

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

FRANCE.

The trial of Montalembert and M. Dounoil, editor of the Correspondent commenced on the 24th. The speeches of Berryer and Dufaure, for the accused, are said to have been magnificent beyond description. The former spoke two hours and a-half, and said the prosecution was unjust, unfounded and ill-advised. When he concluded, a tremendous shout of "bravo" burst from the lower end of the court.

The judges deliberated an hour and pronounced the following verdict:—Montalembert to be imprisoned for six months and pay a fine of 3000 francs; Dounoil one month's imprisonment and 1000 francs fine. It is stated that Montalembert will appeal against the verdict.

The result of the trial had called forth bitter articles from the English press, and caused a slight depression in the funds at London and Paris.

It is reported that an Anglo-French fleet will leave on the 19th for the Gulf of Mexico. The French fleet will have on board a battery of artillery, in order to oppose any enterprise of filibusters against Central America.

The question of the French occupation stands, according to the best information I have as yet been able to obtain, pretty much as follows:—The Papal Government, that is to say, the Pope and Cardinal Antonelli, or perhaps I should say Cardinal Antonelli and the Pope, would like to get rid of their allies. Persons well able to form a just appreciation of the situation, believe that disturbances would quickly follow the withdrawal of the French troops. Of these there are now about 5,000 in the Papal States, including, of course, those in this city. Were they to leave, the Swiss (of whom there are barely 4,000) would be all the Government could depend upon, and they would not suffice. As to the Roman troops, I am positively assured that no reliance could be placed upon them, and that they would be much more likely to join a revolution than to co-operate in its suppression. The Roman army numbers, I believe, about 10,000 men. All these points considered, it is pretty evident that the French cannot yet be dispensed with without danger to the existing order of things. Information that has to-day reached me with respect to preparations making for their accommodation would induce me to think that their numbers are more likely to be increased than diminished. Why this should be, I know not, for in their present strength they suffice to keep things quiet. On the other hand, there are persons who think it probable that, at no distant period, they will be reduced to half the stipulated number of 6,000. You are aware that they are working at a fortification or line of enceinte at Civita Vecchia. This, although nominally for Custom-house objects, will serve for an entrenched camp. Some say that, when this is completed, as well as the railway between Rome and Civita, it will be occupied by 3,000 French troops, and that the remainder will evacuate the Papal States. The Austrians by a corresponding movement, will quit Bologna, and retire to Ancona. All this may possibly be mere conjecture, but it has been talked of in well-informed circles here. The railway open from Civita Vecchia, 3,000 French there, and the knowledge that they could quickly be reinforced from Toulon or Marseilles, would, I dare say, suffice to keep the Romans in order, barring revolutionary movements in other Italian States, whence contagion might spread to them. Were the French to quit the Papal territory it would be stipulated that, in case of foreign aid being again required, it should be furnished by them.—Cor. of the Times.

TRIAL OF COUNT DE MONTALEMBERT.—I have just left the court by which M. de Montalembert has been condemned to an imprisonment of six months, and a fine of three thousand francs (£120). Will my letter reach you in time before you go to press? I doubt it, but, at any rate, I will run the risk, and give you the result of my impressions, whilst they are still fresh in my memory.

Like many others, and notwithstanding my ticket of admittance, I was there at half-past eight this morning, fully decided to wait until ten o'clock, when the doors were to open. It was a cold bleak morning; but the old Palais de Justice wore an unusual appearance of bustle and activity. Along the corridors, and at every access to the court, one met with a noisy set of young barristers, eager to attend on an occasion when three of the greatest spokesmen of the day were to be heard in defiance of the Parliamentary system, still an object of fond regret among the most enlightened portion of the population. As I stood a silent witness of the scene, it recalled to my memory the recollection of times when a public debate was an event hailed with enthusiasm and anxious expectation by the whole nation. I had attended in my own youthful days at the trial of the Ministers of Charles X. I had witnessed the stormy debates in the Chamber of Deputies, which followed upon the revolution of July. The clubs of 1848, and the sitting of the Constitutional Assembly, had found in me an attentive listener, and here I was going to see Count de Montalembert condemned by an Imperial Court of Justice for an attack upon the Government of a man whose principal adviser he himself was but six or seven years ago. What a strange and chequered course of events crowded into my remembrance in that single moment.

