that he was loyal to the Sublime Porte, and asserted not to interfere against the interests of Britain. Haji Suleiman Pasha, who succeeded Ahmed Pasha al-Jazzar, extended the matter, and he showed unrivaled cooperation, fearing for his position, the commercial interests of his state, and awe of the British forces [11].

When it is mentioned in the document organizing the forces that set out to invade Egypt under the leadership of Major General Fraser, who was satisfied with a force of six thousand, and with them 364 women and 323 children, who were part of the campaign, this indicates that the campaign leader was lacking knowledge that the invasion of Egypt is not an easy matter, and that he allowed that the officers and soldiers should accompany the women and children with them, considering that the mission

is nothing more than a picnic, and he was reassured by the information of the British Consul and the assurances of the Mamluk leaders that the Egyptians welcome the campaign, and that the invasion of Egypt will not cause the campaign any hardship, and this will be evident in the first failed attempt on Rosetta.

In fact, the British Consul Missett had a great role in thwarting this campaign due to his misinformation and the arrogance that haunted his actions and directives, as he repeatedly emphasized that once the fleet appeared, he would seek to persuade the governor of Alexandria to surrender, and that he was able to win over Sheikh Muhammad Al-Messiri, who confirmed that the Alexandrians would receive the British army with arms. It was confirmed that Alexandria did not surrender without firing a bullet, as mentioned. According to the statement of the British army, the number of dead in the March 18, 1807 attack reached seven of them an officer and six non-commissioned soldiers. As for the wounded, ten of them were an officer and a sergeant and eight non-commissioned soldiers. Also, the city and castles of Alexandria surrendered to the British forces on March 20 [9], so the city would have held out for forty-eight hours, after which the garrison residents were forced to surrender, after their souls were shattered due to the long fighting, and the British army published false reports that included an exaggeration in the number of forces. For the moral effect on the defending forces, in order to end all hopes for the resistance. In addition to the abandonment of the Turkish forces from their fortresses from the beginning and the escape of most of them, as the Turkish ships were seized in the western port, the truth is evident in the confirmation of Lord Castleria, Minister of Foreign Affairs for War and Colonies, who admits that according to the letters of Major General Fraser, that the British forces have captured Alexandria On March 20, with a tremendous loss, the enemy's resistance was more dangerous [11].

Missett also determined that the campaign would go to Rosetta, and if he had not indicated that, the campaign in Alexandria would have remained unopposed, and he assured Fraser that the Rosetta garrison was weak and the inhabitants welcome the English forces, to the extent that he could seize the city and the forts without firing a single shot. Missett's request, and the agreement of John Duckworth, commander of the fleet, to separate part of the forces to seize Rosetta and Rahmaniya was a scourge on the campaign, and he also continued to insist on the occupation of Damietta as well, where he was entrusted with the implementation of this task to Major General Wachob with Brigadier General Mead and his brigade, which numbered 1,400 personnel, and they believed that the circumstances Prepared for that, and that the occupation of Rosetta is a simple task that takes place in hours to consider that the Mamelukes are only concerned with the acquisition of Cairo and the expulsion of the Albanians outside Egypt, and Missett encouraged them in the hope that the British would help them in their implementation. Missett also sent conciliatory messages to the Arab (Bedouin) leaders, supporters of the British forces, and generally the Mamluks. Information received that Mohamed Ali set out about a month ago towards Upper Egypt and did not listen to the French consul's urging him to march to Alexandria to resist the British. As for the Albanians, who numbered 12,000, they were in the service of Mohamed Ali, and they did not participate in the defense of Alexandria or Rosetta.

In the letter of Admiral Sir Thomas Lewis, the Royal Navy officer, he mentioned that the forces entered Rosetta ill-judgedly, and the residents were confined to their homes, which made them safe from the danger of rifle-shooters and slaughtered many soldiers, despite the fact that the forces that came by land through Idku or by sea from Rosetta port, passing through Rosetta Castle, captured the Abu Mandour Heights, south of the city, without any loss. However, the brigade was lured by the attack on Rosetta, with all his forces, without any prior knowledge of it, and the forces were confronted severely, from the windows and tops of the houses, and the battle ended by defeating the forces, forcing them to withdraw to Abu Qir and return to Alexandria, while acknowledging the heavy and unexpected defeat. Missett had confirmed that the garrison of that city did not exceed 250 men, and due to poor planning and ignorance of the nature of the city and the forces that responded to the campaign, more than 400 British soldiers were slaughtered without seeing an enemy, and he confirmed that the impact of the failure of the campaign will continue in all future operations of the British army in Egypt [11].

The British army repeated the above in Alexandria, where summons were sent to the civil governor Ali Bey Al-Silankli and the military governor with conditions of surrender. However, the first asked to wait until he received instructions from Cairo, which is a political maneuver, as matters were settled in favor of confronting the campaign.

Among the strangest messages is Missett's letter to Fraser on April 22, 1807, in which he states that he had recommended the attack on Rosetta and the occupation of Rahmaniya, but he did not suggest the method of the attack; He stated that the scientist would be surprised to hear that the army could not take over a city like Rosetta, and he tried to absolve him of his responsibility by stating that he had recommended the attack on Rosetta on the twentieth of March, and that when he requested the garrison consisted of 250 men. I reached over 550 on the 29th, and the forces had only two days of supplies. He recommended a second attack on Rosetta, hoping that the honor and influence of the British forces would be restored, and accused the Army Staff of not having at least one individual have the military or political know-how in Egypt [11].

The interrogation of the Greek informant Konstantin Carrere, who had been sent by Petrucci, to Rosetta with the campaign, was mentioned, confirming the vanity and ignorance that dominated the leaders, so that the officers, after the forces' arrival in Rosetta, left their duties and went to dinner at Petrucci house, the British Consul. Which was located on the outskirts of the city, while the soldiers were busy sitting quietly relaxing in groups of eight or ten people, in shops and cafes, thinking badly that the city had come to them, and at the same time, the garrison and the people were preparing to kill them. The reports confirmed that the forces began to flee in the narrow and difficult streets, and were divided into two and three, making the gathering of forces, unaccustomed to such a method of warfare, without harmony, impossible [11].

The testimony of Francis Eckard, the interpreter of Colonel Oswald, one of the leaders of the second expedition, revealed that Ali Bey Salanikli, Rosetta's commander, stated that when the attack on Rosetta for the first time, he had a very small amount of ammunition, and that the Albanians had fled from it, even if the English soldiers had not seated. To eat and drink instead of

pursuing their interest, the city would, no doubt, have fallen.

It was stated within these statements that the fire from the English batteries caused very little damage, because the shells were small. Many of them fell in the Nile. Despite his testimony that the damage was minimal, but it was severe in terms of morale and material, so there were the mosques near the walls, including the Zaghoul Mosque, whose remnants of the blatant destruction of its western minaret still bear witness to this crime, as they hit it with cannons, leaving only the square base and part of The second round is an octagon. In addition to the Abbasi Mosque, which was adjacent to al-Abbasi fort, which overlooked the southern walls overlooking the Abu Mandour hills, they also demolished the walls between the Alexandria Gate and al-Abbasi fort, and between them al-Ninni fort, and the two tables and the walls responded to the enemy's attack, which did not find any apparent destruction by cannons He was unable to enter the city. He also announced that the crime that the British forces committed in the beginning when some of the town's people confronted it, so one of them was burned alive by these forces, so the campaign paid a heavy price for this crime [11].

