EUROPE.

The English Press Criticisms on the Alabama Claims Treaty.

MR. FORSTER'S SPEECH REVIEWED.

An Insight into the Interior Workings of the British Army.

Important Educational Conference in Germany.

RUSSIAN ADVANCES IN THE EAST.

We present the readers of the HERALD this morning with an unusually varied and interesting budget of correspondence from our correspondents in most of the prominent capitals of the Old World. In the British capital it will be seen that the excitement which was inaugurated when Senator Sumner's speech for the payment of the Alabama damages was made known, has not yet died out. It has afforded plenty of food for the literary appetites of the London press, and the newspapers are making the most of it. The letter giving an insight into the present condition of the English army will be found an interesting and an instructive one. The picture which our Madrid correspondent gives of Spain is not one calculated to impress the reader with a very hopeful idea that the irrepressible conflict of dissension at present agitating Spanish parties will shortly terminate and allow the work of reconstruction to proceed. From Berlin, St. Petersburg, Constantinople and other places we give communications of interest.

ENGLAND.

The Alabama War Cloud—Sir Francis Bull Head on the Situation—Mr. Forster's Speech—The Liberals and the Tories.

LONDON, May 24, 1869.

The London journals, having exhausted their first unanimous expression of indignation against Senator Sumner's clear and forcible exposition of the Alabama question, are now beginning to examine and argue the case from different standpoints, according to their respective sentiments and sympathies. Thus, the more liberal papers adopt a conciliatory tone, admitting sins of omission and commission on the part of the British government in regard to the escape and non-capture of the Alabama, and apologizing for the unfriendly attitude of the upper classes in England towards the United States during the rebellion; while the organs of the aristocratic element of the country are putting on an insolent swagger, and breathing fierce defiance against the presuming Yankees. All, however, concur in still declaring the entertainment of any claim, either for apology or compensation on account of the concession of belligerent rights to the Southern rebels, a thing not to be thought of. Two individual representatives of the opposite classes have made themselves heard during last week; the one, Mr. Forster, a radical member of Parliament, who was a friend of the American government during the rebellion, and the other, Sir Francis B. Head, who was Lieutenant Governor of Upper Canada during the so-called "patriot war" of 1837. The effort of the latter gentleman is by no means brilliant, but it must be remembered that its author was born ten years or so before the close of the last century and that since he filled the office of Lieutenant Governor of Canada, thirty odd years ago, he has lived under the impression that he is a retired monarch and has lost sight of the advance and progress of the world. It will be remembered that during the Canadian rebellion of 1837 one of the principal ragamuffins concerned therein, McKenzie by name, escaped to the United States. Sir Francis B. Head made a requisition upon the Governor of New York, the late William L. Marcy, for the rendition of McKenzie on charges of murder, robbery and arson; but Governor Marcy, acting under the advice of Samuel Beardsley, then Attorney General of New York, declined to surrender up the fugitive for the reason that the crimes alleged against him were committed while a state of rebellion or insurrection existed in the province and were the result of a collision between two hostile forces, one endeavoring to overthrow and the other to maintain British rule in Canada. Now Sir Francis Bell Head regards this as a complete parallel to the concession of belligerent rights to the Southern rebels by the British government, and a satisfactory set-off against all claims for Alabama damages. Because you Americans, he says, refused to deliver up a political refugee at my demand thirty years ago, you declared that a state of war existed in Upper Canada, and you decided to act as a neutral between the rebels and the government. So, then, behold our answer to your demand for damages. We will set off your recognition of Canadian rebel belligerency against our recognition of Southern rebel belligerency, and your refusal to send out McKenzie against our refusal to prevent the sending out of the Alabama, and the affair is settled. Even Englishmen who take the trouble to read Sir Francis's document exclaim what a head for a statesman!

