

English Embassy  
a firm position will be  
stow upon me  
most

LETTER

ADDRESSED TO

MADAM BLANCHE SHAKSPEARE DE TREPKA,

On the Relations between England and Poland,

BY J. B. OSTROWSKI,

*Secretary-General to the Ministry of Justice during the War of Independence,  
and Member of the Literary Society of the University of Cracow.*

LONDON:  
J. UNWIN, GRESHAM STEAM PRESS,  
BUCKLERSBURY.



## LETTER

ADDRESSED TO

MADAM BLANCHE SHAKSPEARE DE TREPKA,

On the Relations between England and Poland,

BY J. B. OSTROWSKI,

*Secretary-General to the Ministry of Justice during the War of Independence,  
and Member of the Literary Society of the University of Cracow.*

MADAM,

I beg to return my sincere acknowledgments for the gratification I have felt in the perusal of your two poems: the first, addressed to His Majesty the Emperor of the French, on the occasion of his visit to the Queen of England; and the second, to Lord Palmerston, Minister of the British Crown, the object of so many hopes and so much sympathy.

It is the part of others, Madam, to pronounce their judgment, or to render homage to your poetic talent; I ask permission to present a few observations in reference to the pure and noble sentiment your lines express, and upon the political mission which you attribute to the Emperor Napoleon, and to Lord Palmerston, the most powerful and popular name in your own country.

The simple circumstance of the French and English Alliance, and the fact that the French and English flags, so long opposed, are now united in



hostility against Russia, mark a prodigious change in the moral and political ideas governing hitherto the diplomatic world. The old European system fails, a new Europe is summoned into existence by the initiative of France, based on those principles of 1789, whose salutary influence, once combated with such fierce energy, your country now ceases to reject. Principles which, whether vanquished in appearance or openly victorious, have transformed Europe by that strong spirit that distinguishes French nationality, eminently Christian, humanising, and expansive.

The English people, with unanimous and sincere feeling, welcomed to their shores the Emperor of the French. An English woman, you offer him the tribute of your verse. I congratulate, on this occasion, your compatriots and yourself. France would never have occupied so high a place in the esteem of nations, were it not for the expectation attached to her alone, in the present as in the past, of conduct guiding to a happier future. Your country at length appeals to the intervention of the French idea, honourable to those who offer, and to those who accept its influence. From unmerited abasement France is exalted to be protector even of antagonists who meditated her ruin, unconscious that, as blind instruments of the most subtle perfidy, they laboured to create for themselves a peril, shame, and bondage. The Emperor of the French, faithful representative of the providential mission imposed on France, defends civilisation against the attacks of that Russia, whose aggressive

boldness has grown with the weak compliance of your country. The old diplomacy of England created the preponderance of Russia, and favoured her aggrandisement, by placing at her feet Poland, Turkey, and consequently Germany, unable now to escape from her redoubtable ally. The retribution is terrible but just. England lavishes the blood of her sons to rescue the Crimea which she once yielded without striking a blow, without allowing a blow to be struck; and opposes the destruction of Turkey, whose dismemberment and ruin she has permitted. The former concessions, so dangerous for the Ottoman Empire, so important for Russia, have been wrested from the Turks by the counsels and even by the arms of your country. Modern Russia is the creation of British diplomacy. England perceives her error, the change is honourable, it must also be complete, a reparation of the evils inflicted upon the people of Europe by the long and intimate union existing between herself and the Muscovite Empire.

