

POLAND AND RUSSIA.

The Czar's Government in Poland and on the Danube.

The Historic Relations of Poland and Russia—Present Relations of that People to European Politics—The So-Called Emancipation of the Polish Peasants—Credits Due to the Polish Revolutionists—Greek and Latin Culture—Etc.

[Prepared especially for the Post by a Polish Journalist.]

Since the war, now raging on the Danube, has occupied the minds of the whole civilized world, a more diligent attention is turned to the Polish question and to the relations of Poland to Russia in particular and to all the other Slavonic races in general. An endeavor will be made to acquaint our readers with those relations in their historical, as well as in their present development.

POLAND, IN ITS HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT.

Has played a double part. In the first, it sheltered the Slavonic tribes against the German conquest; in the other, it defended the whole of Europe against the Turkish invasions. In the ninth, tenth and eleventh centuries numerous Slavonic tribes inhabiting the countries now belonging to Prussia, as far as Schleswig-Holstein and the mouth of the Elbe, were compelled to submit to the German preponderance. It seemed that Poland, at that time scarcely converted from paganism, had to share the same fate. But it came otherwise. The so-called "Grang nach oegan" (pressure towards east) was checked by the first Polish king, Miecislav, in the tenth century, and a far stronger resistance was made by Boleslaus the Great (968-1025), for he went over on the offensive and extended his dominions from the river Dnieper to the river Saale.

In the course of time the Teutonic order settled in Prussia—at that time belonging to Poland—and the Order of the Knights, or Brothers of the Sword, in Poland. Under the pretense of converting the Prussians, Lithuanians and Letonians to Christianity, they extended their power over the Slavonic tribes. But in 1410, Ladislaus Jagiello, King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania, struck a heavy blow on the German preponderance in the murderous battle at Grunwald and Tannenberg. The German invasion was checked, unable to extend further, and, till the end of the seventeenth century, the electors of Brandenburg were obliged to be vassals of the Polish crown. This was the part Poland played in the Middle Ages toward the Slavonic race. Now, a word as to its relations to Turkey. The history of Poland from the beginning of the fifteenth century is only an uninterrupted series of wars with the Ottomans. In 1444 Ladislaus Varnusius, King of Poland and Hungary, Grand Duke of Lithuania, perished in the disastrous battle at Warna while hastening to bring support to the threatened Slavonians and the Greek empire. From 1620-21, or from the defeat of the Poles at Cecora and their great victory at Chocim, the war, with a few interruptions, was raging continually. The victors turned from one side to the other, but covered the Polish arms with immortal glory.

THE POWER OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE INCREASED.

Threatening not only Poland but the whole of Europe. At the same time the victories of the Hero King (Joannes III), Sobieski, like a flash of lightning follow one after the other. The battles at Leopold, Polcron and Chocim seem to be only the prelude to the last terrible fight at Vienna in 1683, in which that Hero King, at the head of 20,000 Poles and the remains of the routed German army, defeated and put to flight about half a million Turks and Tartars, and saved not only the German empire but the whole of Christianity, and forever crushed the preponderance of the bulwark of the East. Since that time the Turks have not waged any further wars of conquest, and were hardly able to keep in submission the countries they had previously conquered. Their victorious career was at once stopped. This state of weakness helped considerably to ameliorate the lot of the Serbs growing since the end of the fourteenth century under Turkish oppression. Taking advantage of the weakness of their oppressors, they were able, in the progress of time, under such military leaders as Kara Drordri, Milot Obrenovic and others, if not to fight out a complete independence, to at least secure a state of feudal tenure, in which they still now remain. Thus, Poland, in regard to the Slavonic race, fulfilled a double task of defense, on its eastern and western boundaries. But it also fulfilled a third one, namely, the mission of civilization, which will be briefly outlined. Two only of the Slavonic nations went hand in hand with the progress of time and civilization—the Poles and the Czechs (Bohemians). The buds of culture among the Serbs were destroyed by the Turkish conquest. But the Muscovites, or Russians, till Peter the Great (eighteenth century), as is well known, had almost nothing in common with the rest of the civilized world. At the end of the fourteenth century, in Poland, the University of Cracow was founded, which in the sixteenth century reached the height of its fame and became a strong focus of enlightenment for the Slavonic race. Poles, Ruthenians, Serbs, Czechs and even Germans frequented and learned there. Celebrities like Nicolaus Kopernikus were brought up there. The Academy of Cracow played an important part in the so-called

EPOCH OF REGENERATION.

