# Chapter Five

## *1838-1840: The Fourth Visit*

AT THE BEGINNING of June 1838, a pamphlet appeared in Paris called *Relation historique des événiments du 30 octobre 1836*, written by François Laity, an artillery officer who had been with Louis Napoleon at Strasbourg. It was an account of that attempted *coup*, being a vindication of it and a critique of the July Monarchy, claiming that its persistent ridiculing of the *coup* and Louis Napoleon had been dishonourable and unjustified. Official reaction was swift and violent. On 21 June, Laity was arrested and all available copies of the pamphlet were seized. A week later he was tried in the Chamber of Peers, and on 10 July he was sentenced to imprisonment for five years, fined 10,000 francs, and committed to life police surveillance on release. All the seized copies of his work were destroyed.

What few knew was that the pamphlet had been written at the instigation of Louis Napoleon. On 2 July, the day before Laity appeared before the Chamber of Peers, Louis Napoleon wrote to him from Arenenberg explaining his motives in having involved him:

> my only object … was to repel the cowardly calumnies with which the Ministerial organs covered me during the five months wherein I was in prison or at sea. My honour and that of my friends were concerned in proving that it was no mad dream which led me to Strasburg in 1836 … the cause has partisans everywhere, from the workshop of the mechanic to the council chamber of the King, from the soldiers' barracks to the palace of the marshal of France – Republicans, *Juste-Milieu*, Legitimists, all who desire a strong government, real liberty, an imposing governing authority. All these, I say, are Napoleonists, whether they know it or not; for the Imperial system is not the bastard imitation of English or American Constitutions, but the governmental form of the principles of the Revolution …my aim was not to disturb the tranquillity of France, nor to rekindle smouldering passions, but to show myself to my fellow-citizens as I am, and not as the hate interest has depicted me. But if some day parties overthrow the actual Government … then, perhaps, the name of Napoleon would be a sheet-anchor for all that is generous and truly patriotic in France … You will be asked, no doubt, where you obtained all the statements you publish; you may say that you received them from me.[1]

In spite of the seizure, many editions of the pamphlet escaped the flames and the press in England was quick to comment. 'Although much pressed for room', confessed *The Times*, 'we deem the matter of sufficient importance to entitle it to a place in our columns, observing only that we must not be understood to speak otherwise than from the work'.[2] True to its word, the paper avoided introducing any opinions of its own into a two-and-a-half column perfect exposition of the banned work. If bad publicity is good publicity indifferent publicity is occasionally even better, and after six months of libel and slander on the *coup* the British Public was allowed to make up its own mind.

The July Monarchy once again played into Louis Napoleon's hands, and this repressive reaction resulted in precisely the opposite of what had been intended. When the seven conspirators who had taken part in the attempt had been tried before the Court of Assizes at Strasbourg, on 6 January 1837, all were acquitted to the great rejoicing of the town, which then treated them to a public banquet. Yet Laity was now being persecuted for having written an account of the event after having been acquitted. The severity of the sentence turned him into a martyr, while the seizure and destruction of the pamphlet increased the Public's desire to know what was in it a thousandfold: *The Times,* for example, had not been interested at all until its Paris correspondent acquired a banned copy after 21 June. Best of all for Louis Napoleon

was that the connection with him, which emerged in court, gave him the final legitimacy as a pretender that the attempted *coup* had all but achieved.

The July Monarchy, which had promised so much in 1830, had become by 1838 more reactionary and repressive than the Bourbon regime it had replaced. Distant days they were when Louis Philippe had had the tricolour wrapped around him by Lafayette. What had become of the Citizen King now? On 27 December 1836, as he was passing the Pont Royal on his way to open the Chamber of Deputies, Pierre Meunier fired at him with a pistol. Once again the ball missed its target, but flying glass slightly injured three of his sons. 'Ought we to congratulate the King?' asked one deputy of another. 'Certainly, we always do'.[3] The attempts sometimes originated in the secretive minds of disturbed individuals, but more often than not in the meeting rooms of secret clubs. But they all encouraged the anti-Orleanist press, and between 1835 and 1838 the administration felt obliged to put a tighter grip on the newspapers and caricaturists than Napoleon ever had.

The Duc d'Orléans married Helena von Mecklenburg-Schwerin on 30 May 1837 after his rejection by the Habsburgs. As a preliminary to this, on 8 May, a general amnesty was announced, with many Republicans returning to Paris. The Bonapartes did not return because they alone had not been included in the amnesty, and once again their absence was noted. Thiers's resignation over his desire to become involved in the Carlist Wars had not been sanctioned by the Chamber of Deputies, while Molé's unpopular installation as president of the council and minister of foreign affairs had been achieved at the personal command of Louis Philippe. François Guizot – the minister of public instruction who ought to have replaced Thiers – had been deliberately overlooked. One insurrection followed another in a stifling atmosphere of what Louis Philippe's enemies famously tagged 'bourgeois malaise'.

Meanwhile, on 29 January 1838, Louis Napoleon moved into the castle of Gottlieben between the Untersee and Lake Konstanz, a property Hortense had bought and left to him. It was almost a ruin but he intended to live in the only habitable part while restoring the rest in order to realize something by it. The French Government, both annoyed and delighted that Louis Napoleon had not remained in America, resolved to make life difficult for him. Orleanist *mouchards* hung around the vicinity of the castle making themselves noticeable as they sketched, pointed, and asked searching questions of the locals. On 30 January, the Federal Directory at Lucerne was approached by Molé and informally asked whether Louis Napoleon could be coaxed out of Switzerland. The idea was rejected, but Molé persisted. The Swiss knew that France wished them to comply with the letter of the law as given at the Congress of Vienna – excluding Bonapartes from Swiss territories – at a time when few nations other than France were anymore bothered with even its spirit.

Little could have irritated the Swiss more than the hypocrisy in Paris demanding that they comply with a measure in which the Orleanists had taken no part and which they had even betrayed by ousting the Bourbons. While Louis Philippe and Molé discussed their next move, in May Louis Napoleon was elected a deputy to Diessenhofen in Thurgovie, a generous move designed to give him a measure of sanctuary in addition to the honourary citizenship of the canton accorded to him back in April 1832. However, Louis Napoleon refused, not because he wished to avoid becoming the cause of conflict but because he wished to be a free agent when that conflict came to a head. Notwithstanding this, the Thurgovie Society of Carabineers elected him their president, and this he accepted.

Then came the Laity pamphlet. A few years later Louis Napoleon wrote to Narcisee Vieillard, the republican courtier and former tutor to his late brother, explaining that 'I

had the Laity pamphlet published not only in self-defense, but in order to give the Government a cause to have me expelled from Switzerland'.[4] There is no reason to disbelieve this remark, which again demonstrated the smoothness of his political mind. An incensed Molé sent a despatch to the Federal Directory at Lucerne on 1 August. The tone was haughty, suggesting that Louis Philippe expected a neutral but friendly nation such as Switzerland not to permit an enemy within its borders, and once again firmly asked them to expel Louis Napoleon. On August 6, the Diet discussed the demand and the majority of cantons rejected it with contempt. Meanwhile, Molé engaged the sympathy and assistance of Metternich, who was probably Europe's most intense hater of the name 'Bonaparte'. The Austrian army began to mobilize and divisions massed on the Swiss frontier while French soldiers moved towards Lake Leman. Most Switzers, both within and without the administration, rallied to Louis Napoleon not necessarily because they supported him personally but in order to defend their traditional liberal principles now being threatened by French arrogance.

On 22 September, Louis Napoleon wrote to the president of the petty council of Thurgovie explaining that although he believed he had the right to remain in Switzerland he was mindful of the conflict he was causing. Therefore:

> it only remains for me to depart from a country where my presence is the subject of so many unjust suspicions, and where it would be the pretext for so great a calamity. I beg you … to announce to the Federal Directory that I will leave as soon as they shall have obtained from the Ambassadors of the various Powers the passports which are necessary for me to travel to a place where I shall find a safe asylum.[5]

If Louis Napoleon hoped that by attempting to have him expelled the French Government – now backed by Prussia and some members of the Southern Germanic Confederation – would make it appear to the world that it wished to 'break a butterfly upon a wheel', he was proven right. Many sections of the French press – Orleanist, Legitimist, Republican, liberal-conservative, and commercial – suddenly rallied to his support. If he further believed that by quitting Switzerland in a sacrificial and public act of abnegation he would make it appear to the world that he had averted a minor war, he was proven right again. The Diet met on 1 October, and five days later it replied officially to the request of August without altering the Swiss position, restating their right to shelter whomsoever they pleased and officially notifying the Powers of Louis Napoleon's voluntary departure.