At ten o'clock the doors were opened, and in a few minutes the whole portion of the hall left free for the public was filled by the elite of Parisian society.—About two hundred were jammed into a space that might have afforded room for about sixty. Not the slightest appearance of police in disguise, as had been rumored; indeed, had that been the case, the public might as well have been excluded at once.—The audience, filled with friends of the Court, with members of the bar, with a few foreigners of distinction, bowed to the Countess as she made her appearance, together with a part of her youthful family.—Immediately behind her I observed the usual correspondent of the Times, and I could myself take now and then a share in the conversation which was going on between her and those about her.

The Court entered the hall at exactly twelve o'clock. The murmur and hum of voices was immediately hushed, and the deepest silence ensued. The proceedings began as usual by the examination of the accused. A sort of sympathetic feeling seemed to creep over the assembly when the Count, in answer to a question of the President, gave out, in an audible voice, his profession:—"Formerly a Peer of France, and now a Member of the French Academy." This was followed by an enumeration of the different counts laid to the charge of the presumed delinquents. To English ears, this part of the proceedings ever offers a most striking and offensive contrast to our own practice. There is certainly something that grates upon our feelings of justice, when we see the Chairman of a Bench assume the part of the Public Prosecutor for the Crown. The

defendant has thus to encounter a twofold attack, which frequently exposes him to all the intricacies, and by-ways of the law; and such was the case of the Count. I could not but observe, that he seemed somewhat uneasy under the examination of the President, and if this happened to what must be the unfortunate predicament of those who come for the first time before the justice of their country?

These preliminaries were followed by the speech of the Procureur-Imperial, in support of the accusations. It was now the turn of M. Berryer, counsel for M. de Montalembert. The old orator, plunged deep into the subject, wherein he soon found the warmth and eloquence of his former days. Whoever has heard Berryer recollects him as a perfect type of the real orator. His fine tones immediately take hold of the hearer, whilst his commanding attitude and imposing gestures impress respect both on the public and the judge. On this occasion the latter was evidently anxious to show his sense of the speaker's reputation. However, as the defence went on, it so happened that the unlucky President interrupted Berryer, by accusing him of forgetting the respect due to the laws of the country. Now, if the celebrated old barrister is noted for anything, it is for the remarkable felicity with which he retorts to such interruptions. He at once burst out into an impassioned strain of eloquence, and ended by showing that the unfortunate magistrate had himself forgotten the former laws of the land. There ran a sort of electric shock through the audience, which showed itself in a half-suppressed titter, no less quickly quelled by the stern voice of the President calling to order. You cannot expect me to give the whole of Berryer's pleading, which lasted no less than three hours, without for one instant tiring the attention. Indeed, the thing would be impossible, for no one was allowed to take down even a few straggling notes. Such is the present law of France in regard to political prosecutions.

The principal argument of M. Berryer consisted in showing that the whole actual generation, as well as M. de Montalembert, had been brought up in the love of liberty, and of that free constitution which France has lately abjured, but which is still remembered with fond affection by many a Frenchman, still regretted by many a noble mind. For sixty years the country had waded through blood and revolutions to obtain that boon; for sixty years to worship freedom was considered a virtue—was inculcated as a very first principle—when lo! in consequence of a period of fatal anarchy, this system was repudiated, this constitution was superseded, through the will of the nation, if you please, by a system simple in its nature—a system of absolute power. But what then? To regret the object of an affection which had lasted thirty years—was that a crime? To bend the head to the prevailing ruler, though lamenting the fall of freedom—was that a crime? To admire the play and working of these institutions in another country, on an important occasion like the debate on India—was that a crime? "If this be a crime," exclaimed M. Berryer, "I own myself criminal, for under that Parliamentary system I was brought up; under that system I learned to devote my whole energy to the welfare of my country, and to the regret of that system I shall give my latest breath."

The reader may guess the numerous and powerful developments which such a theme gave rise to under the impulse of the moment, and in such bounds; but it would take whole columns to quote the passages which are now crowded upon my memory. The audience and the tribunal itself seemed particularly taken by a part in which M. Berryer recalled, that if the permanency of the judges on their seats was maintained in 1848, they owed it to M. de Montalembert's strenuous efforts in their favor.