The letters mentioned that the defeat suffered by the British army had inflicted from 1,200 to 1,400 men killed or wounded, which made the forces in a deplorable situation, as weakness and frustration settled over the remaining forces, which do not exceed three thousand men, among them at least Eight hundred to nine hundred foreigners. The number of prisoners of war reached 466, while the number of the captured officers was 22, and the absent officers who remained in the Rosetta Forces camp were seven. The defeat was also due to several reasons, the most important of which are: the determination of the Rosetta garrison to fight and defeat the invading forces, and the force of the cavalry that inflicted heavy losses on the enemy, and with the rains, the British forces mixed randomly, with the lack of military experience of the campaign leaders [11].

The British leaders' ignorance of the climate in Egypt has been proven. The evidence for this is that the campaign came in the months of March and April, unlike the French campaign that came in July 1798, and this period is the period of rainy nuclei in Alexandria and Rosetta in March, the bitter cold and the high level of sea waves. It had an impact on the forces, whether on Lake Mariout when the campaign landed or at Lake Edku after the withdrawal from Rosetta after the second defeat, and the increase in nitrogen content in the air caused the soldiers to feel lethargy, chills and shortness of breath. In addition to the hot and dusty Khamaseen winds (Sirocco), which extends from February to June, and leads to a rapid rise in temperatures and a decrease in the rates of vision, and these winds were the cause of the spread of spring conjunctivitis and eye inflammation widely spread among the forces, as it struck almost all of them. Which caused the spread of chaos among them to an alarming degree, according to the admission of the campaign leader. The matter was made worse by the blowing of the winds, carrying with them all the pests of sand, insects and other things that accompany this scourge, especially since the northern lakes, including Lake Edku, are a suitable place for mosquitoes to breed, and the Khamaseen winds helped to the rampage of these insects that attacked the British army fiercely. This confirms the great mistake the leaders made in choosing an inappropriate date and location [11].

This reminds us of what happened to the French campaign, where the outbreak of the plague was a major reason for ending it, as only two thousand of the French were left to fight. And the plague spread among the soldiers and claimed the lives of the French doctors, although they began to work in quarantine quarantines to monitor travelers and keep them for 40 days.

The campaign against Rosetta witnessed a phenomenon confirming the humiliation and humiliation of some officers and soldiers after the defeat. Frazer stated in a report on the prisoners who were sent to Cairo that many officers and soldiers were led by ordinary members of Rosetta and used them as slaves, and according to tradition, they are considered Private property and do not fall under the description of prisoners of war, and the British government was asked to pay a ransom for their release. He cited the example of a soldier who was sold as a slave in Rosetta, and freed when Lieutenant Colonel Baron Sonnenberg bought him for 4,000 Turkish piasters. In a report on the initiation of the return of the forces that set out under the command of Major General Sherbrooke, from Messina, on May 17, 1807, it was stated that the total of these forces reached 2,100, in addition to 145 women and 133 children who were included in these numbers [11].

Ali Bey Al-Salanikly implemented a strategic plan that increased the sadness of the British forces. After the first victory, he carried out the execution of the British prisoners to Cairo with the heads of their killers. Each time, they mounted the officers and the elderly on donkeys, and the rest were walkers, fixed their heads on Jumbo sticks (Nababites), and roamed them around Cairo, and to continue to sow oppression with the British forces, they buried the heads of the dead, cut off their ears and tanned them and welded them to send them to Istanbul, to confirm the victory of Rashid, which everyone abandoned [11].

The treatment of the prisoners was characterized by humanity and civilization, who represented a pressure card on the British negotiator and on the leader of the campaign, Fraser, to impose Egypt's conditions. The prisoners confirmed that they were treated very well, and all the wounded who could not march were provided with donkeys, and housing was prepared to receive them, to which they were transferred, except for the sick and wounded, who were immediately collected in one place under medical supervision. They were allowed a lot of bread, water and money as a daily wage, and they were treated well.

Despite the ongoing conflict between the French consuls Druffiti and the British Missett, the French consul intervened forcefully with Mohamed Ali to release the prisoner sirra from the British army. Frazer sent the consul Druffiti, a letter in which he thanked him not only from the British army, but from the British nation, and told him that he He will send to the government his testimony of the honorable and honorable behavior he has shown, whatever the expenses in exchange for it, and it will be repaid in the best way he may wish. In another letter, he noted that Lieutenant Matheson, for whom a ransom demand had been submitted, was a slave offering gratitude to the French consul, Mr. Drouviti, for his efforts to secure his release [11].

The objectives of the campaign were confirmed in the orders of the British King George III in the letter of Lord Castlereagh, the British Foreign Secretary for War and Colonies to Major General Fox, that the occupation of Alexandria cannot be separated from the occupation of Rosetta, Rahmaniya, and perhaps Damietta, and that even with the possession of these places, there is no

reason to assume that Alexandria could be safe in the event of a war with the Sublime Porte, apart from the wider military occupation of Egypt, and that the reinforcements sent were only a means of keeping Alexandria; However, for the army to occupy all necessary positions, a force of at least 15,000 men, including 1,000 cavalry, would be under its command [11].

The colonial goals of the British army have been confirmed since the first day of the occupation of Alexandria, when the doctrine of plunder and pillage emerged among the leaders of the campaign, which reminds us of what the Ottomans did when they occupied Egypt from plundering its goods and transporting them to Istanbul, by order of the invader Selim I, where the leaders of the campaign committed a similar crime, Missett indicated that on the twenty-second and twenty-third of March, after the occupation of Alexandria, there was a large quantity of rice, and the bulk of it had been loaded onto ships that would sail to Britain, but the winds detained the means of transport in Abu Qir Bay, the failure of the first attack on Rosetta, forced them to return him, confirming that the intention was for the plunder, which began with food. The letters elaborated on describing the state of panic that prevailed among the inhabitants of Alexandria after rumors that the English forces were about to evacuate from Egypt, as they were concerned in the event of peace between England and the Porte. It is strange that the British army evacuating Alexandria from Alexandria, and leaving the population to their fate, is portrayed as the most shameful act that offends the British nation, and will inflict shame on the name of Britain. As if they did not know that the occupation of the city and the implementation of two campaigns against Rosetta, and what happened in the killing and looting, was not a shameful act, and that what happened had - in fact - inflicted disgrace on the British army [11].