The Powers accepted this situation, and on that same day Louis Napoleon received a passport from the British minister in Berne, David Morier, countersigned by diplomats from Prussia and Baden as well as the consul-general of Holland. On Sunday 14 October, Louis Napoleon set out for England, where the press recognized his status as *Imperator in partibus infidelium*:

> The young Prince has become an object of interest and sympathy, and has risen, by degrees, from the low position of a crack-brained youth to that of a serious and worthy competitor for the French throne … All this has greatly enhanced the merit of Louis Napoleon in French eyes, so that Louis Philippe has actually succeeded, by dint of effects, in raising up a second to none competitor for his crown.[6]

* * *

Why England again? The first three visits had of course demonstrated England's fine qualities to him to the extent that by 1838 he was often quoting himself to the effect that the only two free nations on earth were Switzerland and England. This view

would only alter in so far as France would replace Switzerland after his accession to power. One reason for this was that the Whigs had been in office since April 1835 under Melbourne's second administration. His political achievements were sparse and ephemeral, and he was much criticized by liberals and Tories alike, but his commitment to Palmerston ensured that there was no change in the Foreign Office during the six years of his administration.

It was once again to Palmerston, then, that Louis Napoleon owed the structure of his early life, and which made the later part of it possible. Talleyrand had proposed an Anglo-French treaty in December 1834, but neither Palmerston nor Grey had been interested. Palmerston correctly believed that an unwritten alliance already existed, and he resisted a signed treaty that would by nature be less flexible than the *entente cordiale* that had been largely his doing. The wisdom of this became apparent when Molé revealed himself to be the most Anglophobic of French ministers, convincingly demonstrating his attitude by proceeding to undo all the pro-British efforts previously undertaken by the Duc de Broglie. Palmerston reacted by further relaxing restrictions on political refugees.

There was nothing new about this, even with Palmerston. In November 1831, under Périer's *Résistance* ministry, a minor but protracted and intense diplomatic row ensued when the July Monarchy expelled 78 English Trappist monks from their establishment at Meillerare near Nantes. The official cause given from Paris was that the order had had no official charter, although it appears more likely that the real reason was that they were not French, and perhaps more likely still because they were English. Palmerston immediately retaliated by conspicuously allowing refugees fleeing from France to be granted asylum in England.

When the restored Bourbon Ferdinand VII of Spain died, his revocation of Salic law ensured the succession of his daughter Isabella. Those opposed to distaff rule supported the king's brother the Count of Molina, so igniting the Carlist Wars. Because Isabella II had taken a liberal and potentially democratic approach to government, whereas Molina represented arbitrary personal rule, Palmerston saw this conflict as a national reflection of the general European struggle between liberal and authoritarian principles. When Thiers attempted to take France into the struggle on behalf of Isabella, partly in order to offend Austria for having rejected an Orleans prince as a son-in-law, he was only briefly departing from a general policy of support for a reactionary victory in Spain. Palmerston made it very plain that he was now aligning France with what were to him the hated Powers of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, which Louis Napoleon also detested during the 1830s.

By 1836 the problem of refugees was getting out of control, so many were the numbers either escaping or expelled from France. Granville met Molé in September to discuss a despatch from Palmerston in which the foreign secretary had expressed serious concern over certain German refugees France had successfully forced Switzerland to expel from its territories. They too had fled to England, which of course was fine except that the British Government was worried at the economic plight of these and other exiles, and wished to make clear to Molé that Britain could ill-afford to become the dustbin of France's internal policies. It was, of course, a problem Palmerston had largely brought on himself by sending out his welcoming liberal signals to political agitators in Europe. Nevertheless, he insisted that 'those persons voluntarily seeking an asylum in Great Britain would not be repulsed, whatever might be their political tenets'.[7] Details of diplomatic correspondence were naturally unknown to Louis Napoleon, but the general attitudes in England certainly were. The British Government, in granting Louis Napoleon a passport through

Persigny under the auspices of Lord John Russell, had been neither too hasty nor overly accommodating but simply correct according to its own policies. Melbourne's Cabinet could hardly wish to be seen to be condoning one form of opposition to Louis Philippe, whatever its origins, while condemning another.

On the afternoon of Wednesday October 24, Louis Napoleon arrived in London aboard the *Batavier* from Rotterdam, and for the first time he was able to enter his details under his own name.[8] On this occasion he arrived with a suite more appropriate for an emerging political figure: Persigny, Vaudrey, Bouffet de Montauban, his physician Henri Conneau, and three close manservants, including Thélin, who all moved into the familiar rooms of Fenton's Hotel. Louis Napoleon was now a public celebrity, and people gathered in St James's Street to catch a glimpse of him as he went about his daily affairs.

The French Government was not amused and this time Sébastiani was instructed to petition Melbourne to have London forbidden to the Prince-Pretender, and also to have him put under surveillance. Naturally enough the request was met with a coldness that was little short of hostile. It was pointed out to Sébastiani that unless Louis Napoleon seriously infringed English law he had as much right to live where he wished, and to travel where and when he wished, as did any other subject of her Majesty's realm, and this Louis Napoleon did. After one week delighting in his new freedom in a favourite city he took Persigny to Leamington Spa in Warwickshire where he rented a fine little house, 4 Clarendon Square.

There were two interesting excursions during this journey. One was to Stoneleigh Abbey near Coventry, founded in the twelfth century and possessed by the Leigh family since the sixteenth. Baron Leigh was a respected if minor author and poet, but he was also lord lieutenant of Warwickshire, and although this was by then a largely ceremonial descendant of what had once been a powerful position it nevertheless retained considerable prestige. Louis Napoleon was invited to hunt with Leigh, and to be seen in the Warwickshire Hunt with one of the oldest families in England did him no harm at all.

The other was to the industrial heartland of England. Once again, as in 1832, he travelled through Lancashire and the Midlands, concentrating his attentions on Birmingham and Manchester, reaching Birmingham on January 25 where he lodged at the Hen and Chickens Hotel. Seven years earlier he had had to find his own way around, but this time George Collis, a leading silversmith and Guardian of the Birmingham Assay Office as well as the regional British consul for Russia, was elected to show him around. Louis Napoleon was 'everywhere received with marks of interest and regard' as he paid close attention to the factories and shops of the town,[9] which had been granted a charter of incorporation just the previous year.

Birmingham was not then the centre for heavy industry it would soon become, and Louis Napoleon was shown the more traditional trades of gunsmithing, jewellery manufacture, and of course silversmithing. He was also taken to the Theatre Royal on New Street, on the evening of his arrival, to see a performance of Auber's grand opera *La Muette de Portici,* in which the celebrated Scottish tenor John Templeton took the title role of Masaniello. Auber's librettist, Eugène Scribe, had written the text in the mid-1820s telling the story of Tommaso Aniello, the seventeenth-century fisherman from Amalfi who became the nominal head of a popular insurrection against the Spanish viceroy. It was well known that it had been a performance of this groundbreaking opera, with its realistic crowd scenes and dramatic special effects, at the Théâtre de la Monnaie in Brussels on 25 August 1830 that had begun the Belgian

revolution. Unfortunately, it is not known who, if anyone, suggested this performance to Louis Napoleon.