I have no intention to address reproaches to your country. I respect the people who by an heroic effort break from their political traditions, and begin to comprehend and to conciliate the France they hated, and to resist the power so long cherished as a faithful and devoted ally. I fervently pray that they may be inspired with the sublime but difficult courage to persevere in their new course of policy, and draw from its development the only reasonable result—destruction of the aggressive power of Russia, by depriving her of



territory unjustly acquired. You hope this result, Madam, from the patriotism and the intelligence of Lord Palmerston; I share your hope. Not to dismember what is now called Russia, not to restore that State to its historic frontiers, would be to adjourn danger, to acknowledge the want of power to limit Muscovite preponderance. The course appears plain, if we consider only logic, justice, and the claims of duty, if we consult the interests of England and the political necessities of Europe; yet would it not be for the first time, if, even at this crisis, we were to witness the sacrifice of logic, of justice, and of the highest interests.

In former conversations, Madam, I have attributed the misfortunes of Poland to the action of your country, and the docility of England towards Russia. You have taxed me with exaggeration, yet my judgment was but the reproduction of facts recorded in history. Whenever, in the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries, the question of Poland has been raised, the maintenance or the re-establishment of her independence, English diplomacy has invariably pronounced on the side of Russia and against Poland, in favour of violence and in opposition to right. If Russia and her accomplices struck the iron into the heart of my country, it was with the permission and in accordance with the will of England; the moral responsibility of the murder of Poland falls on England as the most devoted ally of those who usurped the Polish provinces, and as the opponent of France, the only power that endeavoured to save, in saving

Poland, the independence of Europe and the principles of right.

The constant predilection of your country for Russia—her neglect of Poland—her contempt or indifference for the sentiment of justice or morality, date from the 18th century. I state this, earnestly desiring that the conscience of England may be awakened to the knowledge of the frightful ills she has shed, or materially aided to shed, on Poland. At the period of the first partition, in 1772, France made an effort to avert this crime. Betrayed by Austria, she proposed a common action on the Baltic. England refused, and watched unmoved the accomplishment of the nefarious transaction, from whose inevitable consequences she now recoils. Yet, attempting to preserve Turkey after having resigned to Russia the Polish provinces, she still announces her intention not to wrest back these her most efficacious means for the ruin of the Ottoman Empire.

In 1772, the English ambassador at Constantinople encouraged the resistance of *Mussulman* Turkey, which, to save Poland, declared war against Russia, while the powers styled Christian plotted and effected the assassination of an innocent people. The British Minister severely censured his envoy. I recommend, Madam, to your attention the following words, written by the Earl of Rocheford, July 24, 1772:—

“Should the Porte be successful, its victories would greatly weaken the Muscovite Empire, which we consider the natural ally of the Crown,



and with which, according to all appearance, England, sooner or later, will be intimately united.'—Intimately united,—but against whom? Undoubtedly against France. To this *natural* ally, to Russia, England therefore, in 1772 and 1783, made the premeditated sacrifice of Poland and of Turkey.

Equally interesting and useful, Madam, would be the careful study of the causes which produced this union between Russia and your country; a union which, even in this present year of 1855, seems still subsisting. Your countrymen, the most eminent for character and intelligence, even the Ministers of the Crown, have publicly renounced the idea of diminishing the territory of Russia—of attacking her honour and her dignity. You have heard, in the British Parliament, energetic and eloquent advocates in favour of the Muscovite propositions. Has not the English blood, so bravely poured before the ramparts of Sebastopol, been shed sufficiently to expiate this alliance, so disastrous for Poland, for Europe, and for England herself? The Muscovite bullets strike down the valiant champions of Albion, and the British Parliament, in presence of this touching spectacle of the English dead—of those martyrs who have perished gloriously—dares even to justify and to protect Russia. I repress, Madam, the utterance of astonishment or sorrow, and I repeat there is need for calm and serious study of this subject. What moral causes produced the sympathy, powerful and persistent, which creates this intimate union between your

country and Russia? The inquiry demands serious and thoughtful consideration.