The Procureur's reply on the part of the Crown was peculiarly characteristic. He endeavored to show that the plaintiff had opposed Louis Philippe's government, as well as the present. This really amounted to nonsense, for we are all aware that the Count's best battles were fought in favour of the Church, and that no man is reckoned as hostile to the system itself, because he happens to be in opposition relative to some particular line of constitutional government. How such a blunder could escape such an able man as M. Cordouan is reported to be is really beyond conception. It was equalled, however, by another no less flagrant mistake concerning our public meetings, which he maintained were a set of anarchical assemblies, something like the revolutionary clubs. The audience immediately evinced its better knowledge of facts by a stifled laughter; but how singular that such gross ignorance should be met with among professional men in France!

It was an easy matter for M. Dufaure, who now succeeded in his turn, to repel such accusations as these. This gentleman was formerly one of Louis Napoleon's ministers under the Republic, and returned to the bar when the empire was established.—He is equal to Berryer in poignancy—his superior in terseness and the sound good sense with which he grasps a subject. There is no difficult matter he cannot manage; "he says what he wills and as he wills it," such is his reputation in the Courts. On this occasion he dexterously gave out that M. de Montalembert could never have even intended to call the present Government, a Gouvernement d'antichambre, an accusation levelled at him. "Will you tell me," observed the wily barrister; "will you tell me, who have been once the Emperor's minister, that his Government would ever deserve such an appellation?" Why, we all know that he consults no one, seeks the advice of no one; that his powerful and solitary thoughts work alone, bring forth their results alone—yes, alone, solitary, powerful, I do repeat it. Could any man in his senses apply to such a system the expression used by the plaintiff in general terms and on different matters?

To whom they were applied soon became apparent it was to the *Univers* and its adherents. I was rather startled, I must allow, at this assertion, but M. Dufaure proceeded to show that the whole drift of M. de Montalembert's publication was directed more against that paper than against the Government. In my opinion, this was lowering rather than confirming the Count's position—lowering it to a petty newspaper warfare. The language used by the learned counsel was most bitter in regard to that organ of religious opinion in France; and, as an impartial observer, bound to communicate facts, I am obliged to add that many of his statements were fully confirmed by reality. I must likewise confess that universal sympathy went with the speaker as to the harm which the *Univers* is supposed to do to religion by its exaggeration and bitter tone of invective.—This is certainly very remarkable, if we reflect that the great majority of this audience was composed of sound—serious-practical Catholics, among whom were many priests, not the most backward in showing their assent. Allow me to say, that whatever may be our mutual admiration of M. Vuillou's splendid talents, you are necessarily ignorant of many facts which are going on here. It is a melancholy thing to see such divisions among Catholics; but after all what would be the use of concealing them longer? They must be known in England: they are already known in France by every one conversant with the affairs of the country. The attack of M. Dufaure, himself a cool-headed, moderate man, is but one explosion of a growing feeling of pain and distrust, now experienced by many, in regard to the policy followed of late by the *Univers*. It also shows most strikingly how true was my own statement as to the rumours which M. Vuillou has fortunately thought proper to ravel with indignation. I fully wish that the same article had not contained new proofs of his unfounded contempt for those eminent Catholics whose organ you have so frequently praised in your own columns.—Cor. of Weekly Register.

ITALY.

The King of Naples is said to have decided that all foreigners, employed in his States, must themselves be naturalized.

Important reductions have taken place in the army. A rumor was current, that the Austrian Cabinet had despatched a note to the Court of Sardinia, protesting against the recent policy of the Savoy Cabinet.

BELGIUM.

Brussels, Nov. 18.—A special railway company have contracted with the principal iron works of Belgium, for the supply of 40,000 tons of iron. The price accepted is low, but the order will provide work during the whole of next year for a vast number of workmen.

In the Belgian Chambers, the liberal address, in answer to the speech from the throne, has been carried by fifty-three votes against nine of the clerical party.

INDIA.

The following is the letter of the Times's Bombay correspondent:—

Bombay, Oct. 25.—For the purpose of swelling the force destined to reduce the rebels of Central India, General Roberts has been placed on the divisional Staff of Bombay, and the division under his command is under orders to join General Michel.—This measure will throw such a force into the districts now occupied by rebels that their rapid reduction may be confidently anticipated, nor can it be said that the concentration thus obtained is unnecessary. The experience of the last year has shown that English troops cannot successfully pursue insurgents like those under Tantia Topee, whose treasure and baggage are under the care of cavalry, and who are far less encumbered with impedimenta than Europeans, because their food is of the simplest kind, and easily found at every camping place. Such being the fruits of past experience, it is obvious that the proper course to be pursued in attempting the final annihilation of the rebels is to head them in several directions by moving numerous columns on every point where the enemy is likely to pass. To effect this a larger force is required than our Generals in Central India have up to this time been able to command, and in this view the junction of the Rajpootana field force, whose presence is no longer required on its old campaigning ground, with the division under General Michel, is most desirable.