Manchester was reached on Tuesday 29. It had also just been granted a charter of incorporation as a municipal borough (October 1838), and Louis Napoleon was received by the first Town Mayor, Thomas Potter, a wealthy cotton manufacturer who was also an anti-Corn-Law activist and prominent free trader. With him, and in the company of a group of businessmen, he was shown the old Exchange and the current Industrial Exhibition at the local Mechanics' Institute. Manchester, the nation's centre of the textile industry, was unrivalled in its ability to receive raw materials and send out the finished product due to England's intelligent network of roads, canals, and, since 1830, railways. The 150 miles of track from London to Birmingham had been opened the previous year at a time when the issue of railways had only just begun to occupy French politicians, Lamartine having broached the subject for the first time on 9 May. Louis Napoleon was impressed by the industrial and social questions the tour raised, and again particularly with the advantages of rail travel. Before leaving Manchester he attended a performance of Dickens's *Nicholas Nickleby* at the Theatre Royal.

Louis Napoleon returned to Birmingham where, on Thursday 31, he visited Ryan's Amphitheatre, opened the previous year, for a typical variety performance fashionable in the first half of the century. He saw a potted version of Lesage's picaresque romance *Gil Blas de Santillane*, the story of a Spanish peasant boy who falls in with a band of robbers while on his way to the University of Salamanca. He was then entertained by Mr North vaulting across a wooden horse, Miss Lee and Master Adams as 'Jockey & Jenny' performing acrobatics on two real mares, and an Italian juggler known as Signor Giuseppe throwing clubs, knives, and torches. To finish off the night, an equestrian battle scene was staged representing an incident from the recent Greek wars of independence.

On 2 February, he was back in London, having timed his return so that he could see Queen Victoria open Parliament on 6 February. He then took out a one-year lease from the earl of Cardigan on one of the most fashionable houses in London, 17 Carlton House Terrace. Here he was able to establish a quasi-court with portraits of Hortense and Joséphine, miniatures of the Bonaparte princes, a bust of Napoleon by his uncle's favourite neo-classical sculptor Antonio Canova, and also a cabinet of Napoleonic curiosities containing the usual snuff-boxes and handkerchiefs.

Ten more members of staff were then added to those who had arrived on the *Batavier*, some to look after the stable of seven horses and the new cabriolet with its imperial eagles on the door-panels. This superficial grandiosity was not an affectation, and meant that Louis Napoleon could now invite whomsoever he pleased to his own house instead of having to wait for invitations. Persigny, in his contemporary publication *Lettres de Londres*, drew a picture of Louis Napoleon's daily life:

> At six o'clock in the morning he is in his study, where he works till noon – his breakfast hour. After this repast, which never lasts longer than ten minutes, he reads the papers, and has notes taken of the more important events or opinions of the day. At two he receives visits; at four he goes out on his private business; he rides at five and dines at seven … he finds time to work again for some hours in the course of the evening. As to his tastes and habits, they are those of a man who looks only at the serious side of life; he does not understand luxury for himself. In the morning he dresses for the entire day; he is the simplest dressed man of his household, although there is always a certain military elegance in his appearance.[10]

This was all no doubt true, except that when Louis Napoleon was not being quietly sedentary with a book he was being either loudly energetic with a woman or pursuing engagements with interesting society.

*   *   *

By 1839 Holland House was experiencing the waning of its influence in Whig circles that within a few years would witness the deaths of both Henry and Elizabeth Fox from which it would never recover. The new place to be seen 'in' was Gore House, a three-storeyed mansion facing Kensington Gardens belonging to Lady Blessington. It was there, and not even Carlton House Terrace, where Louis Napoleon's most remarkable introductions took place.

Margaret Power had married the earl of Blessington in 1817 after an unhappy childhood and enforced first marriage. The couple travelled extensively throughout Europe, principally in Italy where they spent two months with Byron in Genoa accompanied by Comte d'Orsay, son of a Napoleonic general and the pre-eminent dandy of the age. In 1827, D'Orsay married Lady Harriet Gardiner, Lord Blessington's daughter by his first marriage, cynically palmed off onto him at the age of fifteen and who deserted him in 1831, leaving him free to pursue an ambivalent but intense relationship with his stepmother – the earl had died in 1829 – and several younger men.

Lady Blessington had presided over increasingly sought-after salons for the previous two decades, but it was at Gore House with D'Orsay that she glittered. She made a point of inviting those who were not welcome at Holland House, since her political views were less troublesome to her conscience than to her rivals along the road. To these she added a wider variety of cultural lions than ever could have been permitted to darken the hall of Holland House. Lady Blessington was also the author a number of romantic novels as well as the more substantial *Conversations with Lord Byron*, and these reflected her unconventional private life. Her salons were carefully constructed around men, as both she and D'Orsay could enjoy them. Women guests – when on the rare occasion invited – found their hostess intellectually overpowering and dismissive.

By a striking coincidence, Lady Blessington had been yet another personality who had met Hortense in Rome a decade earlier and liked her, and she therefore extended Louis Napoleon an invitation to attend his first dinner on 16 February. From then on he met numerous men and some women in her company who noted their impressions of him. The most peculiar aspect of these observations would be their wildly contradictory assessments of his character and personality. Some of the most perceptive and creative men and women of early Victorian England were unable to agree – or even themselves to determine – whether Louis Napoleon was a subtle genius or a complete idiot.

That he was gentle and taciturn by nature many already knew, either by reputation or because they had met him. Caroline Norton, one of the three famous 'Sheridan Beauties', told a friend later in life that she had met Louis Napoleon in this year at a dinner given by Lord Melbourne, with whom she had been allegedly so scandalously associated at the time. Benjamin Disraeli, enjoying his first full year as a member of Parliament, and Alexander Cockburn, the barrister destined for greatness, had also been present. She had found Louis Napoleon to be 'a silent young man … He seldom spoke, but listened to the conversation with great attention, and he impressed the other guests with a sense of his strong personality and power of observation'.[11]

What may have been particularly disconcerting for everybody, apart from the taciturnity, was that by 1839 Louis Napoleon had mastered the ability to keep his eyelids half closed at all times without blinking. He would never say why he had mastered this curious exercise, but the likely explanation is that he believed that 'the eyes are the windows of the soul' and he did not wish others to peer inside. But this was not a handicap, and perhaps it even increased his powers of perception, proving true the poet's contention that as a politician Louis Napoleon could 'see through all things with his half-shut eyes'.

One of the many interesting consequences of this deliberate cultivation of the enigmatic was that, being forced to depend heavily on their own subjectivity, the impressions received by those who met Louis Napoleon often revealed more about them than they did about him. The portrait painter Sir Martin Shee noted that he was 'quiet, silent, and inoffensive … but does not impress one with the idea that he has inherited his uncle's talents any more than his fortunes'.[12] Charles Greville, the consummate diarist of the age, was even less charitable, describing Louis Napoleon as 'a short, thickish, vulgar-looking man, without the slightest resemblance to his Imperial uncle, or any intelligence in his countenance'.[13] Shee, the chronicler in paint of the Hanoverian dynasty who had never succumbed to the Napoleonic Legend, had been elected President of the Royal Academy in 1830 where he was criticised for his defence of the Academy as the chief repository of orthodoxy in opposition to the progressive schools. Greville, on the other hand, perhaps admired Napoleon too much and had been expecting his hero's physical *doppelgänger* only to be inevitably disappointed when introduced to his mere nephew.

The Rossetti family represented another important angle. William Rossetti recalled that Louis Napoleon had been 'a frequent guest' at his father's house in Charlotte Street, Portland Place, in 1839 after first having met him at Gore House:

> I have several times heard my father … say that, in all his intercourse with the Prince, he had never heard from him a single expression indicating liberal or popular sympathies. The Prince had not excited any admiration for intellect, demeanour, or person in our house; and was often disadvantageously contrasted with Prince Pierre Buonaparte, also a frequent visitor to my father.[14]

The 'father', Gabriele Rossetti, was himself an exile who, after joining the Continental Freemasons as well as the *Carbonari*, escaped from Italy after the insurrection of 1820, landing in England four years later. He was a passionate, if eccentric, Republican who was utterly opposed to political and ecclesiastical tyranny, which for him meant almost anything short of complete liberty of faith, thought, and action. His four children were then under thirteen years of age, and it is unlikely that they were able to form their own constructive independent judgements of the guest none was ever again to meet. The harsh view of Louis Napoleon's intellect must have been passed down to William in later life. Gabriele Rossetti, a professor of Italian at King's College, London, was a scholar of some note. But if he looked down on someone who had written a treatise on artillery it was from the airy heights of a man whose most durable monomania was a conviction that Dante's *Divina Commedia* was a cypher written in a secret code language by a covert medieval humanist society.