And strove for superiority with the celebrated universities of Oxford, Paris, Padua and Bologna. Thousands of students found therein the fountain of knowledge and enlightenment. Celebrated men, nourished at its breast, occupied prominent positions in the councils of Constantinople and Basil. Poles, Polish and Latin, like Fibemens, Janicki, and afterward Sarbiewski, whose works, besides the first Latin classics, are taught and explained in the English universities till now, were crowned like Peterance at the capital of Rome. Religious tolerance, one of the main principles of a constitution, invited to Poland, in the times of the Huss reformation, and after in those of Luther and Calvin, many celebrities who in their own countries were under ban in consequence of their religious confession. Such a liberal thinking must be attributed to the influence of general enlightenment which produced as its fruit a law of which only England can boast—"neminem captivum nisi jure victum"—and means the same as the English law, habens corpus. It can thus be clearly seen what a great influence Poland exerted upon the Slavonic tribes, not only by saving their political existence, but by pouring upon them enlightenment and civilization. It will not be asserted that Poland from itself would or should have supported the idea of "Pan-Slavism"—for this expression and this idea are born in our times—but this outline has proved clearly that the policy of Poland was de facto also in concert with the welfare of the whole Slavonic race, and the cultivating influence it exercised was both powerful and singular.

At the end of the seventeenth and in the eighteenth century the downfall of Poland began. The principal, among many other reasons, was the total exhaustion—although victorious—in the Turkish wars, which were beyond all experience destructive. The political downfall was succeeded by that of enlightenment and education. It is very easy to comprehend that a nation compelled through a whole century not to dismount their horses, nor to lay aside their swords and guns, must finally have neglected their education. The youths, instead of going to their school-benches, were roaming till the fifteenth year of age on the banks of Dnieper, on the steppes, or on the boundaries of Wallachia, where every day scenes were played which till now could trouble the sound sleep of many of the European diplomats. The consequences were evident; the population decimated—education neglected—the uninterrupted wars for Christianity brought forth by the rough soldiery religious intolerance, and the inability to lead another life than that of the camp. Disorders and civil wars broke out. So came the eighteenth century, and with it a still greater weakness and cause of downfall.

RUSSIA APPEARED ON THE EUROPEAN STAGE.

We shall see how the "protectrix," Russia, played her first debut. It is hard to believe, but the facts prove it. He who does not flatter, and who, with the noble English Lord, Dudley Stuart, can say, *causas non facta sequor*, cannot deny this fact: Russia, "the protectrix of the Slavonic race," began her first debut with the partition of the most famous and most enlightened Slavonic state. The "protectrix" divided a living Slavonia, body and blood, and shared it with Germany, the born foe of the Slavonic race. The first partition, or rather robbery, of Poland was

executed in 1772. The "protectrix," Russia, together with Austria and Prussia, contracted the boundaries of a heroic nation, whose blood had been spilled in struggles for the most sacred ideas. Twenty years afterwards the nation awakened to a new life; the Diet of the 3d of May, 1792, promulgated a liberal constitution; religious tolerance and equal civil rights were secured to all inhabitants, without exception. The nation desired to live again, desired to prove that it had sufficient strength in its bleeding heart—sufficient power of intellect. Russia, "the Slavonic protectrix," in concert with Prussia, and by the consent of Austria, repudiated the second partition. The year 1795 followed. The nation, driven to despair, arose and seized its arms. Above the confusion of the tempest now emerged a name, awakening in the American heart-sacred recollections of their holy war of independence—the name of

THADDEUS KOSCIUSKO.

Washington's friend, posted himself at the head of his nation. The struggle lasted but a short time. After the victories of Dubienka and Raclawice, followed the disaster of Mlaciejowice; the carnage of Praga, in which the Slavonic Russian soldiers butchered 16,000 persons—aged men, women and children. Then came the third and last partition of Poland. Russia, "the protectrix," delivered in that partition the Slavonic cities of Cracow and Lencois to Austria, and the Slavonic city of Warsaw to Prussia, taking the rest for itself. The facts are speaking; the world that reads may judge.