That European troops cannot keep up a vigorous pursuit in this climate has been made painfully evident by the losses which General Michel incurred in his effort to intercept Tantia Topee at Rajghur. With the particulars of the action at that place you have been for some time acquainted, but it has only been known lately at what sacrifices this victory was achieved. General Michel lost 200 Highlanders, dead or hors de combat from sunstroke, and he forced the marches so severely that his baggage fell gradually to the rear, where it was cut off and carried away piecemeal by the insurgents. Military men will, I think, agree that it is better to let the enemy escape than to jeopardize by rash haste the safety of supplies on which the health, nay, the very existence, of European troops depends. Apart from these considerations, however, General Michel must be allowed the credit of having kept up with his enemy as closely as the nature of the localities would permit; and, while he has incurred the severe losses which I have mentioned, he has dealt the enemy two very severe blows, calculated in a great measure to prostrate his strength and impair his efficiency for further efforts.

In the meanwhile it is by no means satisfactory to see the results of the policy pursued by our agents through this portion of India. The defection of the garrison of Esaughur at a most critical moment affords a lesson which should not be lost. I know nothing of the future intentions of the Government of India as regards Gwalior; except that it is intended to confer upon Scindia the lapsed state of Jhansi. Already the principality of Amjheera has already been added to the possessions of the Maharajah. I leave you to make your own reflections as to these additions of territory; but it certainly strikes me that while we thus aggrandize the Scindia family we should make some arrangement with it by which the Maharajah should be deprived of the large army which he keeps together, an army composed of men whom we evidently cannot trust, and who are useless as instruments for suppressing rebellion.

With the exception of a slight action between a detachment from Jhansi and some rebels at a place called Garrote, in which 50 of the 3d Europeans and 14th Dragoons attacked a band of 800 men, killed several of them and took two guns, there is nothing further to chronicle respecting Central India.

GRIEVANCES OF INDIAN POPULATION, AS STATED BY THEMSELVES.—On Saturday last we published an official Manifesto which had been put into circulation through the North-Western Provinces a short time ago, and from this document we are enabled to collect the hopes and expectations presumably entertained by the upper classes of Indian society. If we cannot ascertain what India really would be, we can see very plainly what it was thought that influential natives might wish it to become. The Prince, for it is a Prince who makes the proclamation, describes precisely such a paradise as he knows would prove most alluring, and thus admits us into the secret wishes and traditional "grievances" of the people, whose true sentiments, it is said, we have never yet fathomed. To make the invitation more effective, every class is separately addressed in arguments adapted to its position, so that we learn not only what they might possibly complain of, but what, if they had their own will, they might attempt to realize.

The first persons taken in hand are naturally the Zemindars, or great landholders, and they are assured that, upon the re-establishment of a native dynasty, the rent they pay to Government for their estates will be very much reduced, at the same time that their privileges are proportionately increased.—They will no longer be accountable to common people for their misdoings, or summoned into court at the suits of peasants, or maid servants, or slaves. Their estates will no longer be liable to distress for arrears of rent, nor will they be subject to such other judicial indignities. On the contrary, their honor is to be safe, their taxation light, "and every Zemindar will have absolute rule in his own zemindary." The great territorial families being thus conciliated, the Prince comes to the upper merchants of the country, to whom he promises all that lucrative export trade, which, says he, "the infidel and treacherous British have monopolized." As soon as he and his are restored to power again all this monopoly will cease, and native merchants, instead of being confined to small and insignificant transactions, will have all the commerce of the country concentrated in their hands. Probably it occurred even to the framers of this precious manifesto, that trade would most likely follow capital and means, and that something more material than the mere abolition of "monopoly" would be required to guarantee every merchant in a thriving business of his own. The Prince, however, is quite prepared on this point. The native traders, he says, "will have the benefit of the Government steam vessels and steam carriages for the conveyance of their merchandise gratis, and merchants having no capital of their own shall be assisted from the public treasury." Having settled the great interests of agriculture and commerce by these arrangements, the proclamation next deals with public servants and artisans. To the former class is promised an abundance of rich and highly salaried places, with the adjuncts of honor, title, and costume, most alluring to Oriental minds; to the latter is held out the assurance of absolutely exclusive dealing. None but native artificers will be employed by the King, Rajahs, or the rich, so that every cunning workman will get plenty of work and plenty of pay. These are the temptations unfolded before the eyes of Indians to enlist them against our rule, and to attractions thus established in front is added