Louis Napoleon had few coherent political convictions at this stage not based on the loose idealism it was his privilege as a poetically minded untried politician to nourish. No doubt he and the mature Rossetti did not see eye to half-shut eye on much other than the desire to see the Italic peninsula liberated and united. Even then a difference of opinion may be supposed as to how this was to be achieved; if Rossetti truly preferred Pierre to Louis Napoleon then his attitude becomes even clearer.

Nevertheless, William must have left something out of his perhaps selective memory if he confessed that, in spite of this, Louis Napoleon frequented his father's house for a year.

These examples form three distinct types Louis Napoleon would meet throughout his life in England: the anti-Napoleonist who would dislike him on principle; the Napoleonist who would constantly measure the nephew against the uncle and find the nephew wanting; and the Radical Englishman who was in fact an immigrant, judging him according to the values of the land of his birth rather than those of the country of his adoption. As so often with historical commentary on historical figures, a full understanding of the commentator is a requirement before it is possible to either accept or reject the comment. Sadly, with Louis Napoleon, comments have been extracted at random to suit the prejudice of the historian as though the comment represented some inelastic truth simply because it once appeared in a book.

In any event, at Gore House a more fulfilling friendship was established with Bulwer-Lytton, now Whig member for Lincoln. Louis Napoleon had certainly inherited the Beauharnais gift for attracting friends, so noticeable in his mother, rather than the Bonaparte one for repelling them, so noticeable in his uncle. Bulwer-Lytton took an instant liking to him. That summer he gave a breakfast party at his riverside house, Craven Cottage in Fulham, where he had finished his tenth novel, *Ernest Maltravers; or, The Eleusinian* and its sequel *Alice; or, The Mysteries*, in August 1837. In the summer of 1839 he was preparing a new edition to be published as one volume under the more reasonable title of *Ernest Maltravers*. In this story the eponymous hero hired a cottage in which to secrete himself, the young Alice, and an elderly woman as maid and cook. Bulwer-Lytton used Craven Cottage as the model, and throughout the work there were accurate descriptions of the famous *cottage orné*. It was:

> one of those pretty thatched edifices, with verandahs and monthly roses, a conservatory and a lawn (ch.iv) … Maltravers stole softly through the conservatory, and as he opened the door which led into the garden, he saw at the open window of a little room which was apportioned to Alice, and jutted out from the building in the fanciful irregularity common to ornamental cottages (ch.v) … But then they had all that little world of three acres – lawn and fountain, shrubbery and terrace – to themselves (ch.vii) … bright drops of a recent shower sparkled upon the buds of the lilac and laburnum that clustered around the cottage … The little fountain that played in the centre of a circular basin … added to the fresh green of the lawn … on which the rare and early flowers were closing their heavy lids (ch.viii).

These idyllic descriptions were not exaggerated, and Craven Cottage would have an immense and lasting effect on Louis Napoleon's concept of the ideal English life.

However, Louis Napoleon's first visit there almost ended in a disaster. Bulwer-Lytton had also invited another friend of his, Disraeli, and it was here, before the dinner with Melbourne, that Louis Napoleon first met and almost drowned the young Tory member for Maidstone and his *fiancée* Mary Lewis. Disraeli:

> We arrived late, and all the guests had gone up the Thames in a steamer. Walking along the Terrace, quite alone, two gentlemen who had arrived still later came up to us. These were Prince Louis Napoleon and Persigny …the Prince said: 'We will get a boat, and I will row you down to meet them'.
>
> There was a boat and boatman lingering about, whom we hailed from the Terrace. The Prince took the oars, and for a little time we went on very well. At last, to escape the swell of a steamer that was approaching, the Prince contrived to row into a mudbank in the middle of the river, and there we stuck. Nothing could get us off. I was amused by the manner in which my wife, who was alarmed especially, and not without cause, from the fear of other steamboats which caused a great swell on the water, rated the Prince: 'You should not undertake things which you cannot accomplish. You are always, sir, too

adventurous' … I remained silent. At length the boatman, who had come to the rescue, got us off, and we arrived again at Craven Cottage just as Bulwer's company appeared in the distance. Nothing could be more good-natured than the Prince, and I could not have borne the scolding better myself.[15]

In spite of this incident, which might have had tragic consequences, Disraeli and Bulwer-Lytton would remain life-long, albeit not uncritical, friends of Louis Napoleon.

D'Orsay now joined Persigny as Napoleon's most fervent admirer and supporter. It was after the Gore House dinner at which Shee had been present that Louis Napoleon had met D'Orsay for the first time, and who found the Prince-Pretender irresistible. That evening Louis Napoleon left early, and some of the remaining guests began to tear him apart, at which point, as Shee noted, 'D'Orsay came in and stood up manfully for his friend, which was pleasant to see'.[16]

Not all of Louis Napoleon's invitations were predictable. In March he was invited to tour the Woolwich Arsenal by the commander of the garrison, Lieutenant-General Sir Benjamin Bloomfield. Bloomfield had risen from gentleman-attendant to keeper of the Privy Purse under the Prince Regent, and in 1825 he had been created a baron in the Irish Peerage. The Whig politician and diarist Thomas Creevey, who detested the Prince Regent, characterized Bloomfield as an ambitious cheat and robber, and the decision to invite Louis Napoleon appears to have been Bloomfield's. He may have been trying to court controversy to briefly illuminate a career rapidly fading into twilight; or, as a man who had entered military service in the Royal Artillery in 1781, he may have had an honest interest in a fellow artilleryman, his position in the world notwithstanding. At any rate, Louis Napoleon was conducted around the Arsenal with the dignity accorded visitors of reigning houses, and this caused considerable annoyance to his enemies in Paris as Melbourne's policy of non-intervention did not prevent *mouchards* from reporting every move to Sébastiani.

As an artilleryman, Louis Napoleon was naturally genuinely interested in the tour, which was widely reported in the press to his advantage. The visit covered much of the 150 acres of the site and ended with a complex display of manœuvres by the Royal Horse Artillery on the edge of Woolwich Common. It was noted that Louis Napoleon 'expressed his high opinion and admiration of the excellence and rapidity of the movements, and returned thanks for the honour which had been paid to him'.[17]

Among the many invitations of this time three were noteworthy for the Napoleonic personalities Louis Napoleon met. At a Sunday party given by the notorious but ill-used duchess of Cannizaro, now estranged from her ducal Sicilian husband, at her home on Wimbledon Common, he met his uncle's nemesis the duke of Wellington for the first time, then out of ministerial office and almost deaf. At a large dinner given by the skilled mathematician the duke of Somerset at Wimbledon Park House he was the guest of honour along with the prince of Capua. As it turned out the prince, now only nominally carrying the title, was also an exile for having married an Irish commoner. It was in Wimbledon, then, that for the first time in post-Napoleonic Europe, Bonaparte dined with Wellesley and Bourbon with none suffering indigestion.

Louis Napoleon was also often Earl Harrington's guest at his house on Craig's Court, Trafalgar Square.[18] On one occasion, as he was entering the hall of the mansion, he almost collided with a man just leaving who continued on his way after a brief and formal exchange of courtesies. On making enquiries as to his identity, Louis Napoleon was told by Lord Harrington that the man was Sir Hudson Lowe.

In May, also at Gore House, he met an important figure who would remain associated with him – first as fervent friend and admirer then as ascerbic critic –

throughout his life. The maverick author and fierce republican Walter Landor had served as a volunteer in the Peninsular War for three months in 1808 when in his opinion Napoleon had betrayed his original revolutionary principles. He even paid the expenses for his troops with his own money. Landor's subsequent behaviour meant that he had to spend a great deal of time abroad, usually in his beloved Italy. One such exile had ended in 1835, and by 1838 he had settled down in Bath where he was to remain for the next twenty years.