Eleven years after England's abandonment of Turkey and Poland, in 1783, Russia, skilful in employing the folly of others, announced her intention of seizing the Crimea, the Sebastopol from whence she now menaces Turkey and Europe. France opposed the design. Her admirable reasoning—her views, clear, prophetic, and marvellously applicable to the present time—failed to convince the British Minister. France proposed a common action for the general interest, to limit the Muscovite maritime power. England refused, aiming to conciliate Russia. The French ambassador, M. d'Adhemar, said to Mr. Fox, the British Minister, "This passive state of acquiescence is unbecoming England;—will that free nation appear as the support of despotism and arbitrary power?" The King of England nobly replied to M. Adhemar, "I entirely agree with your master. *Europe will become like a desert—there will be safety for no one.*" Yet in 1783, as in 1772, England authorised Russia to destroy the material equilibrium of States, to overturn the principle of justice and of moral order, to sow the fruitful seed of continual disturbance; for all the wars, the troubles, the violences, which have distracted nations up to the present time, have issued from the same inexhaustible and corrupting stem. *Europe has become like a desert.* Your country, free at home—free according to its idea—abroad has invariably fostered the most arbitrary despotism; wantonly



sacrificing the liberty, the independence, the nationalities and civilisation of the people of the Continent. Intimately united with Russia, its natural ally, England offered no opposition to the first and second partition of Poland; the British envoy at Warsaw advocated the accomplishment of this act, fearful that Poland might prove an ally to France, or that her neutrality would paralyse the efforts of the coalition. With perverted intelligence, England sanctioned the assassination of Poland as a step towards the assassination of France, for the profit of the despotic monarchies. Under pretext of checking the progress of disorder and the dangerous principles manifested at Paris, she fostered the more hideous disorder, the more destructive principles applied by the monarchical spoilers—*revolutionists*—in the sense comprehended by the Count de Montalembert. England, the professor of piety, the defender of religion, in 1793, directed her ambassador at Berlin, Lord Spencer, to offer the sum of £100,000 to a lady of distinction, equally pious, whose office was to beguile the leisure hours of his Prussian Majesty, and for what purpose? To induce the King of Prussia to continue the war against France. Some bleeding fragments of Poland were added to this bribe, and it succeeded. It was the ally of England, the Czarina Catherine, charged with the odium of more than one assassination, and abandoned to orgies surpassing those of Messalina, who commanded the massacre of 24,000 Poles at Praga. No drop of Polish blood has ever fallen without the partici-

pation or the consent of England, maintaining constantly a cordial and intimate alliance with the powers that delivered up Poland to murder and to pillage. Pitt, for an instant, hesitated, on perceiving the unscrupulous application of the political and moral principles formularised by British intelligence; but neither the statesman nor his compatriots comprehended the appeals of conscience, or were capable of remorse. Russia, Austria, and Prussia, allies of England against France, were encouraged by her with full liberty to accomplish the destruction of Poland; to develop with terrible force the conservative and Christian doctrine which sanctioned the dismemberment of a people, the extermination of a nationality, the effacement of its laws, its religion, and its past history. No protest can justify your country for her share in the commission of this social crime. Lord Palmerston declared that the partition of Poland was the violation of political rights and moral sentiment. The assertion is true; but history also declares that to this violation of moral right and justice, England accorded her consent, support, and co-operation.

I own, with infinite pleasure, that the conscience of England *has* burst the bonds of Muscovite fascination; it has attained the knowledge of the evil, but only to stoop lower beneath its influence. At the Congress of Vienna, in 1815, Lord Castlereagh declared, with admirable logic, the necessity for the re-establishment of Poland. Were his convictions serious? Evaporating in lofty words, sterile for the cause he pleaded, in defiant menaces to



Russia, followed by submission to her exactions, politely but imperiously made,—in declamations which assumed the tone of irony; for Lord Castlereagh, affecting interest in the fate of Poland, frankly acknowledged to the Czar Alexander, that his Government had no intention to insist upon a measure it so warmly discussed; in other words, that Russia was free to execute her will. Alexander was not deceived with regard to the meaning of English protests and declarations; he and his successors treated them as non-existent.