a tolerably strong population from behind. "Natives," it is declared, "whether Hindus or Mahomedans, who fall fighting against the English are sure to go to Heaven, and those killed fighting for the English will doubtless go to hell." Finally, and by way of adding present to future terrors, the proclamation announces that if any member of any of the classes enumerated should continue, after this plain exposition of his duty, to adhere to the British Government, "all his estates shall be confiscated and his property plundered, and he himself, with his whole family, shall be imprisoned and ultimately put to death."

Here, then, is the native paradise, that region of happiness, contentment, and amity from which the flaming sword of the British scares away the crushed and terrified Hindoo. It may not be impertinent, however, to ask what place in this reign of bliss is reserved to those two hundred millions who constitute the population of India? When landowners are made absolute, excused from taxes, and raised above the law; when merchants are provided with capital and transport out of the public money; when placemen are multiplied and paid on a scale of heedless extravagance; and when all cheap goods are excluded from the country for the benefit of more costly manufactures—when all this has been brought to pass, what, we ask, is expected to be the condition of the people—the Ryot who cannot sue his master, of the husbandman who must find money for the merchant, of the laborer who must find for protection and sinews with the sweat of his brow?—We believe a good many persons retain an indefinite kind of idea that, somehow or other, the mass of Hindoos are sufferers by the introduction of a foreign rule; that many wants existed under a native Government which find no expression under our own; and that, except for the higher prospects of civilization, perhaps the Indian peasant was better off in the days of Aurungzebe than he is now. Such impressions must be rapidly dispelled by the Manifesto before us. Not to mention that we have insured the greatest blessing of all—internal peace, it is plain from the whole purport of this address that, whatever may have been the charges contingent on our Administration, they must necessarily have operated for the benefit of the multitude. If we have circumscribed the privileges of the landowners and reduced them to a level with their own retainers in the eye of the law, those retainers must have been gainers by the proceeding; if we cultivate indigo with British capital, we save the Treasury from subsidizing native merchants; if Manchester and Birmingham have upset the manufactures of Dacca and Benares, it is simply because they have underdone them, or, in other words, that clothes and hardware have been made cheaper than before. Our correspondent, indeed, remarks in the letter which enclosed the Manifesto, that "as a mass," the artisans of India had improved wonderfully in condition, and that if the more excellent class of artificers has found their calling decay, the million has got the benefit of the change. We can hardly see, ourselves, why even this exception need subsist. If shawl-work, or metal-work, of the highest quality, can still be produced in India, it is not likely to lack purchasers in Europe.

There is one more inference which this proclamation, in common with all others of its kind, entitles us to draw. When we see what facts are put forward as grievances are perfectly justified in assuming that no worse grievances exist. This has been candidly acknowledged by continental critics, who have remarked that never, from first to last, have any pleas been advanced on behalf of the insurgents which could be held to warrant the insurrection. Religious panic might have been a very powerful motive, but it was confessedly an unfounded one, and if this feeling be set aside it is really impossible to discover in any of the manifestoes which have been issued by the rebels so much as an allegation which could justify their outbreak. They have been afraid, or have professed to be so, of our aggression upon their caste institutions by preaching and teaching, and they have charged us, accordingly, with treachery and infidelity. They can point out, as is done in this proclamation, that many features of Oriental administration have become obliterated, though the abolition can be plainly shown to have been for the public good. But on no occasion have they pleaded oppression, rapacity, injustice, or maladministration as justifying their revolt; and it is therefore a fair deduction that they had no such excuses to allege.—Times.