Landor, the epitome of the liberal gentleman of the eighteenth century espousing the aristocratic-republican views of his literary idol Milton, despised all claims of heritable superiority, and it was widely known that he openly advocated tyrannicide as a classical solution to the vexed problem of 'evil despots'. But at the same time he was repelled by the idea of mob-rule and he shuddered at all forms of vulgarity, whether in matters of literary style or personal behaviour. It is clear what attracted the two men to each other in Louis Napoleon's embryonic period. For Landor, even more than for the Imperial Pretender, the liberation and unification of the Italic peninsula was the most pressing need of the civilized world.

On Sunday 21 July, Louis Napoleon, Persigny, and Vaudrey attended a Gore House dinner that was especially resplendent. Around the table were the earl of Pembroke, Protestant Whig scion of a great English family; William Howley, archbishop of Canterbury and strongly opposed to Catholic Emancipation, Parliamentary Reform, and Jewish Relief; Baron Berwick, for eight years ambassador to the Court of Naples and Sicily; Baron Lyndhurst, three times lord chancellor, prosecutor against Queen Caroline, and Tory promoter of both the Catholic Relief Bill and the Reform Bill; Baron Brougham and Vaux, vigorous defender of Queen Caroline; and Disraeli, a great advocate of Jewish Relief. It was Lady Blessington's mischievous talent for assembling her *omnium gatherum* dinners, as Greville dubbed them, with such wildly contrasting characters that enabled Disraeli to describe the evening as 'a most amusing party. Dinner superb'.[19] Whether the nuances of British political and social history with its personality conflicts as manifested themselves that evening were fully grasped by Louis Napoleon may be wondered.

* * *

It has entered into historical folklore that when Wellington was asked his opinion of the late Napoleon he paused before replying: 'Napoleon Bonaparte, sir, was no gentleman'. Less well known is that a quarter of a century later Palmerston was asked the same question of the then still living Louis Napoleon. Recalling Wellington's celebrated comment he too thought for a moment before replying: 'He is always, sir, a gentleman'.

This is anecdotal, but it conceals the historical origins of Louis Napoleon's essential Englishness as expressed by his gentlemanly conduct, a grace on the whole absent in the Bonaparte family. Although this was inchoate it was not mere mannerism, and it would be facile to suppose that his presence in England alone produced this Bonaparte anomaly. Other members of *La Famille* spent considerably more time in England than he did, affecting to cloak themselves with the pretensions of gentlemanly status without ever attaining it.

When Napoleon was accused by the Habsburgs of being a parvenu he was proud of it, allegedly exclaiming '*I* am the Rudolf of *my* line', referring to the thirteenth-century founder of the Habsburg dynasty who of course was a parvenu in his own day. Napoleon had done no more than point out to the accidental products of

historical procreation that every dynasty has to start somewhere. Tellingly, when the same accusation was levelled against Louis Napoleon he was deeply troubled by it. Ironically, whereas the accusation was technically justified with Napoleon it was not so with him since being a parvenu is not a hereditary disease but a conditional title dependent only on the life of the first holder.

The degree of Beauharnais liberal-aristocratic civility Louis Napoleon gained from Hortense was considerable, and England did not create the gentleman Louis Napoleon, although what he learned in England was the true meaning of that status and how to live by its principles. Many years later, in 1855, he whispered into Queen Victoria's ear 'Enfin, je suis gentilhomme!' on being admitted by her into the fraternity of civilized European rulers with a monarchical kiss. It was an inner personal triumph for him, and marked a symbolic 'topping off' ceremony on the gentlemanly edifice he had spent more than twenty years constructing.

More immediately important for Louis Napoleon in 1839 was that revived theories of chivalry were being put into practice in settings more appropriate than those being shaped by the new industrial age. The coronation of George IV in 1821 had been conducted as a great quasi-medieval feast with guests attending in appropriate dress, but the following two coronations were severely curtailed by Whig administrations pandering to Radical agitators by affecting to remove public ostentation. William IV had endured what was known as the 'Halfcrownation' while Queen Victoria fared even worse with the 'Penny Crowning'. How these cut-price coronations actually helped anyone was unclear, but what was very clear was that people of all classes missed the pomp and circumstance associated with such public events. The subsequent cultural exaltation of a romantic reinterpretation of the Middle Ages became a fashionable necessity when escaping from the shadows of 'dark Satanic mills', giving rise to the reinvented medieval knight.

As a young man, the earl of Eglinton was known for his distinctive tartan dress at the races in Ayr, Doncaster, and Newmarket, but he had achieved little other than winning a few of them and being elected to the Jockey Club. In 1838, he was mortified at being deprived of a full medieval spectacle at the coronation of Queen Victoria, at which his stepfather, Sir Charles Lamb, as *Knight Marshal of the Royal Household*, would have marshalled the traditional 'Champion of the Queen'.

Lamb's own son 'Charlie' had been obsessed with medievalism and tourneys since a small boy, so when a friend suggested to him the possibility of incorporating a few medieval games in his next race meeting at Eglinton Park the germ of an idea was born between Lamb and Lord Eglinton that would result in the great Eglinton Tournament.

Grantley Berkeley, the disqualified second heir to the earldom of Berkeley, later recorded that:

> I know of nothing that ever seized on the minds of the young men of fashion with such force as it did, or held out apparently so many romantic attractions. I can safely say that, as far as I was concerned, I was seized with an extraordinary desire to be one of those who would enter the lists, without at first considering the consequences which must inevitably attend on such a proceeding … all that I thought of for the moment was a Queen of Beauty, brave deeds, splendid arms, and magnificent horses.[20]

The Eglinton Tournament struck a deep chord, particularly among young men – the average age of the participants was twenty-seven – who were keen to respect the revived medieval concepts of *cortezia* and *fin'amors* in the Art of Love.

Reductionist socio-historical explanations subsequently attributing this 'seizing' to a national celebration of an idyllic illusion on the threshold of an 'Industrial

Revolution' that would banish such innocent anachronisms forever may or may not be the whole story. What really matters is that it happened and Louis Napoleon was invited to attend as *Principal Visiting Knight*. This was a singular honour for an unproven man by no means alone of his generation to carry his uncle's name. It placed him before the two other Visiting Knights, Persigny and Count Bálint Eszterházy, a future diplomat and scion of the cadet branch of Fraknó counts, the elder branch being represented by Prince Pál Eszterházy.

The invitation was certainly an extraordinary one, and perhaps some of the crucial details of it are now lost beyond retrieval. Lord Eglinton was a Tory of insular dimensions, and the tourney was designed as an exclusive event only in so far as few Whigs and no Radicals were invited. Most non-Tories who applied for a ticket had their applications dismissed, which unmistakable demonstration of Lord Eglinton's political sympathies they would not soon forget. He had, however, met Louis Napoleon at Gore House in the spring of 1839, and perhaps his liking for the Beauharnais in Louis Napoleon was immediate and outweighed his dislike of the Bonaparte tinged with vague ideas of republican socialism. Moreover, in becoming the principle stage director of his own great theatrical event, what better guest of honour on horseback could there be other than the nephew of Napoleon? It may be unclear why Louis Napoleon had been invited, but it is quite clear why by 1839 he accepted.

The rehearsals took place during June and July in the extensive gardens belonging to the Eyre Arms and Assembly Rooms in St John's Wood, a Regency inn capable of accommodating 1500 persons in the hall. Every Tuesday and Saturday afternoon the would-be jousters met there to practice. Sadly, that they did so at a lost art became only too clear as the sessions continued. The men sat on wooden horses attached to trolleys hauled down a sloping gradient along grooved planks. At the end of this run sat a wicker knight on another wooden horse who, it was said, more often than not bested his flesh-and-blood opponents. These rehearsals were nevertheless well attended by spectators and journalists, with 2690 watching on the final Saturday. However, the element of ridicule was already mounting and perhaps the spectacle was simply more entertaining than the customary walk on nearby Primrose Hill.