The speech of Mr. Forster on the Alabama complication is quite a different matter. Mr. Forster was an earnest friend of the American government during the rebellion and struggled manfully against the unjust and unfriendly acts of his country, which he could then stigmatize as they deserved. It is needless to inquire how far self-interest influenced his course; he had cast his lot among the reformers of England; he foresaw that the downfall of republican institutions in America, so ardently desired by the British aristocracy, would utterly destroy the hopes of the progressive party at home, and he, therefore, ranged himself on the side of the American Union. Mr. Forster now declares that, as a friend of that Union, he himself desired and approved the concession of belligerency to the Southern rebels, for the reason that unless her Majesty's proclamation had been issued concerning belligerent rights to the South, it would not have been in the power of the British government to prevent British subjects from engaging in the service of the seceding States or from fitting out vessels to sail under letters of marque against the American government. But English journals are constantly assailing the American government for alleged neglect of duty in suffering expeditions to leave the United States to aid the Cuban revolutionists, and they charge America with inconsistency because, as they assert, she claims damages from England on one side for having aided and sympathized with the Southern rebellion, and on the other side evinces a disposition to extend aid and sympathy to the Cuban rebellion. Now, if Mr. Forster's argument is sound, and England would really have had no right to prevent her subjects from making war against the United States under the cover of Confederate letters of marque, unless she first conceded belligerent rights to the South, then, as the American government has never conceded belligerent rights to the Cuban revolutionists, it can possess no authority to prevent its subjects from engaging in the service of the Cubans and fitting out expeditions for their aid under Cuban commissions. But it must be borne in mind that Mr. Forster's party is now in power, and if his sense of England's unfriendliness to the United States government seems less acute now than it was seven or eight years ago the change may be attributed to the eagerness of a politician to protect his own associates, and not to the conviction that England was then in the right and Mr. Forster in the wrong. Another argument advanced by Mr. Forster is that the hostility to the government of the United States came from the "fashionable society" of England, and not from the workshops, and he expresses astonishment that American republicans should show so much sensitiveness over the hatred of British aristocrats. The liberal organ, backing up his speech, adds:—"It is surely not the part of high minded republican statesmen to spurn the fruitful fidelity and good wishes of the millions, while claiming fabulous damages for the futile affronts of our foiled and abashed upper ten thousand." This might be all very well but for the fact that the upper ten thousand are the rulers of England, while the millions in the workshops are mere political serfs, without a voice in the government or a vote to cast in behalf of their own destiny. Indeed, the organ of the ten thousand vents its wrath upon Mr. Forster for "the impolicy—not to use a stronger word—of addressing the American people at this crisis in language of affectionate admiration," and reminds him that the upper class are the rulers in England, while the masses are only their followers. Mr. Sumner is perfectly justifiable, therefore, in holding England responsible for the action of the governing classes, for they caused the concession of belligerent rights to the rebels who were striving to destroy the American nation; they fitted out Alabamas to prey upon American commerce; they cheered on and supplied the pirates who were reddening the sea with the burning of American vessels; they advanced money on cotton loans to enable the rebels to carry on their rebellion, and Mr. Forster and the good workmen of Bradford, who cheered his speech, were powerless to prevent this sort of "neutrality," which Mr. Forster then looked on as a burning sin and disgrace, but which he now declares to have been a blessed boon to the North.

The tone of two articles which appear to-day in the tory and liberal organs, the *Standard* and *Star*, has already been given to the American reader in the columns of the HERALD by cable telegram; but the articles themselves are deserving a place in that journal. They are significant in their several ways. The *Star*, which speaks for Mr. Bright and the more advanced liberals in the Gladstone administration, takes the opportunity afforded by Forster's speech to declare that the power of the English aristocracy is broken forever; that while they hate the Irish Church bill they will have to swallow it, and that the dose will be followed by one yet more nauseous on the Irish land question. The tory, on the other hand, insolently declares that the aristocracy is the real ruler of the country, and the masses of the people merely the rabble that follow them. The liberal endeavors to conciliate America, because he believes that the cause of radical reform, now progressing so promisingly in England, cannot afford a breach with the great republic of the West. The tory is all insolence and defiance towards the United States government. Some interpret the unyielding tone of the conservative press to mean a desire on the part of the British aristocracy to invite a war as a means of stopping the progress of radicalism at home. This is an error. No one knows better than the educated Englishman that the time for war has passed for England, but it is essentially necessary for the preservation of the power of the aristocracy that there should be no yielding or apparent yielding to America's demands. The British government as at present constituted cannot afford that the great power of the American republic should be brought home to the British "masses," who are at present only the blind followers of aristocratic rulers.

A Terrible Tory Onslaught Upon Mr. Forster, M. P.

[From the London Standard (tory organ), May 24.]

It seems as if nothing could bring home to the radical mind the impolicy—not to use a stronger word—of addressing the American people at this crisis in language of affectionate admiration. We fancied it must have been growing clear to all men that much of the difficulty in which we had become involved was due to the fact that for years past a large number of public speakers and writers in this country had conveyed to the United States the impression that we regarded them with mixed feelings of fear and love. Most assuredly the present menacing attitude of the American government and people has been taken up in consequence of this curious delusion, of which the radical party at large is mainly the author. While no immediate danger seemed to arise from the flattery with which the Americans were so abundantly besmeared by their British adorers, the bulk of the nation looked on quietly enough at these worshippers of the great republic, who, reversing the Mohamedan rule, kneeled as they prayed with their faces to the West. But now a state of things has arisen which forbids any further toleration of this eccentric fanaticism. The worshippers of the West have brought us to the brink of a war with the objects of their idolatry. Received into the belief that a people who loved and revered them so intensely would meekly endure insult and humbly accept chastisement at their hands, the government of the United States has all but committed itself to a message which, addressed to a nation like Great Britain, could only be answered by a challenge. The spirit of the English people has, we trust, been awakened in time to "warn that madman ere it grew too late," but the risk of a rupture has been so imminent that we are hardly disposed as yet to accept with patience the renewal of that mandlin tone which brought us near to a very distressing necessity. For this reason it seems to us that Mr. W. E. Forster's speech at Bradford is an exceedingly ill-advised contribution to the discussion of the American difficulty. It is difficult to understand how a man with English blood in his veins can deal with Mr. Sumner's speech and the American claims generally in such a feeble and unmanly strain. This spirited member of the Gladstone government does not agree with Mr. Sumner altogether in thinking that Great Britain ought to roll in the dust at the bidding of the Washington Senate. No, Mr. Sumner is a personal friend of his own—what a time to choose for putting this fact to ward—he is a man whom it is difficult to praise, love and admire sufficiently; but Mr. Forster "ventures to think he is mistaken" in his view of the Alabama claims. If Mr. Forster must roar, he will at any rate roar as gently as any sucking dove. He "ventures to think" that this monstrous impertinence of Mr. Sumner's is a mistake, and he crawls towards his personal friend with amorous gestures, and as "umble" as Uriah Heap, to reason with him affectionately and try to prove that he is too hard upon us. What a position for a man who, in spite of his affected disclaimer of all responsibility, will be listened to abroad as the exponent of the views entertained by the British government.