The letters confirmed in more than one place that there are only two reasons, not a third, for the survival of the invading forces in Alexandria, after the second defeat, the first being to prepare for a third campaign on Rosetta, and the second to liberate prisoners of war from officers and soldiers. They set this condition in exchange for the evacuation of the city and ports of Alexandria, including those who would have been slaves of individuals. A general amnesty for Alexandria residents. It was mentioned in the letters that a large number of officers and soldiers, numbering forty, fell under the pain of the people who used them as slaves, and some of them converted to Islam and joined the Egyptian forces, as in the case of Thomas Keith, who was captured and converted to Islam and remained in Egypt And he joined the Egyptian army, and it was called Ibrahim Agha, while the number of prisoners reached 466, and this forced the British forces to abandon the idea of the third campaign on Rosetta, which was adopted by the political and military leaders, and forced everyone to make the decision to withdraw from Egypt [11]. Even after the second defeat, Missett remained convinced that Rosetta's occupation must take place. In his letter to Lord Castlereagh, regarding the preparation for the third campaign, Missett told him that he was able to separate some Arab tribes from the governor's service, and to create quarrels between them that could not be completely overcome to cut off their contact with him. And the Bedouins were able to control the left bank of the western branch of the Nile, and no Turkish soldier would dare to be there. The forces will resume hostilities as soon as they receive adequate reinforcements, and sooner or later this mandate will fall into their hands. And he is awaiting the third attack on Rosetta, which is achieved by besieging the city with forces and placing batteries around, so that they will not be used to intercept supplies to Alexandria.

On the other hand, Major General Fraser's message to General Moore revealed a conversation between Mohamed Ali, Major General Sherbrooke and Captain Fellowes, that Mohamed Ali expressed his desire to be placed under British protection, and to participate in preventing the French, Turks, or any other army from entering Alexandria through Land, in exchange for the protection of the British fleet of the Egyptian coasts, and a promise to be a friend and ally of Britain, and to supply all British ships with water, and to release prisoners when the British forces evacuate to Alexandria, and upon the departure of the British forces, the city will be handed over to Kotkhuda (Kikhia), provided that The forces of Mohamed Ali replace the British forces, and power would transfer to him after it had been to the Ottoman Sultan [11].

Reports have confirmed that the campaign was part of the international conflict between Britain, France and Russia, and Britain wanted to resolve this conflict by occupying Alexandria, and then Rosetta, and then the complete occupation of Egypt, after its disastrous failure in the Dardanelles and the expansion of French and Russian influence, and the documents confirmed that the Ottoman Empire They have turned a blind eye to this campaign in order to distance Britain's ambitions from the conflict in Europe, and they were deceived by the claim that the aim of the campaign was to place British forces in Alexandria, to block the road to France, and to counter the influence of Mohamed Ali, whom Britain and the Sublime Port had agreed on the need to remove him from power.

The reports confirmed that nature - in addition to the climate - was with the forces defending Rosetta, which valiantly confronted the enemy forces from behind the walls, buildings and high houses, which inflicted heavy losses on them, as the presence of orchards that extend in the south of the city and in the west had a great impact, as palm trees and trees spread The dense area that obstructed the enemy forces and was used by the soldiers to ambush the enemy forces. The reasons for the failure of the campaign were limited to artillery weapons. And that the information relied upon is inaccurate. And that the attack plan was poorly executed. The officers and men were not sufficiently aware of the nature of the service in which they had to participate. And rush to attack, whether in the first or second campaign [11].

Reports revealed that since the start of the campaign on Rosetta, Fraser had remained on board a ship at a great distance in Abu Qir Bay, and that when the war broke out, Missett claimed illness and left for Alexandria, while confirming that Ali Bey Al-Salanikly, leader of the resistance in Rosetta, had led an attack From the cavalry against the enemy forces on the eleventh of April, that is, since the start of the battle, to the point where the leaders of the campaign prompted each of them to accuse the other of cowardice and misconduct.

Volunteers from all sects of the Egyptian people and from a large number of Arabs from the Hijaz and Moroccans participated in the defense of Rosetta, and among the events revealing the nature of the British forces, which most mercenaries represent,

while the British represent a minority among them, as reports mentioned the flight of some soldiers from service, and the asylum of others. Some of the people of Rosetta have to hide.

This book revealed the historical fallacies that have remained stuck since 1807, which were established by misconceptions of the events of the campaign, and the reliance on one source despite its undocumented accounts based on the narration without evidence, and proved that the Rosetta people were the ones who decided the strategy of the conflict in this period, and revealed the inaction of Mohamed Ali, the betrayal of the Mamluk leaders and the complicity of the Turks and Albanians.

As for Mohamed Ali's inaction, he slowed down from confronting the campaign from the beginning, considering that it would occupy Alexandria only, which of course was not affiliated with him, and he was preoccupied with fighting the Mamluks, and he did not listen to the French consul's urging to march to Alexandria to resist the English, and he failed to send troops to defend Alexandria or Rosetta.

It is strange that al-Jabarti mentioned that Mohamed Ali sent help to Rosetta as he set about building a wall around the city and towers outside it, and fortified the floors surrounding its edges, and this did not happen, so it cannot be convinced that the campaign would reach Alexandria on March 20 and after that in the first campaign against Rosetta in March 31, then the second campaign that was defeated by the popular forces, even when supplies and aid were requested for Rosetta, his attention focused on collecting funds only, leaving the matter to the volunteers of the Egyptian people, while he was busy fighting the Mamelukes. He did not move until after news of the victory that was achieved in the second campaign reached him, and his forces arrived after the war was resolved, and the British forces withdrew from Hammad. This has been confirmed by reports that the forces that arrived at Fowa on April 18 had arrived three days later when British forces were gathering their remnants to begin to withdraw, even though Fowa was within forty miles (64 km) of Rosetta.

The references stated that Mohamed Ali reviewed 200 boats reinforced with cavalry, camels and infantry, but the unjustified exaggeration in their number was proved, in the letter of Brigadier General Stewart to Major General Fraser, on April 25, 1807, that at about 7 a.m. on the 21st, he saw from 60 to 70 boats large crossing the Nile to attack the British army, reported Captain Hallowell in his letter to Admiral Sir Thomas Lewis, on April 29, 1807, on the morning of the 21st, in broad daylight, numbers of boats were discovered at Abu Mandour, near Hammad. Shortly after receiving a narration from Colonel Mac Lloyd, between 60 and 70 boats and some warships with an armed brigade landed on his position with a large enemy reinforcement.

As for the truth about the 200 boats that Mohamed Ali was said to have reviewed in preparation to attack Abu Qir, it appears in Captain Hallowell's letter to the Naval Lieutenant-General Thornborough, on May 21, 1807, where he stated that the enemy (meaning the resistance personnel) is still going strong in Rosetta and its environs, where they gathered a large number of boats and warships, numbering up to 200, and then threatening to launch an attack on this place. On the sixteenth day, about 300 horsemen with a large group of pedestrians headed to Khan Al-Tariq at the entrance to Lake Edku, accompanied by a number of camels, and they brought many large boats, with the intention of crossing the peninsula on the eastern side of Lake Abu Qir.

Mohamed Ali was in an unenviable position, so he could not leave Cairo for fear of the Mamelukes who might attack the government in his absence, and the chaos that the Ottoman garrisons might raise, and they might form a front with the Mamelukes against him. It prepares Cairo for defense, while ensuring its security and safety, so that it does not fall into the hands of the opposing forces. He did not move from Cairo until after the end of the campaign and the news reached that it was impossible to storm Rosetta, while he sent some of his forces to Rosetta to fight the English, in accordance with the principle that it is better late than never, and to reap the fruits of the victory that was settled by the children of Rosetta, to show that he was the one who achieved victory, and it was His goal was to consolidate his power over Rosetta and Alexandria, and to sign the treaty that provided for withdrawal, which the English offered after their defeat.