The following parallel betwixt the Huguenots, or French Protestants, and the Mormons is from the Western Banner, one of the best conducted Catholic periodicals published on this side of the Atlantic:—

"THE MORMON WAR AND THE FRENCH HUGUENOTS.—The Huguenots held views contrary to the universal opinion of the French nation, as expressed in its statutes, and attempted, within the confines of France, to establish an independent Sovereignty on the basis of their peculiar principles. What else has been charged against the Mormons? On what other grounds was their conquest or expulsion demanded? None certainly. It was because they practiced polygamy while the common consent of the country declared it illegal—it was because they presumed to build up an independent State, with Salt Lake City for its capital, within our limits, in disregard of this common consent—that the General Government declared them rebels and sent a force against them.—The parallel is complete. There is not a flaw in it affecting principle. If we are right, so were Louis XIII and Louis XIV. If we are in the wrong, so were they, but not otherwise. We did not say that the French Calvinists "were a peaceful community" for the very good reason that they were not. Taking advantage of the dissensions of parties during the minority of Charles IX. they broke out into open rebellion, overran a considerable part of the kingdom, made themselves masters of many towns, banished Catholic worship from every place they won, massacred the clergy, broke down the tombs of the dead, burned the body of St. Martin at Tours, and plainly acknowledged that they wished to overthrow the fabric of the State and destroy the freedom of the universal religion. They called in foreign aid to effect what their own arms were unable to do; and the succors of men and money received from Queen Elizabeth and the Protestant States of Germany, both before and after the battle of Jernac, where Conde fell, shows with how much reason France had to regard them—not merely as rebels solving a French quarrel by French means—but as traitors trafficking to outside enemies, in the safety and independence of the nation. Even after they had secured freedom of religion and civil privileges, and enjoyed them 87 years, they sought to establish a distinct sovereignty in French Territory, and invited by the persistent hostility the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, as "a peaceful community" is simply absurd. Whatever excuses they had for rebelling before 1598, they had none afterwards; and the attempt to turn Rochelle into the centre of a republic with a Calvinistic Church "establishment," shows that they were rebels from conviction, as they were bigots in practice. The only comment which we need append to our correspondents reference to their "rights of conscience" is this: While they were fighting for them they denied the "rights of conscience" to all who did not believe with Geneva—when they had won them, they abused the consequent privileges, and sought to give a precedent to the secessionists of the South and the Apostles of Utah. There is a difference between the Huguenots and the Mormons, but it is not the one which our correspondent seeks to draw. The former endeavored to force their peculiar notions on the whole French nation—the latter design to confine theirs to their own Territory. The principles which justify the Federal authority in proceeding to bring Utah under its control, are the same Louis XIV. acted on bringing Rochelle into subjection; and we cannot ap-

prove of our present policy in reference to the Latter Day Saints, without approving of Louis' action in regard to the Huguenots.

M. DE MONTALEMBERT'S OPINIONS ON ENGLAND.—From the London Times.—Julius M. Le Maître, who loved the institutions—but hated the nation, M. de Montalembert professes himself as much attached to the latter as to the former, and, as for knowledge, he is as well acquainted with our institutions as most Englishmen, with this additional advantage,—that he is better able to compare them with those of other countries, and can regard them from without as well as from within. Every feeling, every wish of such a writer, is favourable to a country which he not only regards with great, perhaps even with too partial admiration, but also looks upon as the only hope for the advancement of real liberty and progressive civilization. And yet our critic views our present situation with great disquietude. It is not that we are hopelessly committed to the Protestant heresy, for he admits that our liberality and toleration are exceedingly favourable to the mission of Catholic teaching. Nor does he apprehend danger to us from internal discord. He considers that power in this country is substantially in the hands of the middle classes, that there is no real conflict between aristocracy and democracy, and that the nobility are only too ready to serve a power the resolutions of which, when once arrived at, they never dream of disputing. So far from regretting the decline of party spirit, he views in its extinction the best proof of substantial progress, and sees no reason why matters should not go on in a course of steady improvement without this turbulent and exciting agency. The danger which he apprehends for us is not internal, and is not Asiatic! It is to be found, he believes, in the present condition of Europe. In 1815 England possessed the sympathy and good wishes of every nation on the Continent except France. Now it is no longer so. We have become more liberal and the Powers of Europe more retrograde, so that the gulf between us is wide, and widens every day. Our army has, he says, most unjustly and incontestably lost its prestige, and besides all these causes there is a "moral repulsion" between us and the great Powers of Europe. There is, besides, envy at our prosperity and liberty. He thinks we trust too much to our past glory, to our bravery, our liberty, and our naval superiority. Mere physical strength and courage, he believes, are gradually losing their advantage by the progress of science as applied to war. Our naval superiority may be rivalled, as it has often been rivalled before, and the result of that rivalry may not always be as prosperous to us as in the days of La Hogue and Trafalgar. Ancient glory is a source of miscalculation rather than strength, and liberty, like beauty or riches, is a good which requires to be defended, and cannot always defend itself. On the whole, M. de Montalembert thinks that we overestimate our resources, and that we may easily be drawn by our pride and confidence in ourselves into some war from which we may come forth conquered, or at least greatly humbled.