In 1795 began the Russian government of Poland. They had slain the nation; stoen its political existence, by denying the rights of representation and self-government, and what remained? Those rights which are denied to nobody, and which constitute the fundamental and inalienable rights of every people—religion, patriotism, language and literature. Let us see what became of them, beginning with religion. Several million peasants in the different parts of Poland, as Lithuania, Podolia, Wolhynia, Ukraina, belong to the Greek Catholic or united church, whose dogma is common with the Catholic, and which is subject to the Papal power. It has some particular institutions; the mass and liturgy are read in the Slavonic and not in the Latin language, and other details. The Russian government resolved to convert the confessors of this church to the orthodox Greek or schismatic church, of which the Czar is the infallible head, thus ordering the dogmas which govern the conscience of men. None stick more persistently to the faith of their forefathers than the simple peasants, who, without reasoning, attach themselves with all the might of their faithful hearts, even to the mere external form, upon which in their opinion their whole eternity, their salvation or damnation, depends. This people had not the slightest desire to change their faith, and declined to be converted to the orthodox church. The Russian government replied in sending to them apostles with bayonets. Gloomy dramas were played in those, till that time, silent villages. First the priests were seized and banished to Siberia, there chained day and night to hard work in the mines. The only liberty given to them was the choice between death in those poisonous catacombs or—orthodoxy. The majority of them preferred death—they swallowed lead and died. The united monks and nuns were converted by peculiar cures—of "starving" and "watering."

The cure of starvation consisted in giving them to eat every third day only, but the cure of watering was performed in a particular manner. Monks and nuns totally undressed and nude were driven to a river or pond covered with thin ice, and pulled in by ropes. An orthodox priest, always present at executions of this kind, asked now and then in intervals of some minutes: "Will you accept the true faith?" "No, no." Then the priest ordered: "Pull well." The rope strained to the utmost. The sharp ice was broken by the numb bodies in different directions. What a sight! Even the Russian soldiers used for putting the ropes, and the Russian peasants gathered by curiosity on the river banks, broke out in roaring and crying. The Hebrews raising their hands to heaven exclaimed in despair: "Jehovah! Jehovah! dost thou not see it?" A hail of biscuits, pieces of bread and other eatables poured down from the Hebrews' hands on to the river, that the starved, condemned to the horrible death of drowning, could, perchance, snatch something with their dying lips. The Cossacks passed along the shores and charged the merciful crowd with their knouts. The inhabitants of villages in Lithuania, Podolia and Wolhynia were driven in large masses and ordered to sign the act of conversion to the orthodox church. The wretches cried out: "Take all that we have, the last cent, the last piece of bread; leave us only our faith, the faith of our fathers." But those cries were not heard in

THE GILDED CHAMBERS OF ST. PETERSBURG.

