

Scientific Methodology And Sources For Studying The British Campaign In Egypt In 1807, An Analytical Study

Mahmoud Ahmed Darwish

Professor of Islamic Archaeology
Faculty of Arts, Minia University

Abstract: *There is no doubt that the great victory achieved by the Egyptians over the invading British army in 1807, and the people of the city of Rosetta took on this task, as they achieved the greatest victory in the nineteenth century, when the city of Rosetta defeated the army of the great empire. This research deals with the methodology of studying the military campaign that Britain directed to Egypt, which resulted in the occupation of Alexandria, whose defenses and fortifications were neglected by the Ottomans and whose defending forces were reduced to the point that the city fell and was unable to confront the campaign forces, 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-Salankli, the governor of the city and Hassan Krit, the leader of the popular resistance. The army of the British Empire led by Major General Mackenzie Fraser, in which the people of Rosetta won a crushing victory, and achieved the most severe defeats in the history of the British military, and settled the global conflict between the great powers at that time, and it aroused regret in the souls of political and military leaders that a small city like Rosetta confronted and defeated the army of the British Empire, according to them. The research dealt with scientific methodology and sources for studying the British campaign in Egypt in 1807 through: The scientific methodology for the book, Al-Jabarti (1820), Douin, Georges (1928), British documents 21st November 1806 to 21st October 1807, An eyewitness by the pseudonym "Miles" (1837-1838), The difference between Al-Jabarti and British documents, and Darwish, M. A. (2021)*

Keywords: British army, Rosetta, Alexandria, Ali Bey Al-Salankli, Hassan Krit, Mackenzie Fraser, Al-Jabarti, Georges Douin, British documents, Darwish.

1. The scientific methodology for the book

This book is based on the Historical Research Methodology, 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.

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 deduction¹.

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 is divided into three Sections: First deals with the introduction, which consists of the book's sources and scientific methodology and is divided into: scientific methodology and book sources, which include: Al-Jabarti, Douin, Georges and British documents and the difference between Al-Jabarti and British documents.

This section also includes: the military and strategic importance of Rosetta, the Fortifications of Alexandria and Rosetta before the English Campaign, defensive state of Alexandria and Rosetta's defensive status. In the third it includes: The Rosetta Fortifications against the English Expedition, It consists of: Introduction, English expedition on Egypt and English expedition on Rosetta.

The second section of the book about: England and Egypt, the Campaign of 1807, It starts by List of the letters and reports of the British campaign in Egypt, From 21st November 1806 to 21st October 1807, and consists of nine pointd 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 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 section includes: appendix and presenting, about notes on an Expedition to Alexandria in 1807, notes on the campaign in light of the report published in 1837 -1838, and presenting the book.

2. Al-Jabarti (1820)

¹ Darwish, M. A. (2018). Research Methods in the Humanities, Arab Nation Foundation for Publishing and Distribution, pp. 138 ff.

Al-Jabarti¹, History of Al-Jabarti, Original Date of Publication 1820, Cairo: The People's Book, 1958. Cairo: Dar Al-Kutub Al-Masria, 1998.

Al-Jabarti 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-Jabrati², in the book of the great "Wonders of Archeology in the translations and the news"³, 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

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 Al-Jabarti, 'Abd al-Rahman (1994). *History of Egypt: 'Aja'ib al-Athar fi 'l-Tarajim wa'l-Akhbar*, 1. Franz Steiner Verlag Stuttgart. 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. Saleh, Abdulkader (2005). "Ġābārti," in Uhlig, Siegbert, ed., *Encyclopaedia Aethiopica: D-Ha*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, p. 597.

³ Al-Jabarti, History of Al-Jabarti, Original Date of Publication 1820, Cairo: The People's Book, 1958. Cairo: Dar Al-Kutub Al-Masria, 1998

write the complete history of Egypt, making his book (The Appearance of Sanctification with the Demise of the State of Francis)¹ 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.

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: It 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 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".

Al-Jabarti himself admits in his book that he began collecting and coordinating his book papers in the twenty-sixth year after the

¹ 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. 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".

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 period¹, 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.

3. Douin, Georges (1928)

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.