THE "GORILLA."—A most remarkable addition, says a London paper, is about to be made to the objects of interest at the Crystal Palace, Sydenham, consisting of a perfect and complete preserved specimen of a Gorilla. We may as well reply at once to the question of "What is a Gorilla?" by stating that it is an animal that resembles more nearly than any known creature the members of the human family; and there is this extraordinary fact relative to it, that it has been accurately described upon several occasions before it was seen, or was ever known to exist with perfect certainty. Some ten years since, a traveller in the interior of Western Africa saw a native tribe engaged in worshipping what appeared to be a human skull set upon a pole. The curiosity of the traveller was excited, and with considerable trouble he obtained possession of the idol, and forwarded it to Professor Owen for his opinions respecting the nature of the animal of which it had once formed part. Professor Owen decided that the creature did not belong to any of the species of the chimpanzee, or indeed to any of the monkey tribe; that it was altogether unrepresented by any specimen of natural history known to the scientific world; and the learned Professor embodied his views on the subject in a very interesting paper, which he read before the Zoological Society. At length, after extraordinary exertions, an animal was captured, and packed in a cask of spirits of wine, duly arrived in this country, a few weeks since, and is found to correspond in the most minute respect with the description of it by Professor Owen.—The Gorilla is a native of Western Africa, and is known to exist, it is said, in very large numbers, in the Gaboon districts, where they are among the most formidable of the wild animals of the forest. The present specimen, which has been most carefully skinned and preserved by Mr. Bartlett, the taxidermist to the Crystal Palace, under the direction of Professor Owen, is rather more than five feet in height. It is a male, known to be young by the state of its teeth, and the condition of the sutures of the skull. The fore legs or arms are of great length and of prodigious strength, greatly surpassing that of any human arm; the hind legs are comparatively short, and are well adapted for tree climbing. In features, the animal is very much like a negro, and the orbits over the eyes are considerably projected. The teeth are formed almost precisely as in man, and unlike the monkey, chimpanzee, or orang-outang, they are of great strength, and in the skull which was first sent over to this country, the canines were nearly as large and as strong as those of a lion.—The hair on the upper part of the head of the Gorilla is a reddish brown; upon the cheeks, the smooth hair is of a greyish hue; the back is covered with dark or mouse-colored hair; the hair upon the arm, from the hand to the elbow, is black, and it grows upwards from the hand towards the elbow. The chest is nearly bare. There were thirteen wounds in the body of the animal, and two bullets were extracted from it, one from a wound which had been healed over. The Gorilla had to all appearance died of starvation; his body was in a most emaciated condition and his tongue was covered with a thin white coating, as though caused by excessive fever. It is thought that the wound inflicted upon him prevented his being able to procure the necessary supplies of food. These animals are gregarious; and it is stated by the natives that they frequently appear in considerable force, sack the villages, carry away young children, and devour them; and, further, they have a very ugly custom of attacking men, and wrenching off the head of those whom they attack. If one of these creatures is fired at, or attacked, the whole tribe come down to the rescue; and escape from the combined assault is impossible. How far these statements may be correct, there is at present no means of knowing; but it is very certain, from the formation of the teeth, and the great strength of the animal, that the Gorilla is not a vegetarian in his habits, and that he would have no scruple in devouring any flesh that might chance to come in his way. Mr. Bartlett has represented the animal as seated upon the trunk of a tree. It will remain a few days at the palace, by permission of the trustees of the British Museum, whose property it is, and where it is destined ultimately to be placed. Professor Owen will deliver to the Zoological Society a lecture upon this most interesting specimen.

DEATH FROM PUNISHMENT AT AUBURN PRISON.—The telegraph brought us news, yesterday, that a colored man named Samuel Moore, had died immediately after being taken out of the Shower Bath on the day before. The verdict of the Coroner's inquest is published before us, together with the evidence, as published in the Auburn American. The bare fact that a convict had died from punishment is itself enough to arouse the attention of all persons interested in the prison discipline, and to call out the comments of the press. However demoralized the hardened wretches