We do not care to travel with Mr. Forster along the beaten path which he follows through the familiar labyrinth of the Alabama controversy. It is irrelevant at the present stage of the subject to be hammering afresh at the old story concerning the necessity of the neutrality proclamation, and the manner in which that proclamation was issued directly in the interest of the Northern States. That Mr. Forster, the faithful and devoted friend of Mr. Sumner, the stanch adherent of the federal party during the war, the gushing enthusiast who stands among his constituents at Bradford longing that they were Americans, should himself have been the first independent member who at the outbreak of the war called for the issue of the neutrality proclamation, is an amusing little fact, the publication of which is well timed, but over and over again for years past our objection to recognize the belligerency of the South, in order that we might be enabled to accept the blockade, has been explained just as clearly, to say the least, as Mr. Forster can put the matter now. The time for international discussion on the point has long since gone by. Mr. Forster's "excellent and dear friend Mr. Adams," discussed the matter dry with Lord Russell years ago, and to try and repeat the well worn arguments now, when argument has given place to insult on the other side, is to manifest a sort of patience which might go by several less complimentary names. Some points in the speech, however, do call for notice. Mr. Forster, it is true, may have a right to put any complexion upon the civil war in America which harmonizes with his view of contemporary history. Pursuing his policy of conciliation he endeavors to please the American audience which he addresses over the heads of his Bradford constituents by representing the war as a pure-hearted crusade against slavery. Ultimate success often gilds the motive with which an enterprise is undertaken, and many people who would have laughed at Mr. Forster's assertion when the civil war began may listen gravely now to the same bold theory; but the savage onslaught against certain public men who are conspicuous for having taken a very different view of the great struggle outrages good taste altogether.

In saying that Mr. Roebuck "disgraced his name, his life," because he sympathized with the cause of Southern independence, Mr. Forster descends to the use of such coarse invective as is happily unusual among the public men of this country. If his abuse of Mr. Roebuck and Sir John Ramsden is designed to appease the wrath which is still cherished in the Northern States against all Englishmen who sympathized with the South during the war, the attempt is as ill-judged as the whole speech. The Americans do not forget the plain facts of the war, and cannot be persuaded now by the sweeping asseverations of a radical speaker into the belief that the bulk of the English people approved of the subjugation of the South while the war was going on. Such assertions simply have the effect of making them believe that we are now afraid of the consequences which may ensue from the things we said at the time, and are telling lies on the subject to escape a thrashing. There has been, it is true, a great and remarkable change of opinion in this country concerning the rights of the American civil war. Many persons who were enthusiastic partisans of the South, when they thought the South was going to win its independence, became convinced that Jefferson Davis and General Lee were the leaders of a tyrannical slaveholding oligarchy when the supremacy of the North was established; but as far as the history of the past is concerned it is absurd for Mr. Forster to misrepresent facts, as he does grossly, in declaring that speeches in favor of Southern independence were always rebuked by the opinions of the majority.

The struggle is long since past; the voices of those who sympathized with the Southern cause have long been silent, but we at all events will never be guilty of the meanness of denying the sympathies we entertained, in order that by cringing now to the successful party we may endeavor to avert its displeasure. We will never attempt the extraordinary manœuvre which Mr. Forster adopts when he tries to screen the upper and middle classes of this country from American anger by begging that they may be pardoned for the sake of the crowds which were gathered together in the manufacturing districts to cheer the utterances of Northern zealots. "Do not judge of England by her fashionable clubs and drawing rooms," Mr. Forster says; "go to the workshops of the people!" Has Mr. Forster, then, Mr. Bright, had Mr. Cobden and the other public men of England who escape disgrace by agreeing with the Bradford orator, nothing to do with fashionable clubs and drawing rooms? Can any trick of the educated radical speaker be more childish than this affected contempt for the educated classes *en masse*? Will any one pretend that if it had not been for a certain talented clique of Northern sympathizers which emerged from the fashionable clubs and drawing rooms and created opinion in the workshops of the people, the Yorkshire and Lancashire crowds would have arrived unaided at Mr. Forster's view of American questions? The educated classes of a nation are the nation, and the masses are their followers, following some of them, as Mr. Forster shows us, into a morass, in which they may ultimately learn to take new views of the flatterers and false guides by whom they have been led.

