

THE BERKSHIRE CAMPAIGN.

(Standard, Aug. 2.)

The facts are simple as they are surprising, and stated briefly, amount to this; that after six months notice the War Office confesses itself unable to move 30,000 men, or a force smaller than one German army corps, a day's march. The famous Control Department has been compelled to own at the last moment that it had not the means at its disposal, and after trying to procure them has failed utterly. Perhaps it could move 5,000—or less than two regiments of Prussian Infantry—if the transport were allowed to be underhanded; but even of this it is not quiet sure. Accordingly, a certain number of troops—precise number not known, but in any case not many—are to be moved about in the neighborhood of Aldershot, to use Mr. Cardwell's favourite phrase when expounding military matters, "as much as possible," and when the renowned autumn manoeuvres, which were to signalize the passage of the Army reorganization Bill, and at which we were once assured, Count Moltke was to assist, are altogether abandoned. It may be doubted if, off the stage a thing, by courtesy called an army, has ever been made to cut so ridiculous a figure. As we have said, we have no army; since a force even if it were formidable in other respects, is obviously no army if it cannot move. That is precisely our case; not according to the allegations of indignant Tory critics, but on the humble confession of our perplexed and bewildered Liberal Minister of War.

(Globe, August 1.)

The same strange mismanagement and the same all-prevailing parsimony which have led to the ruin of the army prevent its reorganization. On the very threshold of his reforms, at the first attempt to unite the three land forces of the Crown, as especially required of him, Mr. Cardwell has fallen foul of the old difficulty. What possible guarantee or even hope is there that such a Minister will or can accomplish the reforms which are essential to the national safety? If Parliament has the slightest self-respect, it will at once institute an inquiry, and if that is done, we can promise such a disclosure of embarrassment and imbecility as shall at once supply the reason why the proposal to give Mr. Cardwell *carte blanche* and unbounded confidence has been so strenuously opposed.

(Manchester Guardian, August 2.)

If the mock campaign in Berkshire is abandoned really because the expense would be very much greater than the original estimate, it follows that the Control Department is unable to calculate beforehand the expense of moving troops, and is surprised by the discovery, after several months meditation, that it has promised what it cannot perform without spending much more money than it dares to ask for. Perhaps the reports which Mr. Cardwell has promised to present to Parliament may show us precisely the officials who deserve the blame. It is desirable that the discovery should be made now and not at some future time, the interest and honour of England may be more imperilled than they can be by the failure of a mock campaign. The English people will be in no very placable mood, and may not be very leniently disposed towards greater men than subordinate officials, if national disaster or disgrace shall some day be caused by incompetence like that which seems to have frustrated the Berkshire operations that were to have taught such useful lessons to our active and reserve forces.

THE FLAG OF FRANCE.

The first French flag was blue. When Clovis became a Christian, he received from the Emperor Anastasius the title of patrician, and was invested with the insignia of the consulate, the purple, the chlamys, the diadem, and the sceptre surmounted with the Roman eagle, at St. Martin of Tours and in that church received his standard, the mantle of St. Martin which was of *plain blue*, making it the ensign of France. Since the time of Clovis, the flag or rather the *royal pennon* has been blue. As to the *fleurs de lis*, they were not only the badge of the king, but above all of France; their heraldic form having no resemblance to anything certainly established, but their origin is most ancient; they are found in the museum on the helmet of Assyrian warriors, and on the debris of earthenware dug out of the ruins of Nineveh.

The second French flag was red. Louis VI, named the Fat, called the Father of the *Communes*, having re-united to the crown Vexin, of which Pontoise was the capital, took for his banner the *oriflamme* of St. Dennis, a standard of *plain red*, the color of martyrs, which the counts of Vexin had, before the time of that king, the privilege of carrying to the wars under the title of "*Avoués de Saint Denis*," and thus it was that red became the French color up to the time of Charles VII.

The third French flag was white. Henry VI of England having become master of Paris, was therefore crowned king of France adopted as his banner the *oriflamme* of St. Denis, and abandoned the white, which had been his, taking the red in proof of his pretensions to the throne of France. Driven from Paris, on his return to England, he kept to that color, and the red rose became the emblem of the House of Lancaster, in distinction from the House of York, which adopted the white rose. Then as a curious exchange, Charles VII, rightful king of France, adopted the white cross and white flag, and under that ensign routed the English. Thus it was that the white flag became the national standard.