Thus, in 1846, on the destruction of the Cracovian Republic, whose security was guaranteed by England, an English Minister affirmed in Parliament, "We cannot, and will not, proclaim war against Russia, to repair the insult offered to our honour; but if one day war occurs, this also will be placed to Russia's account." Yet recently, and as if the Muscovite suggestions still had sway, the same Minister renounces before Europe any design to curtail Russia. Once more Poland is abandoned, to obtain a durable, honourable, and glorious peace for your country.

In 1830, Poland rose for the defence of her nationality, and the independence of Europe. France listened to the appeal of an old and faithful ally. She performed her duty, and again unavailingly proposed to England a combined action in favour of Poland. The Czar Nicholas destroyed the Polish institutions and Polish nationality, despite the solemn engagements which rendered their preservation incumbent upon the honour of

Great Britain. Lord Palmerston, Sir Robert Peel, and Lord John Russell protested against this violation of the treaty of Vienna. Russia allowed England to protest, and England allowed Russia to act, till the kingdom of Poland, restored by Europe as a guard to the interests of Europe, became a Muscovite province.

In 1846, it pleased Russia to decree the confiscation of the Republic of Cracow, casting the spoil to Austria, whose Government organised the massacres of Tarnow, and paid officially its sanguinary agents. Still France proposed a common action and united protest; but England still refused. Lord John Russell, fired by the insult offered to his own country, declared that Russia could not be pardoned for this act; but to the present moment his generous protest has worked no result.

Thus, Madam, it is undeniable that English diplomacy has constantly and energetically sustained the interests of Russia. No events appear to change or modify this immutable tendency. Your country is at war with Russia: yet, if I except occasional protests, the more to be admired because most rare, an absolute silence reigns with respect to Poland; neither encouragement nor hope, but, even recently, clear disavowal of all interest in the subject. Poland is condemned to annihilation, under pretexts of the highest liberality. Far otherwise inspired, the Emperor of the French, in London, greatly said, *the hopes of those who suffer turn towards the West*. He has heard with sympathy the appeal of Poland; should



his desire remain unproductive, should he be destined to encounter insurmountable obstacles to this act of justice, to this policy of restoration, the Poles will ever retain a grateful remembrance of the true prompting of his judgment, or of his compassion. A virtuous sentiment bears fruitful seeds, which, scattered abroad, germinate in the human conscience. If Poland must drag on her chains a little farther, not on the Emperor should fall the responsibility, but on those who so long helped to hold her captive, and now reject the means of saving her. Divine retribution is slow, but infallible; and Poland, in calm confidence, commits her cause to God.

I am not about to examine England's present policy, for a sufficient reason; it has not yet acquired the knowledge of itself. I cannot, however, forbear directing your notice to its errors, its illusions, and its inconsistencies. The dismemberment of Poland has been termed, in the British Parliament, a violation of political right and moral sentiment. The truth of these words is incontestable; for it was an act the most subversive, the most anti-social and revolutionary. Statesmen, to whatever school they belonged, have unanimously ratified the judgment of Napoleon I., of the Czar Alexander, of Maria Teresa, and of Prince Metternich, who equally condemned the partition of Poland. Is it, then, possible to found a durable and honourable peace by sanctioning anew this violation of political and moral law? A crime exists in Europe; must it continue unexpiated, unrepaired? Is it

confessed in the face of Europe that your country wants power to re-establish right, to redress wrong? M. Guizot, with the prophetic clearness of his fine intellect, said in 1846, "The partition of Poland has disturbed the conscience of Europe." Will no means be applied to restore to the European conscience its power and its peace? I simply suggest to you these important questions.