And in the testimony of Mr. Joseph Aziz, the first translator for the British mission in Egypt and the agent of Major Missett in Cairo, he confirmed the betrayal of the Turks and Albanians, as 1500 of them surrendered when the British arrived in Alexandria, and hid in remote homes in the city, so that they would not fall into a confrontation with the English forces. . Major Missett revealed that since April 10, Mohamed Ali, personally, was said to be walking towards Rosetta Relief with 2,000 cavalry and 1,000 infantry; He wrote on the nineteenth: "Everything that we heard during these past few days, regarding Mohamed Ali, has turned out to be wrong." In this regard, he is following the approach of the British army when he spread lies about the number of his forces at the start of the campaign, to spread terror among the citizens, and the truth was information that Mohamed Ali left about a month ago towards Upper Egypt, and that his Albanian soldiers were in his service at that time. They take part in the defense of Alexandria or Rosetta, and the letters confirmed that the British forces had begun to gather their diaspora as of the morning of April 21, while the forces arrived the evening of the previous day, after they had traveled forty miles (64 km) in three days, and the battle had been decided. Therefore, it is understood that Mohamed Ali took advantage of Rosetta's victory to claim it himself, so he sent his forces that arrived with the surrender of the British forces, so that he could achieve his goal of capturing Rosetta and Alexandria. Although the victors are the people of Rosetta and not others, and the Egyptians who volunteered to support them.

And because Mohamed Ali's goals were clearly visible, Omar Makram - the captain of honor whom most Egyptians respect and reverence for his patriotic role - was warning the ruler of Rosetta that the English forces that had captured the city of Alexandria were undoubtedly heading to Rosetta to seize it in order to march from it. to Cairo. In his letter to the ruler of Rosetta, he recommended the necessity of fortifying the city and preparing to meet the invaders completely, as did the people of Cairo who suspended their studies at Al-Azhar Mosque and began digging trenches and building barricades.

The letter also had a hint for Salanikli not to bet on Mohamed Ali's army, as he was busy fighting the Mamelukes in Upper Egypt, and the most dangerous of this was not to bet on the Ottoman officers and soldiers present in Cairo, as they fled as soon

as they heard the news of the arrival of the campaign to Alexandria, so he fled. Most of them are to the Levant, and Omar Makram's warning to Al-Salanikli was clear from the lines of his letter: Only her people will defend Rosetta. The Turks and Albanians were quick to flee from the British forces that invaded the city, leaving its people to grapple with the enemy. Therefore, the saying that Ali Bey Al-Salanikli ordered the boats to be deported to the East Bank so that the residents of the city would not flee, is completely wrong, as the deportation was not to prevent the people, but so that the soldiers of the Ottoman garrison and the Albanians could not flee. Panic reached them that they were able to flee by throwing themselves into the Nile, including the commander of the Albanian forces, and a large number of them crossed the Nile in boats and on wooden planks [11].

Al-Salanikli realized the shortage of time in front of him, so he held an urgent meeting in which he gathered the dignitaries and dignitaries of Rosetta, headed by the captain of her supervision, Hassan Create, and his decision came in accordance with everyone's opinion: The city must be defended with its capabilities. Al-Salanikli and Crete relied on the city's garrison, which amounted to about 550 soldiers, in addition to all men who could carry weapons, and set up a defense plan requiring that the garrison retreat and sit in a sit-in with the people, and that the clash with the English soldiers would only begin when it was confirmed that they had entered the city. Then the people of Rosetta, led by the ruler of the city, Ali Bey al-Silankli and Sheikh Hassan Create, moved with a patriotic motive to defend their city without permission from either Mohamed Ali or the Turks.

Mohamed Ali's position on Ali Bey al-Silankli was clear, as it was decided to kill him with the Mamluks in the massacre famous for the castle massacre, but he did not attend the ceremony. He also accused Amin Agha of treason, and consequently he accused the people of Alexandria of not defending their city, despite the role he played with the people of Alexandria in defending it with the strength they possessed, and took advantage of the leaders of the people to implement his scheme [11].

We can summarize what Al-Jabarti mentioned, when the facts were revealed and the plot of Mohamed Ali and the Turks against Alexandria and Rosetta appeared in the horizon by failing to help them and confronting the British invasion. Where they stole, burned and looted the property of the people, insulted women and children, and committed countless crimes, and that what the English committed does not amount to the crimes committed by the Turks.

Al-Jabarti confirmed that victory was attributed to the Basha and his soldiers, and the public was punished after that, and when the war was over on the side of Rosetta and the British evaded her and returned to Alexandria, the Turks descended on Hammad and its surroundings, and profaned her family, women, money and livestock, claiming that it had become a war house for the British to descend and own it. And he mentions a sentence circulated among people to mock the position of Mohamed Ali and the Ottomans: "Until the antidote comes from Iraq, the licked person will die, and whoever reads and whoever hears, and that the fatwa applicant did not return, but was neglected by the Mufti and the questioner left it". Many of the people of Rosetta with their harem and their children to leave it.

As for the betrayal of the Mamluk leaders, they were willing to cooperate with any party in return for their return to power, so cooperation with the French was on the part of Othman al-Bardisi and his team, and cooperation with the English was on the part of Muhammad Bey al-Alfi and his team, and the Mamluks did not participate in the defense of Alexandria or Rosetta. They retreated after the death of the millennial, and they had no role except to wait to reap the fruits after the country fell to the grip of the English. They were disappointed after Rosetta achieved victory over the British Army [11].

The testimony of Captain Vincenzo Taberna, Secretary-General of the British campaign in Egypt, confirmed that the number of forces that responded to the first campaign consisted of more than 450 men, while the number of forces that were attacked on Hammad was 2000, and the campaign witnessed the betrayal of the Turks and Albanians, as the Turkish garrison and the Albanians fled. From the city, the defending forces of the city were more than 1,200 men carrying arms, and about 200 were attached during the siege.

As for the complicity of the Turks, they concluded a treaty with England to place British forces in Alexandria, and the Turkish forces that were stationed in Alexandria or Rosetta did not intervene, and the Turkish garrison and warships in charge of maritime defense of the city surrendered without clashing with the British fleet, and the military forces did not intervene. The Turkish government to defend Alexandria or Rosetta, and the Turks did not provide any assistance during the two campaigns, and this complicity led to the popular rallying around Mohamed Ali, who established his authority over all of the Thakur after that.