The tournament began on Wednesday 28 August, the day after the prorogation of parliament, under a blue sky. The enormous procession of all the Knights and Ladies, which had been due to leave the castle and snake its way to the lists at noon, had taken three hours longer than anticipated to organize. Unfortunately, just as the half-mile long procession – with Louis Napoleon, Persigny, and Eszterházy at the rear – finally began to move the skies darkened and the rain came down in torrents. The Ladies were quickly removed from the line, particularly the duchess of Somerset as the *Queen of Beauty*, one of the three 'Sheridan Beauties', who was being carried on an open litter with a silk canopy by four richly attired squires. Lord Eglinton, who as *Lord of the Tournament* was fitted out in fine gold armour and seated on a charger caparisoned in blue and gold, refused to abandon the event. Nevertheless, the rest of the Knights took their seats in the lists awkwardly and without participating in the attendant ceremonies. The *Queen of Beauty* then arrived in a very un-medieval carriage and few noticed her.

The thousands of spectators in their authentic seating arrangements, many of whom had travelled from abroad, were then drenched as the loose awnings proved inadequate to the task entrusted to them and gave way under the weight of the water. Dresses and hairstyles, which in some cases had taken months to arrange, were ruined in minutes. Those few who had had the presence of mind to bring them then opened

their very Victorian umbrellas. The light local soil soon turned into a sea of dark mud more than six inches deep, and one observer likened the eventual withdrawal back to the neo-Gothic castle to Napoleon's disastrous retreat from Moscow. Some of the jousting had taken place, but most of the pretend knights were frankly unfit to do so even in favourable conditions; as it was they slid about clumsily, missing each other or falling over on their rumps with their muddy feet high in the air. Only those who were accomplished horsemen were able to salvage something from the grotesque scene, and the duel between Lord Eglinton and the marquis of Waterford, as the *Knight of the Dragon* in a suit of polished steel, may have commanded the respect of a genuine medieval knight.

The first day's jousting was reluctantly called to a halt in the late afternoon; so also was the medieval banquet in the special tent, which had also leaked badly and ruined the food. Thousands of visitors had to leave the grounds on foot, filthy, wet, and cold. Most had nowhere to go at such short notice and either walked through the night or slept in barns or under trees; the vast majority of them did not return.

The following day the weather did not improve, but by Friday the sun was shining again and a scaled-down tourney was held. Because of this Louis Napoleon did not actually joust as intended, and instead he played esquire to the marquis of Abercorn, a man younger than himself. Lord Eglinton – whose behaviour had been impeccable throughout the calamity – at least managed to construct something out of the remains of what should have been the greatest spectacle of the century. Louisa Stuart, daughter of Lord Stuart de Rothesay, one-time ambassador to Paris, thought that even this 'procession into the Lists, and the tilting, the *mêlée*, were such beautiful sights as one can never expect to see again'.[21]

The special guests who had been given accommodation in the castle improvised indoor versions of the proposed outdoor events. On the first night, Louis Napoleon and Charlie Lamb, as *Knight of the White Rose*, had to be wrested apart when a mock joust with staves and broomsticks threatened to get out of hand as their enthusiasm got the better of them. A more organized indoor event took place on Friday night in the ballroom when Louis Napoleon, with Persigny as his esquire, fought Charlie Lamb again. James Bulkeley, a writer connected with the Bulkeleys of Berkshire, was present:

> The tilting on foot between Prince Napoleon Louis and Mr Charles Lamb … both armed *cap-à-pié*, was sustained with high spirit, and gave great amusement to the numerous dames and cavaliers who crowded round. Their spears riven, they drew their swords, and the armour rings beneath their heavy blows.[22]

The disappointment of Wednesday by no means diminished the remaining participants' desire to do their best. The costumes they wore were still exceptionally skilled, and even to an extent authentic. A description of Louis Napoleon's two outfits exists:

> *Morning costume:* A highly polished steel cuirass, over a leather jacket, trimmed with crimson satin; a steel-vizored helmet, with a high plume of white feathers; white silk hose and russet boots. *Evening costume:* A short cassock of dark green velvet, with shirt and sleeves of crimson satin; a sword-belt or girdle of gold confined the waist; cap of crimson velvet, with a yellow feather, fastened by a jewelled aigrette, falling gracefully over the left side; flesh-silk hose, with high boots, turned over red, and bound with gold lace.[23]

At the final banquet, held in the castle, Louis Napoleon sat at the centre of the table of honour with the *Queen of Beauty*, the *Lord of the Tournament*, and the *King of the*

*Tournament*, who was the marquis of Londonderry and half-brother to the late Lord Castlereagh. James Harris, now styled Viscount Fitzharris, had also been present, dressed in a costume of green velvet and billowing fur: 'I never saw a more general display of gaiety and enjoyment than that which prevailed during the whole of this splendid pageant given by one of the most generous and popular men in Great Britain'.[24]

The tragic irony of the Eglinton Tournament is that it was made possible by the very age that was only too ready to condemn it. John Cleave's eponymous *Penny Gazette of Variety and Amusement* was an anecdotal and ostensibly non-political journal, but whose founder had once spent time in prison for his views. It ran what would become the most famous satirical caricature of the event, *The Eglinton Tomfooleryment*, in which two painted-up knights jousted on tatty childrens' rocking horses – but actually asses – each holding an umbrella. This was amusing if unfair satire, but probably the least offensive of the anti-Eglinton material produced to attack Lord Eglinton and his political views. Whigs and Radicals were scathing and merciless, although just as their attacks would have been fewer had it not rained and everything had gone according to extraordinary plan so one suspects their tone would have been more moderate had they been invited.

Louis Napoleon was naturally found guilty by association. He was no longer the quasi-socialistic Bonaparte exile spending time with Radicals at Holland House that everyone had known, or had imagined. Instead, he was the scion of some baronial seat who had never left it other than to hob-nob with the vainglorious Tory aristocracy and wallow in their ridiculous muddy sports. His presence at Eglinton was widely and prominently reported by the *Manchester Guardian, The Times, Dumfries Times, The Examiner, Glasgow Argus, Glasgow Courier, Morning Post,* and *Ayr Observer*. The Radical papers were only too keen to point out that he had stayed with the marquis of Queensberry the night before the tournament. *The Examiner*, as a moderate voice, thought the tournament was 'a rather childish affair' and 'in bad taste',[25] while the Radical view was put by the semi-weekly *Glasgow Argus* in which the 'piece of unmitigated folly' was condemned as 'senseless pageantry' because:

> Is not enough occurring every day already to call into play questions affecting the privileges of the aristocracy – but must they give additional cause of discontent, by exhibiting, in the face of an enlightened, *though* suffering people, the wastefulness of their prodigality, and the barbarity of their tastes, if not the inferiority of their intellectual position? … On looking at the abundance of Eglinton, one could scarcely help contrasting it with the penury and want which have caused 'cleanness of teeth' in the families of thousands whose bread has been made dear by aristocratic legislation.[26]

In associating Louis Napoleon with such Radical critique, commentators exposed a genuine feature of the fourth visit: his shift from Whigs to Tories. The explanation for this lies partly within the Tory party itself. Sir Robert Peel's progressive economic policies helped inspire Tory dissidents to form 'Young England', who while opposing him looked to history and learned something the Tories of Liverpool's day had forgotten: that wealth, status, and 'breeding' carried with them duties and responsibilities first and privileges second. This was a philosophy that the Radicals, with their oversimplified puritanical cant, either had not realized or had ignored but which the evolving nature of Louis Napoleon had recognized.

Louis Napoleon and Persigny took the opportunity to remain in Scotland for a few weeks after Eglinton, staying with friends they had made during the tourney. Their first engagement was with the duke of Montrose at Buchanan House near Loch Lomond. The duke had been for seven years the Tory member for Cambridge

University until ousted by Palmerston; the duchess had been a beautifully bejewelled guest at Eglinton who had extended the invitation.