Liberal Defence of Mr. Forster, M. P.

[From the London Star, Liberal organ.]

The success of Mr. Forster's American speech at Bradford is the measure of Mr. Sumner's failure in the Senate at Washington. As it is evident Mr. Sumner did not wish for war when he made that speech, it is difficult to imagine at what he aimed. But the result has been, not indeed, to endanger the peace of the world, but to destroy what was hardly less precious—the good understanding between the United States and the masses of the English people, headed by those advanced liberals whose opinions they usually share. Mr. Forster is one of those advanced liberals, and he speaks with good right, not only as a tried friend of the great American republic, but as an accurate representative of the feelings of the majority of the English people. And his tone is that of one wounded in his most cherished susceptibilities, misconstrued by those whose feelings he has most considered, spurned by those to whom in their hour of need he was faithful and useful. Such is the effect of Mr. Sumner's speech. Can any one conceive a result less worthy of the eloquence of so distinguished a friend of freedom? Mr. Forster says the people of Bradford have studied American affairs, and they "know about Mr. Sumner." The people of England have probably as a rule studied American affairs very little, "but they know about Mr. Sumner," enough to recognize the justice of Mr. Forster's description of him. He is "one who has suffered in the cause of right—one who has suffered persecution, injury and outrage in the cause of the slave"—one, in fact, who embodies, to the English mind, all that the friends of the North wished to see triumph in the war, and all that even those who were not friendly to the North were glad to see triumphant when the great strife was concluded. Such a man was the last who should have turned round upon us with injurious reproaches. Mr. Sumner should have remembered, what he probably well knows, that there was a time when the friends of the North in this country were more Northern than the Northerners, more anxious for the suppression of Southern slavery than the Northern Unionists appeared; that the alleged lukewarmness of the North as to slavery was, even with those who felt least deeply on the subject in England, an occasion of hostility towards the Union; and that even among those who seemed to care for little else than the dismemberment of the United States a change of feeling favorable to the North took place when Mr. Lincoln cleared his blank declarations in favor of Union and proclaimed emancipation as essential to peace and the restoration of the republic. * * * No other victory than this sorry one was ever gained by the Southern party, and Mr. Forster is justified in pleading that England saved the United States from a vastly increased expenditure of life and money by steadily refusing to accede to the suggestions of the Emperor of the French that we should acknowledge the South. Against all this Mr. Sumner must place if he chooses, the hostility of the *beau monde* to the Northern cause. In this country we are used to the *beau monde*. We understand it. We are not disturbed by it. Above all, we know, as Mr. Forster says, "that fashionable men do not govern the destinies of England." That same "society" which hated the North and made the South seem popular, hated parliamentary reform, and drove Mr. Gladstone from office for proposing it. To all appearance the cause of popular suffrage was more hopeless in 1866 than the Northern cause was at any period of the war. But society had to accept household suffrage at the hands of its own conservative idol, and to see Mr. Disraeli banished into opposition by the force he himself had evoked. Is society even now in favor of the great measure of religious justice which we are passing for Ireland? Probably not, though its recent reverses and disappointment have greatly humbled it. This at least is certain, that society is not prepared for that ample, sufficient, and statesmanlike settlement of the Irish land question which is certain to be the next great act of the strong government which, in society's despite, has been established. Perhaps it is too much to expect that an American statesman should understand all this as well as English liberals understand it; but Mr. Sumner was at least bound to have recognized the general ill success of the Southern party in England and in Parliament as a set off for the blatancy of the insults they continually offered to the North. Mr. Forster proves most irrefragably that, shameful as was the partisanship of the slave power among our upper classes—melancholy as was their defection from the principles of liberty—petty as was the jealousy which animated them, and galling as are the recollections which their conduct left in the consciousness of English liberals, the hearts of the people at large were soundly in sympathy with the cause of freedom and American Union. It is surely not the part of high-minded republican statesmen to spurn the fruitful fidelity and good wishes of the millions while claiming fabulous damages for the futile affronts of our foiled and abashed "upper ten thousand."

The British Army—How Commissions are Obtained—What is Necessary to Obtain Them—No Military Knowledge Necessary—Buying Rank—Inefficiency of British Officers.

LONDON, May 23, 1869.

In my last letter I drew your attention to the great want of experienced leaders in the British army. This remark may be applied to every rank of the service, from the general officers down to the captains and subalterns, the only exception to the rule being those who hold commissions in the engineers and artillery, and who are obliged to undergo a good military training, very much the same as all the officers of the United States army have to go through at West Point. For those two corps, and for such officers as wish to serve upon the staff, as also for such infantry and cavalry officers as desire to receive a military education, there are the colleges of Woolwich and Sandhurst. But England is the only country in the world that allows men to command her troops without having been trained as officers; for in the cavalry and infantry and Guards the number of subalterns, captains and field officers who have been taught their duty as soldiers before they get commissions is something very small indeed, perhaps not more than ten per cent.