Many agents emerged during the campaign who played dirty roles, next to the Mamluk leaders, the Ottoman garrisons and the Albanians who withdrew a shameful withdrawal in Alexandria and Rosetta, the name of Qasim al-Ghariani, al-Shorbaji, a judge of Alexandria's judges, who provided services to the British forces, despite the defeat, Missett and the Chief Justice continued with him. In calling for another campaign to occupy Rosetta under the pretext that it is in the name of the masses of people, the letters confirmed the conspiratorial role of Qasem al-Gharyani, who Missett tried to do justice to and enumerates his advantages over his continuous efforts during the period of the British forces, thanks to this man the army became indebted to an abundance of supplies, which cooperated With the British army to the point that he benefited from His Majesty, under the name of gratification, a pension of ten shillings per day, as a reward for the services he rendered to the campaign. The king's shilling was granted to anyone who agreed to work as a sailor or soldier in the Royal Navy or the British Army. Therefore, the Alexandria Judge was considered one of the conscripts with a military rank, and this pension was equal to half a pound sterling. Major General John Moore, Commander in Chief of the Mediterranean, promised him that he would double his salary from 25 September 1807, and 20 shillings per day would not be sufficient, and demanded that the government give him adequate compensation for the losses caused by his dedication to the British interest.

Rosetta has settled the global conflict at that time, especially in Europe, when the French Revolution broke out in 1789 - which in turn exploded what is known historically as the wars of the French Revolution, and the theater of that bloody war was the whole of Europe and spread to the Middle East in a colonial conflict, as the naval armada⁵ clashed For the warring countries in

the Atlantic, Caribbean and Indian Oceans - the French campaign against Egypt (1798-1801) was part of this conflict, which was the stone that moved the stagnant waters, and was the first reason to direct the attention of colonial Britain to Egypt, and its attention to the danger of Egypt being in the hands of a colonial power other than Britain, it also restored the Turkish interest in Egypt, which the Turks have refrained - since their occupation of Egypt - from taking care of it, except in collecting its revenues for the benefit of the Turkish treasury [11].

As for the Franco-British conflict, the imperial ambition of Napoleon Bonaparte had no limits, which precipitated the introduction of the whole of Europe in what is historically known as the Napoleonic Wars (1803-1815), and as part of those wars, the English campaign came or what is wrongly known as Fraser's campaign against Egypt, and Britain wanted its French opponents stabbed the killing and breaking of their back in the Mediterranean, by securing a strategic coastal operations base for them on the Mediterranean front against the French.

Therefore, it cannot be accepted that this colonial campaign is called the "Fraser Campaign". Rather, it is Britain's campaign, and that the use of the name of the Fraser campaign to this campaign, which is what historians followed, underestimates the Egyptian victory over it, as the campaign was decided by King George The third, the British Council of Ministers and the House of Commons, under the guidance of British politicians and military at the same time, and managed by the most prominent politicians and military at the time, and the politicians who are also from military backgrounds are: William Windham, British Prime Minister, Lord Howick, Leader of the House of Commons, and Major Edward Missett, an intelligence officer who became a consul Years of Britain in Egypt.

As for the military leaders, they are the leaders of the British army, fleet, and admiralty, including: William Marsden Isaac, First Secretary of the Admiralty, Major General Henry Edward Fox, Commander-in-Chief of the Mediterranean Forces, Lord Collingwood, Commander-in-Chief of the Mediterranean Fleet, and the Marine Corps John Duckworth, who occupied second place in the Mediterranean Fleet.

In addition to them, Major General Frazer, the leader of the campaign, who was chosen by politicians in a hurry, at the beginning of February 1807, to lead and prepare for it in a short period, without good preparation and careful study. So his attempt failed after his forces suffered heavy losses at Rosetta on March 29 and April 21. He refused to initiate preparations for the third campaign because he was convinced that the British army could not, forcing him to agree to leave the British forces, and this was done on September 19, 1807.

The defeat of the British army at Rosetta ended the political life of King George III, who had made no political decisions after the campaign and was mad, and William Wyndham's cabinet, and the House of Commons headed by Lord Howick was dissolved on March 31, 1807. William Marsden Isaac, Admiralty First Secretary and Major General, retired. Henry Edward Fox, Supreme Commander of the British Mediterranean Forces, also caused a coup against the Ottoman Sultan Selim III, who blessed this campaign, and was deposed on the 29th of May 1807, and replaced by his cousin Mustafa IV (1807-1808), who imprisoned his predecessor and then killed him. On the 28th of July 1808, the Battle of Rosetta was the last nail in the coffin of this Sultan, as it opened the way for the great powers to arrange for the elimination of the Ottoman Empire.

All these reasons make the campaign against Egypt a campaign for a state and not a campaign for an individual, and based on what historians have stated that it was in agreement and agreement with the Mamluks and their leader Muhammad Bey al-Alfi, whose mission was to facilitate the entry of the English into Egypt in exchange for power devolving to the Mamluks after that, which prompted a historian A great example is al-Jabarti to say that the campaign is nothing but British military support for the Mamluks and has no other colonial military objective, which is what the author fundamentally differs with, based on the size of the forces, the type of armament and their timing coinciding with the height of the Napoleonic wars, and the raging international conflict between Britain and France [11].

The Anglo-Turkish alliance treaty on January 5, 1799, was the beginning of military cooperation against the French expansion in the Aegean Sea and the eastern Mediterranean and the French campaign on Egypt and the Levant, and the most important condition in the treaty was to prevent the French expansion in the Balkans and confront the French campaign on Egypt and the Levant, and Britain gave to guarantee the territorial integrity of the state. The Ottoman Empire for eight years, and therefore was committed to re-conquering Egypt, to rid it of the French, and nominally return it to the Ottoman Empire.

We conclude this introduction with a document confirming the full Ottoman complicity and explicit consent to the establishment of this campaign, which historians have long convinced us that it occurred as a result of the conflict between Britain and the Ottoman Empire, where the features of betrayal and collusion were confirmed by the Mamluk leaders and Mohamed Ali who were ready to Britain's occupation of Egypt in exchange for their remaining in power. .

This document is the message of Lord Hawkesbury, Minister of Foreign Affairs in the government of Henry Addington on May 19, 1801 addressed to Lord Elgin, the English ambassador to Constantinople when directing negotiations with the Turks: It will clearly and clearly state to the Turkish ministers that in the event of expelling the French from Egypt, the intention The irreversible constant of His Majesty to return all of Egypt to the Sublime Porte, until a general peace is achieved or for a short period of time to be agreed upon at a later time, and the English garrison will be stationed in some parts of the coast, with the aim of consulting about the necessary means to protect Egypt from any invasion project in The future the French government can hold on to. He suggested that the Turks send an English armed force to protect Egypt, this force would provide its assistance only on the condition that the Turks in return grant some commercial concessions to England, and this plan was approved by the British government and sent to Lord Elgin at the end of July 1801, and it is a complete organizing plan that includes:

1. Defining the rights, privileges, and territorial authority of the Mamluks, as well as the nature and extent of the military service that they should provide in a way that does not conflict with the advantages granted to them [11].

2. Paying part of the public revenues to the regular military institution that will be formed, under the supervision and control of British officers, with the Turkish soldiers present in Egypt.

The implementation of this plan was postponed after the end of the treaty signed on January 5, 1799 between Britain and the Ottoman Empire, which was the beginning of military cooperation between the two countries, and after the end of the eight-year period in which Britain gave a guarantee for the territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire, and thus was committed to re-invading Egypt and returning it to the empire The Ottoman Empire nominally, and then the campaign took place in March 1807. By adopting such a plan, Britain confirmed that the country's forces, supervised by English officers, would be able to defend Egypt, without foreign assistance, against the attempt of France. After Alexandria, the conquest extends to Rosetta and Rahmaniya, and after Damietta and the rest of the ports, and then to all Egyptian lands.

