

ORIGINAL POETRY.

THE KISS YOU GAVE AT PARTING.

BY GEORGE WASHINGTON JOHNSON.

You ask me what star shone in glorious gleams
In the gloom that hung over life's billow—
You ask me what thought came last before dreams,
When nightly my head pressed the pillow—
'Twas the sweet, gentle love-light, that beamed from the
depths

Of thine eyes, while the pearl-tears were starting—
'Twas how tenderly, fondly you pressed to my lips
The kiss, that you gave me at parting.

You ask me what forms from the caves of the night
Came up in fair visions before me—
You ask me what hopes shone like angels of light,
In their brightness came up and stood o'er me.
'Twas the form of the maiden my bosom holds dear,
The cause of my heart's wild, sweet smarting—
The hopes, that buoyed up from the dell of despair,
Was the vow that you pledged at parting.

You ask me what hand lured me on to the goal,
Which I saw in the coal-pictures burning—
You ask me what fancies flew back to my soul,
When thoughts of my home were returning—
'Twas the hand that in mine so fondly was pressed,
Of moon's dear o'er the coals darting—
And the sweet happy fancy that came with the rest
Was the kiss that you gave me at parting.

BIRNBROOK, Oct. 23rd, 1863.

THE POLISH QUESTION.

(From the Westminster Review.)

THE Polish question is indeed a striking example of the effects of a breach of international right silently concurred in by all the Powers of Europe. For nearly a hundred years it has been the standing difficulty of statesmen, the terror of sovereigns, and the hope of all the enemies of peace. Before it was first raised by the partition, there had been no sensible alteration of territory in Europe for three centuries: since that time not one century has yet passed, and Europe has not once been free for fifteen years together from convulsions, more or less directly traceable to the partition, which have changed her very face and disturbed her internal organization. With an almost inconceivable blindness, the protectors of the 'order' of 1815, instead of closing up the hideous wound that exposed the European body politic weak and defenceless to the attack of its Muscovite enemy, left open the sore to spread the seeds of chronic disease by corrupting the universal feeling of right and belief in the principles of civilization. And when the partitioning Powers, in defiance of the express stipulations of the Treaty of Vienna, not only neglected to apply to the evil they had committed the weak and inefficient remedies which they were solemnly bound to use, but did their best to turn them into poisons, Europe, as if under a heavy retribution, whose weight she felt powerless to shake off, remained passive and silent in presence of an ever-recurring and aggravated wrong. How infinitely stronger was the case of the Poles, goaded into revolution by the flagrant violation of all their rights and the barbarous tyranny of the monster who was their viceroy, than that of the dissatisfied, but neither insulted nor persecuted Belgians in 1830—and how miserably inefficient were the feeble remonstrances of France and England in the former case, as compared with the firm yet peaceful attitude of all the Powers in the latter! Our government alone seemed to have some consciousness of its duty, and protested with irresistible logic both against Russia's repeated violations of the Treaty of Vienna and monstrous doctrine that the revolution which was the consequence of those violations relieved her from her obligations to Europe under the Treaty. But these isolated protests were of no avail. Prussia, still basely sacrificing her independence to the alliance of Russia, established a cordon of troops on her frontier; and Austria, who secretly favoured the Poles, was deterred from openly pronouncing in their favor by the evident hesitation of France and England. Blocked in by enemies who surrounded her on every side, and shut out from every kind of support, Poland fell once more a victim to the fears and the political blindness of Europe. But her misfortunes, far from crushing her, inspired her with a new life. Without the constitution and the national institutions guaranteed to her by the Treaty of Vienna, oppressed and insulted by the Russianising policy of the Czars and the Germanisation of their allies, she still kept alive the flame of nationality, and eagerly watched for an opportunity to strike another blow for her independence. The opportunity was not long in coming. The absorption of Cracow by Austria—a violation of international right which was perfectly consistent with the conduct pursued by the partitioning Powers towards Poland since 1772, but which now for the first time roused the indignation of Europe—was the prelude to a European revolution in which the Poles of Prussia and Austria took part. Again they failed; but this time they had no claim, as insurgents, on the aid of Europe, as they were quite unable to oppose anything like effectual resistance to the governments against which they had risen, and Russian Poland lay paralyzed beneath the iron arm of Nicholas. In the present insurrection the case is far different. It has now lasted as long as that of 1830, and is daily increasing in strength. It is the united work of all classes of the population; it embraces the whole of ancient Poland; in a word, it exhibits all the signs of a national rising. An opportunity is now offered to Europe not only to 'prevent bloodshed' and to 'preserve social order,' as in the case of Belgium, but to vindicate the sacredness of treaties and restore the balance of power. Those who object that the restoration of Poland would not achieve the last of these objects because it would give France an ally in the north, seem to forget that there is but one alterna-