But in order to make you and your readers fully understand what I mean—and I do not think our system of appointment to and promotion in the army is understood on your side of the ocean, for that matter there are thousands of well educated men in this country who know nothing whatever about it—I must tell you how it is that commissions are given away in the army, and by what rule officers are promoted after they enter the service.

Say that I, Mr. John Smith, want to put a son of mine in the Guards or the cavalry or the infantry. If I am a wealthy man, of good interest at what is called "the Horse Guards"—that is, the headquarters of the army, now presided over by his Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge—I select the first of these corps—the Guards—and make all the interest I can to get my son into the corps. If I am moderately wealthy and have a fair amount of interest I try to get him into the cavalry. If my wealth and my interest is only third class I am glad to get him into the infantry, although even that is a boon which many men of good position cannot obtain for their sons. Let us suppose, however, that I am only a third class man—say a country squire, who has not much Parliamentary influence, and whose estate does not return more than two or three thousand a year—in that case I select the infantry. I ask for a nomination, and in due time, after a vast deal of trouble, I obtain it. But it is given conditionally upon my son passing a certain examination, of which one is held in London every six months. The young man receives several weeks notice before the examination is to take place, and in the meantime I get him "coached" up by some tutor who knows exactly the style of questions the youth will be asked, and has to be paid a considerable sum for "putting the lad through" the ordeal.

The examinations are fairly enough conducted, and are such that any commonly well educated youth can get through with the greatest ease. They relate to the English language, to writing from dictation, and a certain knowledge of one foreign language, also mathematics as far as the first three books of Euclid. But of military knowledge, military science, or even any test as to whether the candidate is morally fitted or trained to be a soldier, there is none whatever. If he passes his examination, I, as his parent or guardian, have to pay the sum of £450; he is then appointed to a corps, joins it, or if it is abroad, he joins the depot, without any more knowledge of his duties than the youngest recruit who has just enlisted. Of course he must learn his drill, and to do this he is placed in an awkward squad with the recruits; but in other matters which require no drill he does his duty as a commissioned officer. Thus it is that an anomaly, which may be witnessed any day in any one of our barracks, has ceased to be regarded with wonder in our service. A young officer, or four or five young officers, may be seen in the awkward squad learning the goose step, or the manual exercise, or battalion drill, or how to march, and an hour afterwards they may—and do—take their places as members of military courts martial, and sit in judgment upon old soldiers of perhaps twenty years' service, who know their duty thoroughly. Thus from the very commencement the officer is exposed as ignorant of his work before the men he will have to command, and loses respect in proportion. In no other army in the world does an officer join his regiment without being thoroughly well drilled in his duties and knowing what he ought to do. In our service, however, he joins a corps, has all the authority and holds the commission of an officer, but has to go through his military training with recruits. At one moment the drill sergeant is showing him how to handle a musket and an hour later has to touch his cap respectfully to him when he passes. Surely, here, at the very outset, is an anomaly which ought not to exist.

Let us suppose that the young man has learned his drill and risen by degrees from junior to senior ensign of his corps. He then undergoes an examination upon his military duties before a committee, composed of officers of his regiment. This done he awaits the first vacancy in the higher ranks. But before he can become a lieutenant he must pay, or his friends must pay for him, a further sum of £250. If he cannot do this he is passed over, the second ensign getting the step over his head. He (my imaginary son) may be the best officer in the regiment, and the ensign next to him may be the greatest dolt it is possible to imagine. No matter; without money there can be no promotion in the British army, excepting only when the vacancy is caused by the death of a senior. In point of fact, the promotion in a corps may be said to be out of the hands of the authorities. If a lieutenant wishes to retire he must get back what he has paid for his commission—viz., £450 to start with and £250 for his step. This must be repaid him by the ensign who gets his vacancy and by the young man from outside who takes the ensign's place. If the one who is next to him in seniority cannot pay the second gets the step, if the second cannot the third gets it, if the third cannot the fourth gets it, and so on to the end. Remember, too, that this rule holds good throughout the regimental ranks up to lieutenant colonel, inclusive. If a captain wishes to retire from the army the senior lieutenant gets the step if he can pay for it. The regulation price, in addition to what he has paid before, is £1,100, making in all £1,800, or somewhere about $9,000 in gold of your money. If the senior lieutenant cannot pay this the step goes to the second on the list, if the second cannot it goes to the third, and so on to the end of the list. I remember a few years ago the thirteenth lieutenant of a regiment became a captain over the heads of his twelve seniors, simply because he could command the £1,100 which had to be paid for his step—that is, for the difference between the rank of lieutenant and captain—and the others could not. And in our West indian regiments I have known cases in which not one of the lieutenants could pay for promotion, and I were consequently superseded by some wealthy young man from another regiment who could pay the price. And it is the same with the two majors of a regiment. If one of them sells out the senior captain gets the step if he can pay for it; if not, the second, or the third, or any other the senior of those who can pay the price. The command of the corps is no exception to the rule. If the senior major can pay for his lieutenant colonelcy he gets it, if not the junior steps over his head, becomes lieutenant colonel, and commands the one who was his senior.