It is unacceptable for the study to be limited to the campaign directly, rather it was necessary to study the features of the political and military conflict, whose colonial beginnings appeared when the Ottomans invaded Egypt and European ambitions to control it when the Ottomans preoccupied with the economic aspects and neglected the army and the entrenchments except what served Turkish interests in the first place.

In this study, which dealt with the conflict during three centuries, the importance of Egypt emerged, and then it was the coveted of the Ottomans, and the European colonial ambitions represented by the French and British campaigns continued, all of which were utterly unsuccessful. Therefore, the value of the victory of the Rosetta people, which does not represent A victory for a people who faced brute force and taught them an unforgettable lesson. It was enough. Rather, it played a role in resolving conflicts between the great powers, and it was the first nail in the coffin of the Ottoman Empire. It suffices that - as we mentioned earlier - he overthrew the Ottoman Sultan, the British King, the British Ministry, the House of Commons, and most of the political and military leaders who had a role in this campaign, as well as the Mamluk dream of returning to power [11].

The book cannot ignore the Russian ambitions in Egypt, as this campaign was part of the international conflict between Britain, France and Russia, and Britain wanted to resolve this conflict by occupying Alexandria, and then Rosetta, and then the complete occupation of Egypt, to stop the expansion of French and Russian influence.

As for the Russian role, when international tension increased and war was declared between the Ottoman Empire and Russia in December 1806, the British-Ottoman negotiations were cut off, and the Ottoman Empire was engaged in fighting, and after Shaheen Bey assumed the leadership of the millennial Mamelukes after his death, then the Russian Consul called Shaheen Bey, and asked From him sending one of the Mamluk officers to Constantinople to mediate the Russians at the Sublime Porte so that they could rule Egypt, and the most likely possibility was that Russia would invade Egypt, relying on its contact with Shaheen Bey as an auxiliary force to occupy Cairo, and Russian contacts with the Mamelukes in Egypt were sufficient for the governor of Alexandria to be conducted The utmost readiness to face not only the British, but the Russian forces as well. Preparations were taken to face the threat of a possible foreign invasion, whether from Russia or Britain.

And in Major Missett's letter to Wyndham, on February 14, 1807, in which he included a translation of the urgent message he received on the ninth day from Shaheen Bey, the successor to Muhammad al-Alfi. He mentioned that the defensive preparations made by the commander of Alexandria were at the same time to resist the invasion of the Russians. Britain resorted to the means of pressure on the Sublime Porte when it saw from it the strictness in negotiations after the defeat of Britain in Egypt, until it achieved its objectives in the Mediterranean by breaking the French-Ottoman rapprochement, and allied with Russia, and the British and Russian fleets rushed to the straits of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles threatening the Ottoman trade movement until it yielded The Sublime Porte demanded Britain and granted it a plot of land on the Black Sea to serve as a military base for it, but the Sublime Port rejected this British request after hearing the children of the British defeats in Egypt. Accordingly, orders were issued to the fleet command officers, in coordination with the Russian squadron in the Mediterranean, to blockade the Dardanelles, the port of Smyrna, the mouth of the Nile, and any other major ports through which supplies could be transported to the Turkish capital [11].

In the letter of Major Missett to Wyndham, from Alexandria, on April 12, 1807, he suggested to Major General Fraser to immediately send a group of troops to capture Rosetta, assuring him that the garrison of that city did not exceed 250 men, and due to poor planning and ignorance of the nature of the city and the forces that responded to the campaign. Over 400 British soldiers were massacred without seeing an enemy. He stressed that the impact of the failure of the campaign will continue in all future operations of the British army in Egypt. The British army repeated the above in Alexandria, where summons were sent to the civil governor (Ali Bey Al-Salanikli), the military governor, the terms of surrender, and a letter to the residents. However, the former asked to wait until he received instructions from Cairo, a political maneuver where matters had been settled in favor of confronting the campaign.

It suffices to admit the campaign leaders that the army staff does not have at least one person with military or political know-how, and that the British forces were indiscriminately mixed together, while the forces defending Rosetta were moving magnificently (moving his greatly-augmented troops at pleasure). English commanders testified to him and described him as a clever enemy.

The book emphasized that Rosetta had no preference in defending and defeating the British army except for her sons who were abandoned by everyone, while this victory was attributed to Mohamed Ali, the Albanians, and the Ottomans, although the historical documents confirmed that Rosetta fell prey to the betrayal of the Mamluk leaders and the complicity of Mohamed Ali and his forces from the Albanians and the conspiracy of the Ottomans, to The British colonial ambitions, arrogance and arrogance, the aim of the occupation of the city was to enable all parties to control the gaps, including tightening control over government, even under the banner of Britain, and to resolve the international conflict, whose features will be clear in the book

later.

And when we remember the image of the British fleet when the French campaign against Egypt occurred, arriving and wandering the length and breadth of the Mediterranean, and was able to destroy the French fleet in Abu Qir, and impose British control over the campaign and force it to withdraw on British terms, as if Britain is the owner of the country, even when the French abdicated About the antiquities they stole from Egypt, and the persistence of the British fleet and forces for two years after the campaign's departure from Egypt, when we remember the picture after the defeat of the British army in Rosetta and its withdrawal from Egypt, we realize the size of the victory of the Rosetta people over the British army [11].

Therefore, the interpretation of these events was not subject to the tendencies, nature and mind of the author and his personality and his bias for one of the parties at the expense of others, and therefore, the writing was not from a personal point of view, but rather as it actually happened, and we can confirm that the confusion that occurred in the narration of the events of the campaign that ended in victory Mohamed Ali and the tightening of his control over all parts of the country, due to the fact that the victor is the one who writes history, and this saying is to some extent true, but closer to the truth, for he is the one who wrote in the history books what he wanted from the events he wanted to attribute victory to him and his Albanian soldiers, while he was deliberately neglecting Other information of importance and value in the completeness of the picture regarding the event, and in order of that, history is always written by the victor in order to promote himself and his victories, highlight his achievements, and diminish the value of the true victor, which is the great people of Rosetta.

Fourth: The scientific method for the book

This book is based on the Historical Research Methodology [13], which is one of the branches of the Descriptive Approach to Human Studies, as it relies on the study from the reality of the original historical sources, and is concerned with describing an accurate description, and expressing it in a qualitative or quantitative expression, as well as a qualitative expression. It describes the phenomenon and explains its characteristics, while the quantitative expression gives it a numerical description that shows the extent of this phenomenon, its size and the degrees of its association with various other phenomena.

In terms of the importance of studying history, the topic covered in this book is proceeding according to a temporal factor and a geographical factor, as the temporal factor starts from the Ottoman occupation of Egypt until the end of the first decade of the nineteenth century, while the geographical factor focuses its events in the Mediterranean basin in general and Egypt in particular according to Subject related to political history in this period. According to Ibn Khaldun in his introduction: The art of studying history is a deep reflection on the sources, as the study of historical facts and events has many values and advantages in understanding ideas, facts and events.