tive. The choice is between an alliance of France with a free constitutional Poland or with a despotic and aggressive Russia. Already does rumor speak of the latter as impending over the head of liberal Europe. And after all, if Europe will adhere to the duties traced out for her by her own written law, where is the danger of this Franco-Polish alliance? A Poland freed by Napoleon may indeed be tied by links of gratitude to his policy; but a Poland resuscitated under the protection of united Europe will have no motive for joining herself in a monstrous union with an aggressor and a despot. Nor does she claim or desire anything more than this protection. Her national government repudiates all foreign intervention; it asks only for a recognition by Europe of the same belligerent rights as those she has hitherto extended to every insurgent nation; to the Greeks in 1826, to the Belgians in 1830, and to the Confederate States of America since the beginning of the present civil war. And if we look at the fact that before the Treaty of Vienna the position of Poland in the international law of Europe was that of an independent nation, and that the arrangements of the Treaty which altered that position have been completely destroyed and have proved impracticable, we cannot but acknowledge that it is the duty of Europe to reconsider the position she made for Poland in 1815, and to settle its future fate in such a manner as to prevent its being a source of constant disturbance in consequence of the misgovernment and bad faith of the three Powers who by the Treaty were made its sovereigns. For it cannot be too often repeated that the right of Europe to interfere is not confined to the Congress kingdom. The articles of the Treaty we have already quoted show clearly that the administration of the Polish provinces divided among the three Powers was as much a matter of European arrangement as that of the kingdom; and that the only right enjoyed by the three partitioning Powers over their Polish possessions is derived from the Treaty of Vienna.* This right, one at least of the Powers in question has forfeited by her persistent non-fulfilment of the conditions attached to it. The conduct of Russia with regard to the Polish articles of the Treaty of Vienna presents the grossest and most indefensible instance of that offence against the society of nations, whose necessary punishment we alluded to at the beginning of this article. 'It has been,' said our veteran statesman and diplomatist in his place in Parliament in 1861, 'the greatest violation of a treaty that has ever taken place in the history of the world.' Unless, therefore, treaties are henceforward to be mere declarations of an intention to confer certain benefits during pleasure, this violation for nearly half a century of the greatest of European treaties with impunity must be put a stop to. There can be no more dignified and effectual means of doing this than the declaration by Europe of her withdrawal of the rights she gave to Russia over Poland in 1815. Such a course could not deprive Europe of her right to interfere in Poland; on the contrary, it would make that right only the stronger, for it would make it dependent, not on the title-deed of the Treaty of Poland of 1815, but on that of the lawfully independent Poland of 1782. Further, it would be both the reason and the explanation of the recognition of the Poles as belligerents, who will then be entitled to fight, not for the restricted rights under the Treaty, but for their full rights as a lawfully independent nation. The objections which have been urged against this recognition are easily shown to be futile. It has been said that, unless an insurgent country is sufficiently strong to have reasonable hopes of success, its recognition as a belligerent would be useless and even mischievous; that the Poles have no regular army, and do not occupy any towns; and that therefore they can have no claim to such a recognition. The principle is, no doubt, a sound one; but it will be difficult to support the inference which is drawn from it.

The true measure of the strength of an insurrection obviously consists in the difficulties it has overcome and the advance it has made towards success. In 1830 Poland had one of the finest regular armies in Europe, and was in full possession of all her towns; yet she failed, after an insurrection which lasted only nine months—a period during which the present rising has steadily increased in force and extent. And if we look at the strength which the Confederates of America have put forward during their insurrection, which nevertheless was considered sufficiently great to justify their recognition by Europe as belligerents, we shall find that their efforts have been as nothing compared with those of the Poles. The Confederates, rich, free, and prosperous, began the struggle with their own ground for a disputed question of Federal rights; the Poles, ground down by a despotism without parallel, impoverished by excessive taxation, and watched by the most elaborate system of espionage in the world, rose against their oppressors, unarmed and surrounded by enemies, for the holy cause of independence and freedom. The Confederates are defending themselves against an invader from without; the Poles are making desperate efforts to expel the oppressor within. And on which side has been the balance of success? The vast armies of the South, fighting for a point of law, are yielding; the half-starved and ill-armed insurgents, fighting for their homes and all that is most dear to them, are disputing, step by step, every inch of their country with the enemy, defeating his troops, counter-checking his manœuvres, and superseding his government by their own. By their strength, therefore, at least as much as by the justice of their cause and the barbarity of their opponents, and as a logical consequence of Russia's rejection of the propositions of the Powers, have the Poles a right to claim from Europe recognition as belligerents. Nor would this recognition be a mere barren advantage to the insurgents. Besides opening to them all the markets

* See Lord Palmerston's Despatches to Lord Hoytesbury, March 22, 1831, and March 12, 1832.