4. British documents (21st November 1806 to 21st October 1807)

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 parts²:

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:

1. 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).
2. 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:

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

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

- Portfolio No. (W. O. 1-303) contains eleven documents.
- Portfolio No. (W. O. 1-304) contains twenty-four documents.
- Portfolio No. (W. O. 1-305) contains five documents.
- Portfolio No. (W. O. 1-348) contains sixty-seven documents.
- Portfolio No. (W. O. 6-56) contains four documents.

B. The documents of the external administration, including one document in the following portfolio: The English Archives of the Foreign Office (F. O.), 24-3.

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

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

¹ 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.

² 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.

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

D. 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.

E. 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).

F. 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.

5. An eyewitness by the pseudonym "Miles"¹(1837-1838)

Appendix, Notes on an Expedition to Alexandria in 1807, in the United Service Journal and the United Service Magazine, 1837-1838, (the author has not been identified).

This report is signed under the pseudonym "Miles". It is an eyewitness story that narrates part of the events, from the beginning of February to September 23, 1807, 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.

These notes included a summary of the course of the campaign, from preparation to withdrawal from Egypt. They too are eyewitnesses who narrate part of the events, but they are individual, precise and clear, and which, by this very fact, are completed what the official reports were, compelled to transcend. It dealt with complete impartiality and honesty, and went as far as criticizing the leaders of the campaign and showing its shortcomings, confusion and randomness that led to the defeat of the British forces twice, and these statements did not negate the great role played by the popular resistance in Rosetta.

6. The difference between 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 Mohamed 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.

Al-Jabarti mentioned different and contradictory accounts of what he heard about rumors about the resistance of Alexandria at one

¹ 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.

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 Mohamed 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. 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.

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 was one of the most important economic resources of the state, and it was directly affiliated with the Pasha and not affiliated with the governor of Egypt, until these events.

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.

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 Fraser frustrated and made him He asks 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 Fraser 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?¹.

7. Darwish, M. A. (2021)

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

¹ Darwish, M. A. (2020). The Rakhito Writes History.

Arab Nation Foundation for Publishing and Distribution.

The 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 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.

The 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, 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.

Conclusions

- The research relied on information sources in the historical approach, which include two types of published and written sources: primary sources and secondary sources. The first includes both artifacts and documents, and in our subject, 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.
- The written record includes manuscripts, letters and books, which in turn constitute an important source for learning about the nature of political and military life during the study period.
- These sources contain original data and information that are as close to reality as possible, and they often reflect the truth, and are rarely distorted. The person who writes as an eyewitness to a particular incident is often correct and closer to the truth than the person who narrates it about him or who reads it transmitted from another person or persons. Secondary sources include referring to sources transmitted from other primary and non-primary sources, and they include authored books, historical, literary, philosophical research and studies, and scientific theses, and they are of scientific value to the historian because they are based on scientific investigation and can be used with greater confidence.
- The research dealt with scientific methodology and sources for studying the British campaign in Egypt in 1807 through: The scientific methodology for the book, Al-Jabarti (1820), Douin, Georges (1928), British documents 21st November 1806 to 21st October 1807, an eyewitness by the pseudonym "Miles" (1837-1838), the difference between Al-Jabarti and British documents, and Darwish, M. A. (2021)

References

- 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.
- Al-Jabarti (1998). History of Al-Jabarti, Original Date of Publication 1820, Cairo: The People's Book, 1958. Cairo: Dar Al-Kutub Al-Masria,
- Al-Jabarti, 'Abd al-Rahman (1994). *History of Egypt: 'Aja'ib al-Athar fi 'l-Tarajim wa'l-Akhbar*, 1. Franz Steiner Verlag Stuttgart.
- 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.

- Ayalon, David (1960). "The Historian al-Jabartī and His Background", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*, 23 (2).
- Darwish, M. A. (2018). Research Methods in the Humanities, Arab Nation Foundation for Publishing and Distribution.
- 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.
- Douin, Georges et E. C. Fawtier-Jones (1928). *L'Angleterre et L'Egypt, 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.
- Saleh, Abdulkader (2005). "Ġābārti," in Uhlig, Siegbert, ed., *Encyclopaedia Aethiopica: D-Ha*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.