Despite the necessity of impartiality in the methodology of historical research, there is a fact that must be acknowledged, which is that achieving complete objective criticism is a matter of imagination. Whereas historians of the past were accused of interpreting historical events according to their emotions and beliefs, we find that Contemporary historians demand the historical trial of the past, as Friedrich Nietzsche says, and they demand impartiality and impersonality in historical writing, as Neale Walsch sees it. As for historical writing, it is retrospective history, and the historian who tries to stand on the scene of the long historical events that he is trying to restore will find himself fraught with danger, because he must understand those events.

The historical research methodology represents the stages during which the author walked until he reached the historical truth, and presented it to specialists in particular and the readers in general. Logical facts and generalizations help to understand that past. This approach, then, is the set of methods and techniques used by the author to reach the truth.

As for the sources of information in the historical curriculum, there are two types of published and written sources, namely: primary sources and secondary sources. The first includes both antiquities and documents, and in our topic, documents are records of past events or facts, and they are written in the form of letters that reach us without going through the stages of interpretation, change, deletion and addition, and the written record includes manuscripts, letters and books, which in turn constitute an important source for identification The character of political and military life in the study period. These sources contain original data and information close to reality, and they often reflect the truth, and are rarely tainted by distortion, so the person who writes as an eyewitness to a particular incident is often correct and closer to the truth than the person who tells it about him or who reads it transmitted from another person or persons.

As for secondary sources, they include referring to the sources transferred from other primary and non-primary sources, and they include authored books, historical, literary and philosophical studies and studies and scientific treatises, and they are of scientific value for the historian because they are based on a scientific inquiry and can be used with greater confidence, although the benefit from the sources The primary, which we referred to earlier, is considered better than the secondary sources. It is also possible to benefit from the descriptive studies that were conducted previously, which cannot be repeated as it is considered a documentary source. That is why the facts that were reached were accurate according to the standards of scientific research, due to the availability of most of its components as a method for conducting scientific research.

And if the documents and other materials collected by the author on the subject he dealt with through the study and analysis represent the truth, then the existence of these facts and documents does not guarantee agreement among historians on their interpretation of the same interpretation, because every historian has his point of view and motives, so the historian is the one who makes the prior decision in the process of arranging texts And documents that serve his point of view, that is why we cannot guarantee agreement among historians on a specific event, as each has its interpretation and analysis of this when analyzing historical texts. And that the facts and documents are not in themselves history, but rather are a testimony to a part of the historical moment, and perhaps this testimony may be false, except in our case, as the documents that have been studied are like military

documents that cannot be affected by forgery, as they bear facts recorded. Leaders and diplomats, and confirmed by comparing it with other testimonies, which helped reach the truth, and what confirms the authenticity of these documents is that they included the leaders' admissions of defeat, and mentioned facts that historians cannot address.

As for the second approach it is the analytical method, and the steps of the descriptive approach are represented in the content analysis study, in identifying the research problem and its hypotheses, confirming the validity of the hypotheses and analyzing them until reaching results. This went in two directions: The first is the descriptive trend in content analysis. The second: the inferential trend in the analysis, which goes beyond just describing the content to making inferences about the elements of the topic. The method of content analysis relied on the deductive method by which the deduction is intended and the extraction based on diligence, and the most prominent characteristic of this method is the presentation of new concepts and issues that have not been previously raised and this is normal, as long as the research has relied on the method of deduction and deduction [13].

As for the intended methodological steps in the content analysis curriculum and related to it, they include: Classifying the researched contents, which are messages and reports on the campaign according to its topics and historical divisions, as it is considered the most important step in content analysis because it is a direct reflection of the problem to be studied, and analyzing these contents to draw conclusions. As for the strengths of the data analysis method, they are the presence of the researcher's source of information and the possibility of reference to it while conducting the research. By using content analysis, trends, information and facts that were not included before that could be known, which helped bias the researcher in analyzing the content due to the apparent quantitative nature of it. Finally, it is necessary to refer here to the characteristics and qualities of content analysis in what Bernard Berelson reported in the terms Objective, Systematic, Quantitative, and Manifest are the terms that distinguish between scientific analysis and ordinary description based on subjectivity, which are not based on a strict methodological basis.

The book begins with an introduction about: The military and strategic importance of Rosetta, and the first chapter deals with: the political and military theater before the British campaign 1807, and includes: The Ottoman occupation of Egypt in 923 AH (1517 AD), in terms of: the internal conditions since the Ottoman occupation, and the foreign communities in Rosetta and their economic and political role The fortifications of the cities of Alexandria and Rosetta and their castles before the campaign, as well as the French campaign (1798-1801), in terms of: the French occupation of Egypt in 1798, Western colonial orientations, and political theater in Egypt (1801-1807), after the withdrawal of the French campaign from Egypt (1801-1807), and Russian ambitions in Egypt (1806-1807).

The second chapter deals with the English campaign on Egypt 1807 in light of the documents, and the study includes: the stages the campaign went through, historically, the messages and reports of this stage, in addition to the analytical study of the texts contained in these letters and reports, and ends with notes on the campaign in light of the report published in 1837 -1838, and a summary of this documentary study, which includes these stages: Preparation for the campaign against Egypt (November 21, 1806 - February 28, 1807). Letters between the Mamluks and the leaders of the campaign (February 2, 1807 - July 14, 1807), the arrival of the campaign and the occupation of Alexandria, the first campaign on Rosetta (March 1807), the second campaign on Rosetta (April 1807), the post-defeat at Rosetta (April - September 1807) The echoes of defeat and the withdrawal of the campaign from Egypt (September - October 1807).

The third chapter deals with the political theater and the international conflict after the English campaign, and the study includes: the stability of the rule of Mohamed Ali, with regard to the establishment of the state in Egypt, the stability of government (1807-1812), the elimination of popular leadership and the suppression of the influence of the sheikhs, the position of Mohamed Ali towards the Mamluks, and the establishment of A modern regular military force, and the establishment of fortresses and fortifications. It also deals with the internal situation in the Sublime Porte and Britain after the defeat at Rosetta, in relation to the coups in the Ottoman palace, the internal situation in Britain, and the great-power struggles after the campaign, in terms of the political position in light of the reports of French diplomats (1808-1810), and the Ottoman-English war Russian, English, Russian, and Ottoman Russian.

This conflict was dealt with by studying its political and military features, especially since the defeat of the British army had confused the global political situation, and had impacts on society, the government and the British House of Commons, as well as the tragedies that befell King George III, and fueled political and military conflicts between major countries. It caused the coup against the Ottoman Sultan Selim III, his removal and then killing him, and opened the way for the arrangement to eliminate the Ottoman Empire.