Wherefrom the orders were given. Inhabitants of several villages took flight in the deep recesses of the forests. Not having friends of their own faith, and not willing to summon the orthodox, they married, baptized children and buried the dead without any spiritual assistance. All this lasted several years. In 1830, 1832, 1834, 1836, it was discussed in the English Parliament. A voice called the Czar Nicholas "a miscreant." It was discussed in the French Chambers, and finally the records of the debate were taken to the Archives. The martyred generation died out, and in our days the Greek united religion is forbidden in those parts of the Russian empire by governmental "ukases," and if existing somewhere secretly, only in the recesses of a Lithuanian prairie. But it is of no use to mention what happened ten or twenty years since. In what was formerly called the kingdom of Poland, the departments Lublin and Siedlce, scenes as above described were repeated last year, and have been repeated till now. The statement is distinctly made and repeated—the same scenes occur of shooting, starving, driving out masses of nude women and children in the snow in the severest winter time, the same scenes of marrying, baptizing and burying in the far remote recesses of prairies and forests. What shall be said more. We only need refer to the official reports of the English Consul, Mr. Lagarra, in St. Petersburg, and those of Mr. Mansfield in Warsaw. The readers may think that the Catholic religion of the Latin rite was better treated and spared. Let the facts speak again. Archbishop Felinski, of Warsaw, was banished into the interior of Russia; Bishops Lubieniski Poppel, Bzewuski, Bia-tobruski, either died in Siberia or are still living in banishment. Are these facts sufficient? At the present moment the ories of the clergy and peasantry are hushed by the thunder of cannon on the Danube. Russia defends there Christianity against the Turkish intolerance. "There are more things in heaven and earth," says Hamlet, "than are dreamed of in your philosophy." The next right guaranteed by every liberal government to every nation is the maintaining and supporting of the patriotic spirit. Let us see what relation exists between Russia and Poland in that respect. Patriotism everywhere is a virtue. In the whole world patriotism signifies love of country. In Poland it is officially forbidden to love Poland. In Russia and Poland instead of the expression "country," is substituted that of "Czar." But we will use the official language. Every Pole who attains his majority has to deposit a solemn oath of fidelity that he will love the "Czar" before all; that he will remain faithful to life, and if he should notice that somebody undertakes something against the "Czar," the deponent will denounce and deliver him to the authorities. A horrible system, making espionage—the meanest of all crimes,—

A STATE INSTITUTION.

A horrible condition this, obliging the son to deliver his own father into the hands of the prosecutor; a horrible situation, forcing the whole nation to take an oath to act in concert with the power, that is fendish language. In Vienna a government ukase in a public place, should use the Polish language in conversation forfeits for the first time a fine of 25 roubles, the second time 50 of a farther persistence, he or she is to be sent to Siberia under conditions provided by law. The want of knowledge of another language cannot be accepted as an exculpating reason for the guilty party. That order was printed and posted on all the street corners and government buildings. The Roman Catholic Church uses the Latin language in its ritual. The Russian government tries earnestly to substitute for the Latin the Russian language. In Warsaw, in all schools, the Russian language is not only obligatory for all lectures and lecturers, but, under the penalty of expulsion from all educational institutions in the whole empire, the pupils are forbidden to use in their conversation the Polish language. In fact, the Prussian government also forbid the Polish language in the public schools in Posen, but an order forbidding

the pupils to talk Polish to each other does not exist now. Although in Posen the removal of the native Polish language from the public schools is not constitutional and against the solemn royal promises, the act cannot be compared with similar prohibitions in Russian Poland, for the Prussians are not Slavonians and never pretended to be "protectors" of the Slavonic race. Concerning the prohibition of the Polish language one fact more will be sufficient: A few years ago the "University of Warsaw," by virtue of an imperial ukase was changed to that of the "Imperial Warsaw-Slavonian University." In that university all scientific lectures, without exception, are delivered in the Russian language; and because the university bears the name "Slavonian" there are introduced lecture chairs for all the Slavonic languages except the Polish. The only exception is made of that Slavonic language which has a high perfection, mighty literature, and which has poets like Mickiewicz. The Polish literature unfolds itself every day in spite of all the measures used by the government to stop its development. Every Polish book, every Polish newspaper, before printed, must be submitted to the imperial censor, and having suffered so many scratches as it pleases that official, then and only then it can gain permission to be printed. That is the relation of Russia to Poland provided by government ukases. The foreign European press knows very little or nothing about it, or is purposely silent, influenced in its judgment, of course, by Russian roubles. Another principal reason will be found in the hypocrisy of the Russian government and its diplomacy, by which it has been distinguished from the beginning of its existence. Whoever considers these words an exaggeration may be convinced by some instances taken from Prussian sources. In 1792 the manifesto of the Czarina Catharine declared that the partition of Poland was necessary for the safety of Europe, because the majority of the Polish nation were marked by a spirit of Jacobinism dangerous for the public social order. This happened in 1792, exactly in that year in which, by virtue of the statute of May 3d, the electoral throne of Poland was declared an hereditary one—direct in direct opposition to any spirit of Jacobinism. That is not all. The same Russia which nearly one hundred years before denounced Poland, at that time for the most part conservative, for having revolutionary tendencies—this same Russia now denounces Poland—when in progress of time its ideas became democratic and progressive—of retrogression and conservatism. Political perversity cannot go any farther. More conscientious Russians, however, acknowledge it. The Russian historian Kossovnow, friendly to Poland, relating to the partition of Poland in his work, "The Last Years of the Polish Republic," says: "We can hardly suppress the feelings of shame and ignominy when looking at the conduct of our Russian diplomacy at the time." And in fact it was hard, but it is far harder now than 100 years since. Let the reader take into consideration that the same Poland which in 1792 was accused of being too revolutionary, is now in our days—1872—accused of being too conservative. On what basis this accusation rests let us inquire.