We are informed that the re-establishment of Poland is not of primary consequence to England, but a mere secondary question, a purely German quarrel. In the first place I have had the honour to show you, that if Poland fell, it was because England morally supported this iniquitous measure. Does England owe to Poland no reparation for having sacrificed her to Russia? Reducing the Polish question to the narrowest limits, is or is not the British signature appended to the treaty of Vienna? Is or is not the honour of Great Britain engaged? or is Russia held at liberty to break with impunity the most solemn contracts in which England has a part? The principles of public honesty, the observance of treaties, loyalty, faith, conscience, are these idle terms, when used in reference to Poland? What must be the effect produced by denial of justice to a great people, who have rendered service to humanity, and were the saviours once of Austria and of Christian Europe? When the Czar Nicholas said "The West declines," his words were attributed to pride or madness. Does England wish to prove the justice of the condemnation? In this sense the West does not include



France. There have been two victims to the godless policy represented in the eighteenth century by your country in alliance with the Northern Powers. Poland yet suffers; France has overcome, with renewed strength to accomplish the duty she courageously accepts.

It has been stated in the British Parliament, that the question of the re-establishment of Poland is interesting to Germany alone; a doctrine which the Russian party in the British Senate receives by inspiration from St. Petersburg, to propagate in London. Has, then, the conduct of the two Powers called German—although one is not so—no influence upon the diplomatic relations of England, or upon the war in the East? Can there exist, in the present day, questions purely German, purely English, or purely Polish? Has not Austria declared herself free from the treaty of the 2nd of December, resumed full liberty of action, and annulled her engagements with Great Britain? Is it from this circumstance that Poland has become a local, a Germanic question, unconnected with the interests of your country? At the treaty of Vienna it was unanimously considered the most important of European questions. Can we, in 1855, have retrograded so far from 1815?

We are told also—the British Parliament still the authority—that it would be criminal to encourage in Poland hopes impossible to realise; that the sole chance for her re-establishment lies in the will of Germany. I regret there should be reference to what are termed the “hopes of Poland;”

I approve of their discouragement whilst your country preserves another hope—that of renewing the Muscovite alliance founded in 1772, and religiously observed to 1853. Nor can you forget the protestations of the English ambassador—protestations of respect for the honour and dignity of Russia, and denial of hostile designs entertained towards her. I place, indeed, but small reliance on these hopes of Poland. But there is another consideration,—was the honour and dignity of England pledged at the treaty of Vienna to maintain the nationality of Poland? Is it possible to consolidate the independence of Turkey, to secure the independence of Europe, whilst Russia with the Polish provinces holds the most efficacious means to destroy Turkey and rule Germany, bending the latter power to be an accomplice to her own ruin? These are the questions I would submit to the attention of the British Government; the political and commercial future of England hangs upon their solution.

But there is a meaning, clear and significant, contained in the declaration that the Poles have nothing to expect, and it would be criminal to excite the hopes of Poland. It condemns all chance of the re-establishment of Poland, announces to Europe and to Russia, especially interested in the information, that Russia is to retain what she has taken from Sweden, Poland, Turkey, Persia—sometimes with consent, sometimes with the armed or diplomatic co-operation of the British Government. If it is imprudent to encourage the hopes of Poland,





is it beneficial to encourage the resistance and invasions of Russia?—I state the point and add no comment. The judgment of this fact belongs to the people of England.

The strange hesitations, the sincere but terrible avowals of the statesmen of your country,—how are they to be understood? Are they but expressions of a last lingering regret for the Muscovite alliance that expires, or of return to the alliance about to be renewed? Must Europe remain a desert, without protection, without security; or, obeying the impulse of France, re-organize, on the basis of a true society, the conservative principles of right and justice? United, England and France are powerful enough to ensure the welfare, and the moral and material progress of Europe; divided, their action can only consolidate the preponderance of Russia, the type of despotism and arbitrary power.