Conclusion

- Based on the foregoing, this book is an addition to the Arab Library, as it refutes the historical events of the British campaign from both the Arab and British viewpoints.
- Although the Arab viewpoint is marred by some ambiguity or lack of truth, the British point of view carries a truth proven by historical documents that cannot be discussed.
- The British documents are letters and reports on behalf of the enemy, who was unavoidable to admit his utter failure and defeat, which won the honor of the British Empire by the admission of the leaders themselves, and demonstrated the failure of planning, lack of experience and vanity.
- The study reviews the political situation in Great Britain during the campaign against Egypt in 1807, through the repercussions of this defeat on the British king, who paid a dear price for this brutal campaign, after the defeat of his army that bestowed British honor, according to what the campaign leaders said in their letters included in this book in More than

- one position.
- The study confirmed that King George III had yet to defeat his army of any major political decisions during his remaining reign. Three years after the defeat of the British army at Rosetta, George III, in November 1810, was completely insane after being defeated by the parliamentary opposition.
 - The defeat of the British army was a direct cause of the dismissal of William Wyndham Grenville's ministry for its failure to manage the war and the shameful defeat of the British Empire army in front of the people of Rosetta. And they caused a change in the political arena in Britain, as the Foxite Whig party was removed.
 - The defeat ended the political or military life of all political and military leaders, William Windham's cabinet was sacked, and the British House of Commons headed by Lord Howick was dissolved on March 31, 1807. With the exception of Major Edward Messet, who continued to exercise his duties as an intelligence officer in disguise under the guise of the consulate until 1815.
 - His lack of experience with the climate of Egypt and the launch of the campaign during the blowing of the Khamseen winds, which were the cause of the spread of inflammatory eye disease and spring conjunctivitis, was a great spread among the forces, as it struck almost all of them, in addition to his complete dependence on reckless leaders and without military experience. After the forces arrived in Rosetta, the officers left their duties and went to dinner at the house of the British Consul Petrucci, which was located on the outskirts of the city, while the soldiers were busy sitting quietly in groups of eight or ten people, in the shops and cafes, thinking badly that the city had come to them. .
 - The study proved that the Great sons of Rosetta, who defeated the British army, and played a role in resolving the political conflicts between the great powers.
 - The sons of Rosetta, who have the right to rewrite the history of their city's victory, are not based on the transmitted narratives and historians who attributed the campaign to a person (Fraser) to belittle it, and attributed the victory to Mohamed Ali, the Albanians and the Ottomans. But according to the documents and reports of the British political and military leaders, they found no choice but to admit that a small town like Rosetta inflicted the harshest defeats on the British Empire's army.
 - The book affirmed that the crushing victory of the people of Rosetta sons over the victorious British Empire's army overthrew the Ottoman Sultan, the British King, the House of Commons, the ruling party, the British Ministry, and most of the political and military leaders who had a role in this campaign.

References

- [1] Al-Jabarti, 'Abd al-Rahman (1994). *History of Egypt: 'Aja'ib al-Athar fi 'l-Tarajim wa'l-Akhbar*. vol. 1. Franz Steiner Verlag Stuttgart.
- [2] Ayalon, David (1960). "The Historian al-Jabartī and His Background", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*, 23 (2): pp. 217-238-249.
- [3] Saleh, Abdulkader (2005). "Ġābārti," in Uhlig, Siegbert, ed., *Encyclopaedia Aethiopica: D-Ha*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, p. 597.
- [4] Al-Jabarti, Abdul Rahman bin Hassan bin Burhan Al-Din Al-Jabarti Al-Hanafi d. 1240 AH / 1825 AD. Wonders of Archeology in Translations and News, History of Al-Jabarti, Original Date of Publication 1820, Cairo: The People's Book, 1958. Cairo: Dar Al-Kutub Al-Masria, 1998
- [5] Al-Jabarti, Abdel-Rahman (2017). The appearance of sanctification with the demise of the state of Franciscan, "Edited by Dr. Abdel-Rahim Abdel-Rahman, Cairo: General Authority for National Library and Archives. The book documents the period of the French campaign against Egypt 1798-1801AD".
- [6] Abdel-Rahim, Abdel-Rahim Abdel-Rahman (1998) Wonders of Antiquities (investigation), 1-1, Cairo: The Egyptian Library Abdulaziz, Omar (1998). Abd al-Rahman al-Jabarti and Nicola al-Turk, Beirut: Beirut Arab University.
- [7] Darwish, M. A. (2020). The Rakhito Writes History, Great Britain's Campaign against Rosetta in 1807 in Light of British Archives Documents, Cairo: The Arab Nation Foundation for Publishing and Distribution
- [8] Douin, Georges et E. C. Fawtier-Jones (1928). L'Angleterre et L'Égypte, La campagne de 1807, Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale Pour la Société Royale de Géographie d'Égypte, pour la Société Royale de Géographie d'Égypte, Le Caire, pp. LXXII-29-31-32-33-183:235.
- [9] Pollock, Arthur William Alsager (1837). Notes on an expedition to Alexandria in the year 1807, *The United Service Magazine*, H. Colburn, 25, London, pp. 183:192-481-189.
- [10] Colburn, H. (1837). Notes on an expedition to Alexandria in the year 1807, *The United Service Journal*, 3, London.
- [11] Darwish, M. A. (2020). The Rakhito Writes History, Great Britain's Campaign against Rosetta in 1807 in Light of British Archives Documents, Cairo: The Arab Nation Foundation for Publishing and Distribution
- [12] Al-Jundi, Anwar (1963). The life of the scholar Ahmed Zaki Pasha, known as Sheikh of Arabism (1284-1353), *Flags of the Arabs Series*, 29, Cairo: The Egyptian General Organization for Authorship, Translation, Printing and Publishing, pp. 112-118.
- [13] Darwish, Mahmoud Ahmad (2018). Research Methods in the Humanities, Arab Nation Foundation for Publishing and Distribution, pp. 138 ff.

Notes

¹ Al-Jabarti - who belongs to the village of Jabart and is now located in Eritrea, where his paternal grandfather came to Cairo to study at Al-Azhar, and settled there - in Cairo in 1753, and lived seventy-three years where he died in 1825, and continued his studies until he graduated from Al-Azhar.

² It is considered an official document that Al-Jabarti presented to the Ottoman Grand Vizier, and Al-Jabarti was until the date of his presentation of the book in support of the Ottomans, and he did not mention any praiseworthy work for the French, and then when he saw after the departure of the French the approach that the Ottomans followed in the rule of Egypt, he denounced that from them, and when he wrote The third part of his book “Wonders of Archeology in Translations and News”, included the first and largest part of it, a modified version of the book “The Appearance of Sanctification with the Demise of the State of Francis,” in which he modified many of his views. The only thing that al-Jabarti did not amend, but rather was necessary in both versions, is his metaphysical view of the Egyptian people and described them as Harafish.

³ Although these notes are not known to the author, what was mentioned in them indicates that the author is one of the leaders or soldiers participating in the campaign, from the stage of preparation until the withdrawal from Egypt, and it included the hidden events of the events, and dealt with complete neutrality and sincerity, reaching the point of criticizing the leaders of the campaign and showing its shortcomings, and the confusion and randomness it reached, led to the defeat of the British forces twice. These remarks did not deny the great role that the popular resistance played in Rosetta.

⁴ There is a copy of the fourth part of the history of al-Jabarti that contains many chapters, which he had to delete from the copy that was printed in Bulaq because it contained an attack on Mohamed Ali, and what was removed from the assets is equal to about 50 pages.

⁵ Armada: Spanish and Portuguese word for naval fleet, which is also translated into English with the same meaning.