† The rumored grant of a Constitution to Russia and Poland was so glaringly improbable that none but those who were totally ignorant of the real state of those countries gave it any credit. It has already been denied by the official organs of the Russian Government.

of Europe for the purchase of materials of war, it would, combined with the declaration of their right to independence, cause an open breach between Russia and the Powers making the declaration. From the consequences of such a breach England and France would have nothing to fear; and the effect of this decisive step on their part would be to give Austria an opportunity of practically proving her liberal professions by making Galicia an independent State, and thereby obtaining that influence in Germany and over her own motley territories which she covets so much. It would practically throw back Russia into Asia, and thus put an end to those dangerous schemes of Pan-Slavism which threaten the disruption of Austria and Turkey, and the consequent enslavement of Eastern and Central Europe. It would dissipate the dangers of a European war by establishing a principle of common and peaceful action against Russia. Finally, it would introduce the reign of peace and order in Europe, by showing the determination of the Powers to prove that right is stronger than might, and that neither the integrity of nations nor the faith of treaties shall in future be violated with impunity.

THE CLOSE OF THE RUSSIAN FESTIVITIES IN NEW YORK.

(From the New York Herald.)

At last we can announce the close of the Russian *fetes*, or farces. Glad as we are that all the fuss and parade is over, we cannot allow the occasion to pass without a few sensible words in regard to those who have made themselves so entirely ridiculous during these farcical performances. The great Napoleon, when confined upon the Island of St. Helena, uttered the memorable proverb that if you scratch a Russian you will find a Tartar beneath. Napoleon never said anything more true, and we have found it so during our recent experience in entertaining the officers of the Russian fleet now in our harbor.

Upon the arrival of the Russian fleet in our harbor we were seized with a Russian mania. Our citizen soldiers paraded the streets, muddied their trousers, to show themselves to the Russians, and were quietly ignored at the Russian dinner. This dinner was got up lavishly—although lard and tallow and train oil would have done as well as game, and pastry, and champagne—but the speeches were exceedingly farcical, especially in those portions which essayed to draw a comparison between the Emperor Alexander and President Lincoln. Then came the ball, which was, as we predicted, a farce and a failure. So ends the history of the Russian festivities; and what have we gained by them? Is it the sympathy of the Russian Czar? We had that before, in a diplomatic way, and it really amounts to nothing. Russia sends her navy here to keep it safe in the event of a war with France; but we doubt if she would send it here if we needed it to aid us in fighting England. Her navy, in fact, is not worth the sending. One of our Ironsides could blow it out of water, with all the barbarians on board, in a couple of hours. How else can Russian sympathy avail us? What assistance is her barbarian legation or her barbarian diplomacy to a people able to take care of themselves? If she has any sympathy to spare let her expend it upon the Poles, who have groaned for half a century under her iron yoke, and have been deprived of all their natural and national rights, except the right of being sent to Siberia. For free America to become cheek by jowl with such a despotism is contrary to all the traditions, all the sentiments and all the principles of this republic. We may have forgotten this during our recent excitement. Let us remember it now.

A CUTE LAWYER.—A gentleman, on dying, left all his estates to a monastery, on condition that, on the return of his only son, who was then abroad the worthy fathers should give him whatever they should choose. When the son came home he went to the monastery, and received but a small share, the monks choosing to keep the greater part to themselves. A barrister, to whom he happened to mention the case, advised him to sue the monastery, and promised to gain his cause. The gentleman followed his adviser. 'The testator,' said the ingenious barrister, 'has left his son that share of the estate which the monks should choose; these are the express words of the will. Now, it is plain what they have chosen, by what they keep for themselves. My client, then, stands upon the words of the will. Let us have,' said he, 'the part they have chosen, and I am satisfied. And he gained the suit.'

No mode of payment can be fair which overlooks the previous training of the workman. Sir Joshua Reynolds was once asked by a person for whom he had painted a small picture how he could charge so much for a work which only employed him for five days? 'Five days!' replied Sir Joshua, 'why I have expended the work of thirty-five years upon it.'

John Reeve was once accosted by a man, with a bottle of gin in his hand, 'Pray, sir, is this the way to the poor house?' John gave him a look of clerical dignity, and pointing to the bottle, said, 'No, sir, but that is.'

Never trouble trouble till trouble troubles you.

There is a young woman in Nova Scotia, seventeen years of age, who is seven feet two inches in height. She measures forty-three inches round the waist, thirty-three inches from her armpit to the tip of her fingers, weighs 274 pounds and has a foot thirteen inches long. She is good looking, quite social, although diffident, not being accustomed to see the public, and her name is Anna Swan.

'A gentleman in our office,' remarks Dr. Eddy, 'the other day stated that he had a system by which he could remember things almost *ad infinitum*. We like to hear him, for he talks heartily. By and by he started and walked along nearly to the stair-door, when suddenly he returned, and with sanguiferous hue said, 'I forgot my hat!'