Undoubtedly not from France will proceed hindrances to the strictest union of resistance to the invading force of Russia. France foresaw and strove to avert the dangers which are now manifest, and when her wisdom was denied, and when alone, abandoned, betrayed, humiliated—placed under interdict by the working of an insane policy—she had the courage to battle on, even in the interests of those whose enmity was so bitter against her. The wars under the Republic and the Empire were directed to one end, to restore the moral and material order overthrown by the Anglo-Muscovite alliance; or, rather, the unfailing submission of England to the exactions of Russia. In 1783, M. Vergennes wrote well,

“If England and France separate, they will become only active instruments to the passions of others; they will exhaust each other to create rivals, who will soon compel them to feel the strength of their ascendancy.” France and England did separate, because England willed it so; to the refusal to save Poland in 1772, to the refusal to save Turkey in 1772 and 1783, may be traced the first cause of all the convulsions which have devastated Europe, and of the present difficulties against which even England has armed. England desires only to limit the Muscovite power she aided to construct, and perceives but vaguely the necessity of limiting her territory. Free at home, as England comprehends freedom, she has never respected the liberty of others. Conservative at home, almost to excess, she has promoted abroad anarchy and revolution. In 1793 and 1815 she aroused governments and people against France, in the name of independence and civilisation. After 1815, people and governments fell under the oppression of the child of her predilection, and the little liberty Europe rescued from the Russian grasp, sprang from the reforms introduced in 1789, developed and consolidated by the Emperor Napoleon I.

And now France pursues her mission; the English people proclaim, as the defender of European law and order, the sovereign of that nation once injured, humiliated and insulted—inheritor in blood and spirit of him whom a policy without intelligence chained to a rock. France resumes her place; the proscribed family return to the mission



recognized as theirs by former foes, to the sublime privilege of doing good to those who have persecuted, of remembering those who have kept fidelity—to be the strength of nations who suffer—a promise condemned with such energy and precision by one of the Ministers of the British Crown.

I present you, Madam, a rapid record of the disastrous influence which the past policy of England has exercised upon the destinies of my country. England in the 18th century separated from France, and yielded to the consequences of the separation; wanting power to uphold an independent policy, she favoured the ambition and aggrandizements of Russia, she sacrificed to a mistaken view of interest liberties, rights, nationalities, even her own security, and became the instrument and accomplice of that Russia she had believed herself able to control. Will she, at length, abandon this alliance, hitherto disturbed rather than destroyed—retrace her errors, and repair the ills she has heaped on Poland and on other lands? This, Madam, is your hope and my earnest wish, for the honour and interest of your country, her probable future, and the prompt re-establishment of Polish independence. The political system of England, external and internal, has become weakened and deranged. She is forced to relinquish her ancient alliances, accounted falsely to have been strong and faithful. She is at war with Russia; Austria and Prussia, gorged with her gold, abandon and betray her. She unites with France, the former object of unreasonable enmity. Internal signs denote the commencement of great and

inevitable reforms. A state of transition always dangerous and it may be fatal, if England with an earnest resolution do not break completely with the past, accepting the consequences of her alliance with France, in order to realise the words of His Majesty the Emperor Napoleon III., "That justice and truth may universally prevail." The vital interests of England and of Europe are indissolubly attached to the Anglo-French alliance. The demands of these two great countries no power could put aside. The resistance of Russia, and the disguised or open hostility of the Germanic powers, result from the uncertain counsels of the statesmen of your country. The old policy is not yet crushed, and the new, struggles to burst the bondage of the past. All parties in England agree to invoke a change of system, and this avowed necessity for progress and amelioration is an effect of the principles of 1789, and of the restoration of the Napoleon family.

I share, Madam, in your admiration for the talents of Lord Palmerston, and would participate in the generous confidence which proclaims him the "defender of civilisation." No man is better aware than Lord Palmerston himself, that the Machiavelian policy which meditated the ruin of France by Russia, or of Russia by France, has had its time. The game is played out. The mission of Lord Palmerston is one of atonement and of reparation, to re-establish the sense of moral and political right which Russia has violated; and to co-operate with France in her long effort to



promote the reign of justice and of truth, in Turkey, in Poland, and throughout all Europe.