THE RUSSIAN GOVERNMENT ASSERTS

That it has brought to a successful end the "emancipation" of the peasants in Poland, to which the majority of the Polish nation was opposed. In consequence of the expression used, "emancipation," everybody would form the idea: First, that the Polish peasants were like the negroes in America; second, that their servile condition lasted till our time; third, that the Russian government really had it abolished. The answer is short—so many words, so many lies. History will furnish the proof. Centuries ago, 1349, in the so called "Statute of Wislica," a book containing a collection of laws or statutes issued during the reign of Casimir the Great, we find the statute: "O wolnych knieziach" (of the free peasants). We cannot find in that statute an expression like "servi" (slaves), or "servi sunt res" (slaves are things). And even the Tartaric and Turkish prisoners of war could not be bought or sold, and, therefore, were not considered as slaves. In Poland slavery never existed—not even that condition of subjection which existed in western Europe, and is contained in the statute, "gleba adscriptus" (bound to the soil). The peasant in Poland never was bound to the soil (gleba adscriptus), but in Russia slavery existed till 1861. It is to be understood that in Poland when a person (peasant) took a piece of ground from a nobleman, or from the government, into his possession, and used it for his own advantage, he was obliged to pay for it a yearly rent, called "cryznr," in money or in personal work.

From that personal work originated the so-called "panszerzyne," that is the obligation to compulsory labor due to the lord of the manor in certain days of the week. In case the latter was too severe or demanded too much, the peasant—to for he was not gleba adscriptus—was at liberty to leave the manor and to look for another holding under more convenient conditions, or to devote his time to any art, trade or mechanical labor. That shows clearly that the peasant was personally free; and for this assertion there are some more striking illustrations. Act III of the constitution of May 3, 1792, contains the following words: "Every person who enters Polish soil is free." Josef II, Emperor of Germany, having taken possession of his dominion after the death of his mother, Maria Theresa, noticed the difference between the personal relations of the peasants to their masters in Galicia and in his other hereditary dominions. Taking the personal relation of the subjects to the lords, as it was practiced in Galicia, as a basis, he abolished a form of slavery in all other provinces except Galicia, regulating there only the services and presentations due to the lords of the manor. This is satisfactory proof that the peasants in Galicia were personally free and not slaves. Readers will understand that where there is not a "mancipium" there cannot be an "emancipation." Russia, therefore, has not emancipated the peasants in Poland, for no form of slavery was ever known there.

What, then, has the Russian government done for the peasants? It endowed the peasants with lands, which they possessed before, on condition that they paid for them yearly a certain rent, in money or in work. Why, then, was it not done during the political existence of Poland? From the time when Poland was destroyed in its political existence and self-government, 100 years has passed, and at that time nobody thought about the endowment of peasants. This was true not only of Poland, but of Germany, France, England—of the whole of Europe.

In Polish law the relations of the subjects to the masters were from the most remote times better defined than in any other European country, for they were in Poland not gleba adscripti, and the land endowment would have come earlier if Poland had maintained the rights of self-government. There are good grounds for asserting that: 1st—It was far earlier spoken of in Poland than in any other country in Europe except France; 2d—the land endowment came not in consequence of

A RUSSIAN INITIATIVE.