It is needless to ask the question, which every soldier will answer for himself when he reads this statement—namely, can an army in which this is the system of promotion be properly commanded? And, recollect, I have told but half my tale. I have hurriedly sketched the purchase system as it is worked in the most economical regiments in the service in the infantry of the line. I have said nothing respecting the extra regulation money that is paid for every step in promotion, and which if an officer does not pay he cannot get his promotion; for the officer wanting to sell out will not retire if he does not get the amount he demands, but exchanges to some other corps in which there are men with money, and sells out in that regiment. In round figures no officer can ever hope to become the lieutenant colonel of an infantry regiment unless he is able from first to last, including regulation and extra regulation prices, to pay about $8,500 for his rank. In the same way a lieutenant colonel of cavalry will have to pay at least $10,000 for getting to the top of the tree. It is true that if these gentlemen leave the army they get their money back again, but if they remain and are promoted to be general officers they do not, and never can recover what they have paid; it is lost to them and their families forever. Hence it follows that none save the wealthy can in England ever hope to be generals, or to command in the field. The immense majority of field officers cannot afford this, and so retire before they get higher than regimental rank; and thus but few remain from which any selection can be made, and our general officers are as a body wholly unfit for active commands.

"But," your readers will ask, "do men who have no money never enter the English army, and if they do, how are they promoted?"

I will answer this question and terminate this already too long letter at the same time by a story which you may rely upon as coming under my own observation, and the moral of the tale is applicable to all similar cases in the English army:—

About thirty years ago two young men joined as ensigns the same corps, a regiment then stationed in India. I will, for distinction's sake, call them No. 1 and No. 2. No. 1 was the senior, No. 2 the junior. No. 1 was the son of an old officer who had died in India; No. 2 was the son of a wealthy London merchant; No. 1 had but enough money to pay for his outfit, No. 2 had some twelve or fourteen thousand pounds at command. They were both capital soldiers. Where are they now? No. 2 has been a full colonel for some years and has commanded an excellent regiment for a longer time. He will be a major general next year, and may reap honors wherever hard blows are going. No. 1 is a major on half pay, a heart-broken, discontented man, hating the review in which he once took so much pride, and only looking forward to the day when his many years' service will entitle him to a pension. He was longer in becoming a captain (because he had no money) than his former junior was in getting the rank of lieutenant colonel. How, I ask, can an army in which promotion is on such a footing ever be well commanded? In my next I shall give you some idea of what the private soldier is in the British service.

SPAIN.

The Situation—Success of Republican Tactics—Form of Government—Probabilities of Civil War—A Ministerial Crisis—French Watchfulness.

MADRID, May 12, 1869.

This country is slowly drifting either to a haven of refuge or into a Charybdis to be engulfed. Spain's position just now is very interesting. The wisest political prophet could not foretell the end and final settlement of the questions about to rise to-morrow or the day after. The various parties—whose number is legion—have had reunions, secret caucuses, mass meetings, with transcendental orators to address them, as well as chilling, frigid political speakers, whose craniums were as white as the snows of Nova Zembla; and while the former urge Costellanos to action the latter advise them to be patient. But though ancient political hacks cry patience, there is not a party in existence here that could govern its conduct accordingly. It is a period of activity to all, of active brain work, of intriguing with might and main, as well conducted as by any parcel of experienced lobbyists at Washington. The republicans especially have their wits supernaturally sharpened at this crisis. It is the most ably managed party in Spain. The chiefs are cool, experienced persons; but they have plenty of the fiery stuff in their composition as well which spurs them to necessary action. Knowing well that the longer time the Cortes waste over the constitution the better for them, they have been very busy impeding the progress of the House in the discussion of the several articles. They have either made long speeches or inuendoes which invited rectifications from those persons whose characters were attacked, and in very many ways they have been fruitful in devices and expedients to retard the Chamber. All this delay has served to gather whole hosts of republicans together, and to their standard several of the progressistas and unionists have attached themselves. They have also been very skilful in trifling but telling tactics in the Cortes. Being defeated overwhelmingly on one point they knew well was too bold for the present epoch, they would gracefully yield, but would advance on another point almost synonymous with that at which they had been defeated, and so on from point to point—retreating slowly, skilfully, at bay the while, until, though the majority were the victors, they could not pride themselves upon the slimsy skeleton of an act they had passed. Up to the present time the republicans have been successful in erasing the word monarchy from the project of the constitution.