An interesting guest at Buchanan House was Baron Burghersh, heir to the earldom of Westmorland, a fine amateur composer who had served in the Napoleonic Wars and had at one time been aide-de-camp to Wellington, whose niece he had married. Burghersh, who founded the Royal Academy of Music in 1823, made his own contribution to medieval revivalism when his opera *Il Torneo* – set in Plantagenet England – was first produced in London as *The Tournament* at St James's Theatre on 18 July 1838. Like most Englishmen of taste at that time, he believed Italy to be the sole repository of worthy music, and although Louis Napoleon knew next to nothing about music he was at least passionate on Italy, and the two became good companions during the stay. After Burghersh left Buchanan House he visited Sir Archibald Alison, the historian who was then sheriff of Lanarkshire. 'Only think of that young man Louis Napoleon', he said to Alison. 'Nothing can persuade him he is not to be Emperor of France; the Strasbourg affair has not in the least shaken him; he is thinking constantly of what he is to do when on the throne'.[27]

This sort of remark was becoming rather commonplace. After Louis Napoleon and Persigny left Buchanan House they travelled the fifty miles to Brodick Castle on the Isle of Arran, seat of the Duke of Hamilton. Apart from being Scotland's premier peer and principal Stuart claimant, he was also a relative of the marquis of Abercorn to whom Louis Napoleon had been esquire at Eglinton, and through whom Louis Napoleon had received his invitation. Three years later, the duke's son William would marry Marie von Baden, Louis Napoleon's cousin. One of his guests was Henry Howard, the heir to the duchy of Norfolk, England's premier peerage, a Tory member for Horsham and treasurer of the household. He went out frequently with Louis Napoleon, ostensibly to hunt but, as neither cared very much for this 'sport', usually to sit in the heather on Goatfell to talk like a pair of poets. But, Howard observed, 'he always opened these conversations by discoursing on what he would do when he was Emperor of France'.[28]

* * *

When Louis Napoleon had arrived in London he brought with him the rough draft of a manuscript, which he spent the first half of that year completing. *Idées napoléoniennes* was finished in the British Library in July, and the preface written at Carlton House Terrace immediately afterwards. In August, it was published in Brussels then taken up in Paris where it ran into four editions within the year.[29] The story of its completion in London explains in part Thomas Carlyle's subsequent antipathy to Louis Napoleon.

Since 1837 the Keeper of Printed Books at the British Museum had been Antonio Panizzi, an Italian patriot and man of letters who had been another exile since 1822, granted the honour of becoming a British subject ten years later. In an unprecedented step, he allowed Louis Napoleon to work undisturbed in an annexe to his own office, with staff assigned to fetch whatever books or material he might need. Technically, since 1760 power of admission was invested in the Principal Librarian, a post Panizzi did not attain until 1856, and in 1839 it was Sir Henry Ellis who held this influential post. Assistant Panizzi, however, made enemies very quickly by superseding Ellis's authority after 1836 when that authority was at a low ebb due to Ellis's quarrels with the museum's patrons. It was thereafter Panizzi alone who decided who would or would not be given a Readers' Admission Ticket.

Among those who thought Panizzi ruled autocratically where he ought to have served was Carlyle. Although Carlyle had been a reader since 1831 (tickets were annual), he had never been happy with the cramped conditions of the reading room, a narrow and dark apartment at the southwest angle on the second floor of Montague House, which had just two windows. When the airier King's Library was opened in 1840, and for which a separate ticket was required, Carlyle applied for one, but Panizzi did not like him and refused. Carlyle was furious: 'Panizzi, whom I do not love, and who returns the feeling, will not, though solicited from various quarters … admit me to the silent rooms of the King's Library … I believe I could explode the poor monster if I took to petitioning'.[30] But he did not. Instead, Carlyle then founded the London Library with the help of William Gladstone, Bulwer-Lytton, and others who also found their applications inexplicably rejected by the 'monster'.

Antonio Gallenga, a writer who had been imprisoned just before the 1831 insurrection in Modena, arrived in London as a refugee in May 1839. He went to Bloomsbury for help and a readers' ticket from Panizzi, who in spite of the worthy *curriculum vitæ* refused because, as Gallenga put it, 'my face … was not to his liking'.[31] Panizzi was an autocrat, but an arbitrary one, and so it was not, as some have supposed, Catholic Mediterranean cliquishness that enabled Louis Napoleon to work in private even without a ticket, although the real reason may never be known.[32] In any event, this rare privilege made for him an implacable enemy. When Carlyle learned how the socialistic Bonaparte he already disliked on principle had been favoured while he had been snubbed his antipathy found expression in bursts of Francophobic spleen quite worthy of his legendary Scottish Presbyterian fury.

When *Idées napoléoniennes* was published, Louis Napoleon presented an inscribed copy to Bulwer-Lytton, who inserted some remarks about the work and its author:

The book of a very able mind; with few ideas, but these ideas bold, large, and reducible to vigorous action. Very much depreciated at this day by the critics of a drawing-room, Prince Louis Napoleon has qualities that may render him a remarkable man if he ever returns to France. Dogged, daring, yet somewhat reserved and close, he can conceive with secrecy and act with promptitude. His faults would come from conceit and rashness; but akin with those characteristics are will and enthusiasm. He has these in a high degree. Above all, he has that intense faith in his own destiny with which men rarely fail of achieving something great, without which all talent lacks the *mens divinior*.[33]

*Idées napoléoniennes* made a deep impression both in England and France, whether it was admired or despised. The *Athenæum* gave the book a four-column review in August:

The mission of Bonaparte … had already ended; and should one, even of his name and blood … again ascend an European throne, its renewal will not the less remain a political impossibility … The world, we hope, has learned that the sword of Brennus was the sword of a barbarian, and that its weight … has been … the great obstacle to the social progress of society … We are satisfied indeed that Prince Louis has taken a wrong view of that portion of history which he has undertaken to illustrate; but we are equally satisfied that there are many 'potent, grave, and reverend signors' in Parliament and out who will be surprised if they learn from its pages that there is such a thing at all as a philosophy of history.[34]

*The Examiner* reviewed it in two columns in September. It believed Louis Napoleon's historical analysis to be fair, but:

if this glowing picture of Napoleon's reign be held up for the purpose of comparison with the present and in order to shame it, if the Imperial system of government be recommended as something worthy of repetition and fit to replace the present constitution of France, then indeed we have much not only to criticize, but to contradict … A regime, in fact, more degrading to free intellect than that of Napoleon

could not be found … [it] was most useful [only] as a continuation … of the government and principles of the revolution.[35]

The paper believed that Napoleon could never have been liberal in peace as this relaxation would have given rise to the forces determined to overthrow him, and the only way a liberal imperial regime could survive was by decentralizing power, freeing industry and commerce, education, and political institutions. Nevertheless, the paper reckoned the book to be 'pithily and lucidly written, and which certainly does credit to the heart and to the talents of the nephew of Napoleon'.

*The Times* published a detailed and blistering attack in October. The French 'hate us', it declared over and over, pointing out how unfortunate it was that attitudes to the man who had once been called 'the bloody Corsican upstart and assassin' had changed over the years. Louis Napoleon's attempted *coup* was described as 'silly' with a 'foolish' pretext, a 'doubtful' aim, and its leader had been 'inexperienced'. 'We know not', it went on, 'whether the present work is intended by its author as an apology for himself as well as for his uncle; it seems to us, however, to be entirely insufficient to prove his uncle's case, and much more so therefore to prove his own'.[36]

But not everyone agreed. The paper later inserted a letter from 'A. Subscriber', writing from St James's Club, who leaped to Louis Napoleon's defence. Quoting a passage from the book explaining how the 'enlightened' aristocracy in England – the Whig Napoleonists – may have been misunderstood, he wrote:

I appeal to your candour whether such a judgement can emanate from a mind imbued with the resentments of a bygone epoch? Does not the nephew of the Emperor here show that, faithful to the maxims of his uncle, he has learned in exile not to impute to a nation the excesses to which the passions of the moment give rise? [37]

What had angered English readers was the implication that they had misunderstood Napoleon and had fought against him in error. In 'The Foreign Question', Louis Napoleon – remembering some of his uncle's loose anglophilia – stated that 'All our wars were attributable to England. She would never listen to any propositions of peace. Did she believe that the Emperor desired her ruin? He never entertained such a thought'. Somewhat disingenuous statements like this were not likely to be accepted with anything approaching good grace in the London clubs.

Who were these reviewers? The *Athenæum* was a high-quality literary review of immense integrity, then under the editorship of Charles Dilke, a Whig antiquary and critic, and his young right-hand man John Francis. Dilke attacked the Tory *Quarterly Review* for its political bias when reviewing literature, although of course he had just done something similar with Louis Napoleon. Dilke exercised no form of dictatorial censorship and reviewed works by authors whose unorthodox views might have escaped attention elsewhere, and Louis Napoleon was certainly a case in point. *The Examiner* was a Sunday Whig paper supportive of Melbourne, since 1830 under the direction and ownership of Albany Fonblanque, a radical journalist of Huguenot ancestry.