Permit me, Madam, in a few words, to repeat the sum of my reflections. England has yielded or delivered those formidable positions, Sebastopol and Warsaw, from whence Russia menaces Turkey and Europe. It is the duty of England to break the dangerous power she created. The British Government is strangely deceived in supposing it possible to preserve either Turkey or the independence of Europe, whilst leaving in the hands of Russia her present weapons of attack. The re-establishment of Poland is the only practicable solution of the difficulty, the only guarantee for future security. If England wavers before the inexorable logic of facts, she admits one of two things—either the want of power to reduce Russia to her limits of 1772, or that she has powerful interests at home opposed to this most equitable and decisive act. Her hesitation will inflict irreparable injury upon her own honour, dignity, and influence, upon the Continent. Her attempt to conciliate Russia will not expunge the famous declaration published in 1836, in the *Gazette* of Moscow:—“We Muscovites—bears—will sign at Calcutta our first treaty of peace with England.” A commentary on this text was furnished recently, when the *ci-devant* Minister of the British Crown condemned the war as useless, and reproached his country for not having ratified the Russian propositions,—could this be the last strophe of “Rule Britannia?” Every speech uttered in the British

Parliament contains a revelation, and even the men who support most energetically a vigorous prosecution of the war, appreciate but imperfectly its true character. The conquest of the Crimea, the destruction of Sebastopol, will have no decisive influence: Russia is only vulnerable at home. The conquest of Russia depends upon depriving her of means for the accomplishment of her ambitious designs—of destroying the materials of her power. A peace on any other foundation would be simply a suspension of arms, a new triumph for Russia, a fresh humiliation for your country. We touch upon a great day of reckoning. Poland, victorious over the torture of her enemies, has no further cause for apprehension—her most remorseless persecutor proffers terms of reconciliation. The weight of this judgment threatens England. *Discite justitiam moniti et non temnere diros*, wrote the heathen poet—sublime words, which I address to your Christian country. Humanity, in presence of an important crisis, will turn with indifference from diplomatic subtleties; she has need of truth and justice. France, represented by the great Sovereign so justly honoured by Lord Palmerston, invites your country to the completion of a glorious and pacific mission. May God grant her strength and wisdom to aid a noble and powerful ally, who devotes her own children to expiate faults she did not commit, and crimes against which she has invariably protested.

Accept, Madam, the assurance of my sincere and respectful sentiments,

J. BOLESŁAS OSTROWSKI.

August, 1855.





## POSTSCRIPT.

At the moment of sending these lines to press—on the 18th of August, 1855—an important event has occurred. The Queen of England has arrived in Paris, and no doubt appreciated the cordial reception prepared for her by the Emperor of the French, and the nation so universally and passionately attached to its sovereign. This welcome to the Queen strikingly manifests the manner in which the people of Paris understand the Anglo-French alliance, and the just and great hopes that depend upon it.

How wonderful this change! Forty years ago the representatives of England and her Allies entered Paris, to destroy France, to crush the power of the first Napoleon, whose fall retarded the regeneration of Europe, and completed the misfortunes of Poland,—of that country which the other powers combined to exterminate, and he alone refused to abandon. At the present moment England, awakened to the knowledge of her true interests, ratifies, on the soil of France, her alliance with him who inherits the plans and the ideas of Napoleon I.

France and England possess power to ensure the progress and the peace of the world. It is their common duty and their common task to redress past wrongs, and to overturn the barbarous and anti-Christian policy of Russia, and the powers she has subjugated, morally and politically, until, to repeat the confession of the *Times*, "the Continent to the Rhine is governed by Russian colonels." I pray that God may grant England strength and perseverance in her new course, to realise the promise of the French and English alliance, and subdue Russia, by depriving her of the unjustly-acquired territory which forms the basis of her aggressive force.

J. B. O.