So here Spain stands to-day. Next week these questions will be materially changed. No doubt the form of government will have been decided upon. If it has been decided to have a monarchy, we may see any quantity of candidates brought forth, and perhaps it might be just as well to watch General Prim's conduct then. There will be Bourbons and Coburgs, German, Italian and French princes without number, all striving to get the Spanish crown, and there will be such an olio of sweet intrigues of the various factions of the monarchists never before heard of in Spain. If a regency is established, Prim may be seen figuring in the foreground, with four and twenty outsiders, and the most glorious staff in Christendom, mimicking the royalty he helped to overthrow. If a directory, Serrano, Prim, Topete, Rivere and Zorrilla will conduct affairs very much as at present, with more or less fermentation in the interior from Carlists risings, dissonant republicans, and priestly cabals.

It was reported and generally believed that the republicans would resign their seats in a body if the monarchy was voted, but lately they had a reunion, whereat they decided that they should remain to fill the duties to which they were appointed by their constituents. This general resignation meant to imply something very serious, very probably civil war. Several cities have sent petitions to the Cortes that they adopt a federal republican form of government.

A ministerial crisis is inevitable after the passage of the article referring to the form of government. If the monarchy is voted the new Cabinet will be composed of Señor Becena (democrat), Minister of Public Works; Señor Maitos (democrat), Vice President of the Cortes, Minister of Grace and Justice; Señor Ulloa (unionist), Minister of State; Señor Ardanaz (unionist), Minister of Finance; Señor Balaguer (progressista), Foreign Affairs; Ruiz Zorrilla, government; Prim, War; Topete, Marine.

Various comments are made in political circles upon the return of Baron Mercier, the French Ambassador to Madrid. As it was believed in France as well as everywhere else that as the Cortes neared rapidly the lively debates to be expected upon the form of government influences of every kind would be brought to bear upon the Spanish representatives, the arrival of Baron Mercier is very opportune here, and may be regarded as a stroke of policy on the part of Napoleon III. that he might have something to put in the scale against those in favor of a republic, and adverse to both Napoleonic and Bourbon claims.

ROME.

Health of the Pope—A Novel Project to Prevent Wars—Arbitration as a Substitute for Fighting—His Holiness on Agrarian Outrages in Ireland.

ROME, May 16, 1869.

The Pope's last public benediction for the season was conferred by his Holiness to his faithful troops and subjects and such sight-seers as still lingered at Rome for this closing festival on Thursday, the 6th inst., from the balcony of St. John Lateran, as customary on Ascension Day. Pio Nono was in excellent voice, and the sight was very brilliant on the irregular but picturesque piazza of St. John, which, with its background of the old Aurelian walls, the aqueducts, Campagna and Alban hills beyond, is infinitely more attractive than the piazza of St. Peter's, in spite of the formal grandeur of the latter.

Although his Holiness appears to enjoy capital health, his medical advisers are anxious that he should get some change of air this summer; but he has hitherto resisted their suggestions, at any rate with respect to Porto d'Anzio, where they wished him to inhale the mild sea breezes of May. A few days since, however, the Pope allowed himself a day in the country, having invited a few cardinals and ecclesiastics of rank to dine at his summer place of Castel Gandolfo, fourteen miles from Rome. Pio Nono says that if he were to leave the capital this summer he should prefer going to Frosinone to drink the mineral waters, but his Holiness adds, jokingly, "We are too poor for such excursions."

A movement in the direction of doing away with wars, and constituting the Pope arbiter and peacemaker between quarrelsome nations, according to a sort of code of international law, which it is proposed shall be drawn up by the Catholic Bishops assembled in the Ecumenical Council, has been initiated by several French and English Catholic journals, and some appeals and addresses from Protestants to the Pope have also been published tending to the same purpose. To do away with expensive standing armies would be doubtless an immense advantage, but it is to be doubted whether the Pope's arbitration will suffice to establish such a feeling of reciprocal good will and good faith between rival nations as to allow them to convert their cannons and rifles into ploughshares and reaping hooks, although the *Osservatore Romano* of the 7th advocates the scheme in an enthusiastic article entitled "The best means of preserving peace."

I hear that Cardinal Barnabo, Prefect of the Propaganda, has written in the Pope's name to Cardinal Cullen, complaining that the influence of the Catholic clergy in Ireland is not more powerfully exercised in preventing the commission of so many agrarian murders as the Irish peasantry have been indulging in of late. If this is correct, the measure is a step towards the realization of the office of peacemaker proposed to be conferred on the Pope, and it is to be hoped that the Irish clergy will act according to his suggestion.

GERMANY.

Annual Congress of Pedagogues—Vast Assembly—All Parts of Germany Represented—Liberal Spirit Predominant—Separation of Church and School—Absence of Sectarianism—Fraternization of Teachers North and South—Illness of the King.

BERLIN, May 20, 1869.

During this week a Teachers' Congress has been held in this city, being the eighteenth annual gathering, which was very numerously attended. Not less than 4,000 pedagogues from all parts of Germany have joined in it. The position and interests of this class being so vastly different from that of public teachers in America, a detailed account of their proceedings would hardly be relished by the reader. Suffice it to say that the discussions and the resolutions drafted mainly tended towards separation of Church government from that of scholastic institutions. It being generally understood beforehand that liberal principles with respect to educational questions would be strenuously advocated in this assembly, it is no matter of surprise that Herr von Mühler, Minister of Public Instruction, and his partisans kept pretty well aloof, and that meagre civilities on the part of government, such as affording conveniences for sight-seeing and two gratuitous performances at the royal theatre, were all that were extended on the occasion.