Earlier or later it must have come, with the spirit of progress, and for the accelerated introduction of the statute the peasants are indebted to the Polish revolutionary movements. When, after the outbreak of the last revolution (1863), a revolutionary government was constituted, its first act was to promulgate the instant endowment of the peasants. At that time, and not before, the Russian government, in order to bring the peasantry on its side and not to offend them, was compelled to realize the endowment of the peasants, although it had intended to put it aside for many years. The whole proceeding of the Russian government shows no intention to ameliorate the lot of the "subjects," but to alienate the national cause. During the last revolution the fighting was going on not in towns and cities, for they were without exception in possession of Russian troops, but in villages. The revolution lasted but two years, and, therefore, if the peasants or inhabitants of villages would have been opposed to it, the revolution against the organized and ten times stronger Russian forces could not have held out two months. When the Russian official organs state they had the peasants on their side, they are answered by most striking historical facts: Thaddeus Kosciusko gained his greatest victory at Raclawice through the assistance of Polish peasants armed with scythes, called kosyuzki, and in the revolution of 1833 detachments of infantry armed with scythes instead of firearms were mostly composed of Polish peasants. The peasantry are exceedingly attached to their native villages, faith, language and customs. The Russian government draws them away from their villages by drafting them in the army; persecutes their religion, language and customs. Let any man of judgment answer, if, in presence of such facts, sympathy is possible? This argument is based upon facts, and only one more need be mentioned. The government of Russian Poland does not

support the common schools and teachers. All expenses of that kind have to be paid by the inhabitants. Because the ukase forbids the teaching of the Polish language in common schools, the inhabitants do not pay and do not send the children to school. The only reason is that they shall not be compelled to learn the Russian language. Is that a sign of sympathy? In spite of all ukases they learn secretly how to read and write Polish, and any kind of new-paper, any kind of book printed in Polish is considered as a precious treasure, and is forwarded with the greatest caution from hand to hand. The Russian government made public the statement that there exists a great enmity between the proprietors (noblemen) and the peasants, whilst in the communal elections, mostly for such positions as mayors, the fact is that proprietors (noblemen) are usually elected. Finally, hundreds of murdered peasants of the Greek Catholic Church, hundreds imprisoned, and thousands deported to Siberia, testify to the protection which the Russian government spread over that class of the Polish people. The sister republic, Lithuania, had, in regard to the peasants, regulations differing from those in Poland. Their lot in Lithuania was less favorable and similar to that in Russia. The peasant was bound to the soil. The proprietors, comprehending their unfavorable situation, not corresponding with the spirit of the times, began *motu proprio* to emancipate the peasants. In 1817

THE DIET OF THE NOBILITY

Submitted to the Czar a petition calling his attention to the condition of the peasants as not being in accord with humanity and civilization. The Czar in the same year issued an "ukase," forbidding the nobility—1. To submit any petition concerning that question. 2. From emancipating the peasants in a summary way. Reviewing what we have said and proved by facts found either in the past or present history of Poland, the following conclusions are reached: 1. That slavery never existed in Poland, and that therefore there could not be any emancipation. 2. The endowment of peasants with lands they used to possess was first promulgated by the revolutionary government in 1863. 3. The Russian government, by committing outrages upon peasants, by persecuting religion, butchering adherents to the Greek Catholic Church, and by supporting public corruption, cannot depend upon the sympathy of the peasants, any more than it can upon the sympathy of all other classes.

The foregoing presents a picture of the relation of Poland to Russia and of the Russian government to Poland. This is important, throwing a light not only upon the relations mentioned, but upon the events now pending on the Danube and upon the Russian policy from the beginning of its existence. It is worth taking into consideration, what the same Russia which now sends

HALF A MILLION SOLDIERS TO THE DANUBE.

In order to liberate and unite the Slavonians, has done in past times, and is doing in our days, to make the union of the Slavonic race impossible. Such union demands that the different nations should find security under Russian protection. Russia proved in Poland that union with it is ruin. Union demands confidence; Russia destroyed all confidence. Union must secure liberty; Russia is the only despotic government in Europe. Union demands religious tolerance; Russia is persecuting religion. Union demands equal rights for all; Russia understands only how to deprive all of their rights.

Let us cast an impartial look upon the position of the Slavonians under Turkish and under Russian governments. Turkey has given a constitution. We will admit the constitution has its faults, is badly executed, is misunderstood; that it is not able to abolish abuses, but in all cases the constitution is existing in Turkey, not in Russia. Turkish oppression is horrible, but is felt mostly by individual persons; the Russian, not only by persons, but by whole nations. The Turkish is a result of a barbaric administration;

THE RUSSIAN, A RESULT OF A NATION-EXTERMINATING POLICY.