The colors of the city of Paris were originally blue and red. Its arms carried a *ship on a field gules*, surmounted by *fleur de lis on a field azure*. Already, at a most remote period, those colors had been adopted by the provost of the merchants Stephen Marcel as a rallying sign. The distinctive hood of his partizans was *half red, half blue*; and it was this *bicolor* hood that he put on the head of the Dauphin himself, afterwards Charles V.

The first color in 1789 was, however, *green*. On the 12th July the green cockade was adopted on the motion of Camille Desmoulins, when haranguing the crowd at the Palais Royal. "The citizens of all ranks," says the *Moniteur*, "of all orders, of all ages, every Frenchman who was found in the capital, were inscribed on the list of the soldiers of their country, and decorated themselves with the *green cockade*."

On the 13th July following, the electors of Paris, sitting at the Hotel de Ville in permanent committee (origin of the *Commune*) determined that the green cockade, being the color of the Count d'Artois, should be done away with, and that the colors of the city should be adopted by general assembly every one, therefore should wear the blue and red cockade.

It was the *bicolor* cockade that "M. Bailly, presented to his Majesty, who received it kindly, and deigned on the spot to fasten it to his hat. *Moniteur* of 1789, *Pieces justificatives*.

On the 26th July, 1789, General de La Fayette, who had been nominated commandant of the national militia, proposed to the assembly of electors a *tricolor* cockade. "This cockade," said he, "joining the color of the *lilies* to the colors of Paris, will make the circuit of the world;" and from that time our flags have taken the three colors, but at first in their historical order; the red at the bottom, the blue in the middle, and the white on top, horizontally, an order which has since been varied many times.

As to the red flag which figured on the Champ-de-Mars on the 17th July, 1791, it was displayed in terms of the law, as a 'definite signal for every assemblage,' and it was only under the same title that it continued to be hoisted at one of the windows of the Hotel de Ville up to the 7th of August following. Nevertheless, it is still in the present day, the signal of danger, put in front or in rear of railway trains; the signal placed at the top of the towers of the city to point out the direction of a fire. M. de Lamartine in making allusion, in 1848 to this flag was as in many other things, a poet and not a historian.—*Paris Univers*.

MONARCHY IN ENGLAND.

We meet frequently in American papers the assertion that monarchical institutions in England are near the end, and that the "effete despotisms" in Europe must totter and fall. They point to the recent demonstrations in London by Mr. Odger and his associates; to the fact that the Queen is unpopular, and that popular agitation is likely to make suffrage universal. We do not dispute the facts they observe, but we do dispute the conclusions they show from them. There was a time even in Saxon England when there were no kings, but it is twelve hundred years ago. The whole system of Government has become bound up in royal government, and whether among the Saxons, the Danes, the Normans, or the later English Monarchs, it has always been received with favor. There is no institution to which the English are more wedded, and none to which the Scotch are more attached. The Queen is unpopular, say the anti-monarchists. And why? Because she neglects her duties as a sovereign. She has been the most popular of Monarchs. If any one should be asked to point out the period in British history when England enjoyed the greatest peace, gave the greatest protection to the sciences and arts; and revered the sovereign the most, it is during the present reign. That she does not now enjoy the popular favor so greatly as she once did is owing to her practical abdication of the duties of her position. She is the great patron of art, but she does not open picture galleries or inaugurate statues. She is the highest lady in the land, but her drawing-rooms are infrequent, and her fashions control no society. She is the mouthpiece of the nation, and yet she shrinks from the performance of her duties. Foreign princes take lodgings at Claridge's, and pay for them like private individuals, while the royal lady in seclusion mourns the death of her late consort—a touching grief, but which must have its outward show tempered by the obligations of her position. These are the grievances of England against Victoria, they would cease if she led an active life; and performed the duties of her station.

There is no feeling against royalty in the abstract. It harmonizes with the views of the people, and there may be evils just as great in any other form of Government.