At the close of the conference the President, Herr Hoffmann, a school director from Hamburg, announced that seven teachers from the United States of America had been present during the sittings, which announcement was greeted with applause. On leaving the building, the public Turn Halle, my attention was attracted by a crowd of young teachers listening eagerly to a gentleman who styled himself "Professor," from Rochester, N. Y., and who was enlarging upon the fine chances which would open up to teachers disposed to emigrate to your shores. Inside the hall one of the speakers, having insisted on the beneficial influence of church government, had been listened to very patiently for some little time, but when the audience discovered that he was a simon pure disciple of the Von Mühler tribe, their disapprobation knew no bounds, and they refused to listen to him any further. A similar fate awaited our friend outside; for on being closely pressed by the inquisitive teachers he was at length forced to admit that he was connected with a theological establishment purely religious—a fact which had scarcely transpired when his audience rapidly thinned.

A refreshing symptom worthy of notice in this meeting of 4,000 instructors of youth, the greatest assemblage of its kind ever known as yet, was the absence of sectarianism, all shades of religion being represented, and even any allusion to tenets of faith carefully avoided. We might mention a case in point—that of Wiesbaden, with three-fourths of its inhabitants and a corresponding number of teachers being Protestants, and the authorities of which town had, nevertheless, delegated a Catholic teacher as their representative. The list of those present contains also the names of many Israelites, and though last, not least, a number of preceptresses, who took a lively interest in the proceedings. How little the Von Mühler doctrine of strict sectarianism found favor in the eyes of the assembled thousands of pedagogues was at once evident when the aforesaid Wiesbaden delegate had conveyed his greetings, and, with a view of demonstrating the liberality of sentiment pervading his section, had avowed his creed, thereby eliciting enthusiastic applause. We should also mention that, apart from the oppositional bearing so strongly pronounced against the drift of the government educational department, all remarks respecting South Germany and a united Fatherland were hailed with stormy applause. The gentlemen delegates from Vienna, Munich, Augsburg, &c., found it an easy task to arouse the sympathies of their northern brethren. Fraternization was the order of the day; the word "Vaterland" at every recurrence was pathetically applauded, and by unanimous acclamation Vienna fixed upon for the next annual gathering.

To-day's official press reports a slight indisposition of his Majesty King William, to which, however, we must attach a little more importance, inasmuch as the projected royal tour through the annexed provinces, which was to commence on the 23d inst., has been postponed for fully eight days. Such an alteration in the travelling programme, already published in all its detail, the countermanding of extra railway trains, reviews, &c., to say nothing of the *contretemps* arising from magistrates having to shelve their arches of triumph, bottle up their loyal and congratulatory speeches, &c., is assuredly no small matter, and when we consider the advanced age of the royal though yet hale patient, we might indulge in sundry reflections were it not that if anything serious should happen you would be immediately advised by wire.

TURKEY.

Progress in the Ottoman Empire—The Speech of the Sultan—Liberation of Political Offenders—A Nice Trick of a Theatrical Manager—A Conspiracy Plot for a Consideration.

CONSTANTINOPLE, May 16, 1869.

The Sultan's speech has been the topic of interest for the past week. It has been the custom for the Sultan to go to the Porte at the commencement of each year to hear his Ministers report upon the events of the past year and the state of the country. These reports are never published, and the public is consequently unable to judge if the information given to his Majesty is borne out by facts. The Sultan's annual visit to the Porte has, therefore, hitherto possessed no interest. It has been looked upon as a mere formality and allowed to pass with the mere record of its having taken place. Last year for the first time in the history of Turkey his Majesty, after receiving the customary report, made a speech, in which he expressed sentiments and made promises which for good, sound common sense and liberality might compare most favorably with the royal declarations of his European fellow sovereigns. This speech was much commented upon at the time, and has been quoted and referred to continually ever since as a mark of progress on one hand, and as a species of text book against oppression and injustice on the other. The speech delivered the other day is not less important as a mark of progress in civilization, and as such a "sign of the times," and a matter of hearty congratulation to the government and the country. The speech, though delivered by his Majesty, must of course, in accordance with usage, be considered as the mere dictum of the Divan; but even so its publication in the public journals and its submission thereby to criticism is a mark of enlightened liberality that few could have foreseen or believed in.

At the close of the Cretan affair many of the insurgent chiefs were brought up to Constantinople and imprisoned. They were all set at liberty a few days ago and sent off to Syra at the government expense, the famous Hadji Michaeli excepted. He is at large in Pera, apparently preferring Constantinople to his native mountains.

You will have heard of the supposed attempt on the Viceroy's life, which turned out to be a scheme concocted by Mons