At the time when Turkey secured to all its citizens their national rights, at the same time Russia expelled the Polish language from the judicial courts. What a confusion of conception, what a historical wrong, what an inconsequence of hypocrisy. Let us further proceed in this inquiry.

The union of the Germans was far easier than that of the Slavonic race. The Germans were divided by different forms of government, different jargons, different religious confessions, but they had something common uniting them—their culture. The Slavonians are divided by culture. While the Bohemians, Poles and generally the Slavonians in the West have accepted Christianity from Rome, and with it the Latin and general European culture, Russia and the Slavonians in the East have accepted Christianity from the Greeks, and with it the Byzantine culture. Nothing stands more in contradictory opposition than these, and their differences have influenced the nations in their historical development, in their governmental forms, in their spirit of laws, in their character, their customs, their way of thinking, so that the difference between a Montenegro and a Bohemian or Czech, in spite of their common Slavonic descent, is far greater than that between the same Bohemian and an Englishman. The Slavonians in the East have nothing in common with the Slavonians in the West except the Slavonic descent and the similarity of languages; but they are separated by mutual prejudices, civilization, historical traditions, social institutions and religion. A long series of remarkable differences, which till now are not united, and without a single link bringing the Slavonic nations nearer to each other. Did such a link exist? History answers, yes. That link was the Ruthenian nation by its Unitarian Greek-Catholic religion; by its Latin-Byzantine culture. The Ruthenian nation is neither a pure Russian nor a pure Polish nation. Its language keeps the middle course between the Russian and Polish tongues like a gradual transition from the one to the other. Being historically united with Poland, and therefore with the general European culture, it was, by its geographical situation, influenced by the Byzantine culture also. Its Catholic religion has something in common with the Eastern Church. It has the liturgy in its native language; it admits the marriage of the priests, etc. In one word, that nation was stretching one hand toward the east and the other toward the west.

That nation was the link to a possible union of the Eastern and Western Slavonians, regarding ethnography and civilization. Had Russia sincerely intended a union, had it sincerely and on liberal principles aimed to that point, then it must have supported the Ruthenian nationality, the Unitarian Greek Catholic religion, and the trausitive Latin-Byzantine culture. But it had intended, and intends now, with all strength and power to ruin that nationality, religion and culture. The horrible persecution of the adherents of the Greek Catholic church in Lithuania, Wolhynia, Podlachia, etc., are the best illustrations of what is here stated.

The present Russian policy can be defined in few words: Either the appearance of Russia on the Danube—if it sincerely aims to ameliorate the loss of the Southern Slavonians, if it sincerely aims to a future union—is the greatest political nonsense, a stupidity of a blind diplomacy, or it is intended only to cloak by that pretense Russia's desire for conquests at the expense of the

OTHER SLAVONIANS.

Pressing upon them, instead of a constitutional government, the despotism of the Czar. In the first case it is only a political adventure; in the second, a new political robbery, and must be condemned by all nations. What has been said may explain the relations of Poland to Russia, and to the events now pending on the Danube. The Russian diplomacy declares that the Poles are opposed to the welfare and union of the Slavonic race. That is false. They never were, and are not. But they will never support a political adventure or a political robbery. Poland cannot take an active part under such circumstances; it has to wait, and to try to open the eyes of the enlightened public, and friends of truth and liberty.

Said a Main street man to a German friend, who was complaining of not having anything to do: "Why don't you form a class and teach German? Your friend Schmidt has a night class, and he manages to make a few dollars in that way." "What did the Schmidt write under da gort-house?" "Yes, the same." "Vj, he don't can speak dot English language like me. Ven he say moole he say moole; he don't can say moole like me; and ven he say blay he say blay; he don't say blay like me."—Memphis Avalanche.

Take away your Spartan boy and his fox. The lad who puts his lighted cigar in his pocket when he meets his father, and tells while the Sunday school teacher said, while the cigar is burning him, is infinitely more worthy of admiration.