More interesting was the review in *The Times*, published anonymously but written by William Makepeace Thackeray. Thackeray made the fact that he had never succumbed to the Napoleonic Legend very clear, but his attack on Louis Napoleon – or, rather, those sentiments an Englishman would have found appalling – was personal because he had not met him. If he also misinterpreted the overall message, if not the details, he assumed the natural prejudice Louis Napoleon had unfortunately encouraged. A few years later Thackeray would meet the author he had so bitterly

criticized and his opinion of both the man and his policies would be turned upside-down.[38]

One man who was impressed enough by the book to change his opinion of its author straight away was Joseph Bonaparte. Both he and his brother Jérôme were then in London, although not, of course, together. Jérôme had been staying at Fenton's Hotel when Louis Napoleon and his suite first moved in, and it is more than likely that this was sufficient inducement for him to find somewhere like Carlton House Terrace as soon as possible. At the end of May, Jérôme left for the interior and then Ireland, but Joseph remained in London, first at his rooms in Marshall Thompson's Hotel, 28 Cavendish Square, then Hanover Lodge in Regent's Park. Louis Napoleon still distrusted all his uncles, but when Joseph made encouraging advances after reading his book he accepted the move to mend their broken relationship. *Idées napoléoniennes* did not mention Joseph – not even indirectly in the few pages devoted to Spain – and yet it served to reconcile uncle to nephew in a way the *débâcle* at Strasbourg had made almost impossible.

* * *

On 15 May 1839, Cardinal Fesch, half-brother of Mme Mère, died in Rome from cancer of the stomach. In itself a minor incident, it may have resulted in Louis Napoleon's death. Fesch had died a very wealthy man, but, respecting the old Roman concept of *paterfamilias*, he had left almost all of his money to Joseph. Most Bonapartes shrugged their shoulders and got on with their lives. But two who did not, and who as Napoleon's direct descendants felt the 'slight' most keenly, were counts Walewski and Léon. Walewski eventually decided to make the best of it, but Léon, facing a less certain future, was determined to do something about it

Léon had been in and out of the debtors' prison at 70 rue de Clichy since 1837, from where he was finally released on 23 October 1839. Together with a business associate, Martial Kien, he arrived in London on 13 February 'with nothing but the clothes on my back'[39] to claim his inheritance from Joseph, moving directly into Fenton's Hotel. But Joseph, then living as the Comte de Survilliers, had no intention of seeing him, and made this very clear in a letter to Baron Claude de Méneval in Paris, former private secretary to Joseph and Napoleon, and also one of Léon's former guardians. He did this in such a way that Léon should see it without actually having to address him in person.

Léon then approached Jérôme, who had arrived back in London that month as the Comte de Montfort, but he was curtly informed by his secretary that Jérôme would not see him until Joseph had done so, which of course Joseph refused to do. Meanwhile, Léon had met Bouffet de Montauban for lunch at Fenton's and explained to him his predicament. Bouffet de Montauban could do nothing, but he later advised Léon to approach Louis Napoleon, something Léon had not believed (or hoped) would be necessary.

This was bad advice, since Louis Napoleon had moved home again, his lease on Carlton House Terrace having expired. He took out a new one on 27 February for 1 Carlton Gardens, belonging to the earl of Ripon, a liberal Tory who as Viscount Goderich had served as prime minister in 1827. Louis Napoleon had a hundred cases to unpack and a dozen people to install, and the last thing he needed was Léon complicating his life. On four consecutive days, Léon walked from Fenton's Hotel to Carlton Gardens and left his card in the hall; on the fourth the porter told him that

Louis Napoleon would not see him. This third family rejection was too much, and Léon sent Louis Napoleon a provocative letter on 29 February:

*Mon petit cousin* … you … have been guilty of a gross discourtesy in not receiving me. You have felt yourself able to interpret in the worst light, and without having heard me, my uncle Joseph's refusal to see me. I have left my card on you several times and you have believed yourself able not to respond with your own. Do you not think, *monsieur mon cousin*, that you have behaved offensively towards me? I was able to regard the bad actions and letters of my uncle Joseph and my uncle Jérôme as malicious …do you believe that you can do likewise at your age, *mon petit cousin?* As you call yourself a Frenchman you must feel that my honour is offended by such disloyalty and that I must have just reparation … I swear on the ashes of the Emperor Napoleon my father that your evil behaviour towards me will bring its punishment one day … if you have not a drop of French blood in your veins out of human respect you are obliged to give me a reply … With which, *monsieur mon petit cousin*, I have the great honour of paying my respects … I am keeping a copy of this letter, and together with many others I shall have it printed at the appropriate time.[40]

The original letter had been written in French, and here the italics have been inserted over the original French to emphasize Léon's open discourtesy in referring to Louis Napoleon with an obviously affected familiarity that even in dignified use he had not earned.

In addition, Léon's pointed use of the first person possessive respecting their uncles was an overt reference to widely believed allegations concerning Louis Napoleon's own paternity. Since his birth, slander directed at Hortense had suggested that he was the son of either Carel Ver Huell, a Dutch admiral five years older than Napoleon, or his nephew Quirjin Ver Huell, also a naval officer and four years younger than Hortense. Other candidates were the former minister to Louis XVIII and ambassador in London Duc Élie Decazes; Alexander van Bylandt, a Dutch-Belgian general associated with Louis Bonaparte who had been at Waterloo and was over sixty when Louis Napoleon was born; and Hortense's own chamberlain, René de Villeneuve.

But most offensive of all for Louis Napoleon would have been the suggestion that he was not a man of honour. Léon ought, perhaps, to have been completely ignored and ostracized. Instead, being in fact too much a man of conventional honour, Louis Napoleon felt obliged to respond, at least in some way. He sent Charles Parquin – an officer who had been at Strasbourg and who had married Hortense's reader – to Fenton's Hotel with a verbal message two days later. The following exchange took place in the coffee-room:

Parquin: 'If you have something with which to reproach Prince Louis Bonaparte, it is with me you will have to reckon'.
Léon: 'Is that all? This confirms me in the opinion that the Prince is a coward'.[41]

The enraged Parquin left the hotel.

Sitting with Léon while all this had taken place, and finding the proceedings highly amusing, was his friend Kien and Lieutenant-Colonel Jeremiah Ratcliffe of the 6th Inniskillen Dragoon Guards, a veteran of the Peninsular War and then on half-pay. Léon immediately wrote another letter and Ratcliffe offered to take it to Louis Napoleon for him. It was a thinly veiled challenge to a duel:

*Monsieur mon cousin* – A tall, fat gentleman by the name of Parquin is leaving my hotel after having told me on your behalf that the letter which I wrote you … was the real reason why you refused to see me. You will understand that I was quite unable to reply to the type of language which was capable of exciting such hilarity in the members of my entourage and others standing by. You abuse my letter in an extraordinary fashion. I had foreseen this; and I am therefore obliged to repeat that the natural consequence of this comical visit is that you have not a drop of French blood in your veins. If another

such messenger appears I shall request Monsieur Guizot, the French ambassador, to accompany me to a magistrate.[42]

When Ratcliffe delivered this letter to Louis Napoleon in person he added, possibly in his own words: 'Count Léon says that if you persist in maintaining that he is a police agent sent to spy on you, he will challenge you to a duel with pistols … It is a stain that he sees on your brow, and one that can only be effaced by a bullet'.[43] The duel was on.

In France, duels took place well into the twentieth century, but by the 1840s English gentlemen were strongly urging each other to discontinue eliminating themselves in this absurd fashion. The Anti-Duelling Association had been formed in 1810, and by 1840 both the Church and Public found the concept morally repugnant, although military censure remained equivocal. By 1840, Putney Heath was *passé* as the place to blow a hole into, or cut a slice out of, someone in the name of honour – the last duel there had been fought between Castlereagh and Canning in 1809. The new fashionable location was a small depression divided by a little stream and surrounded by thick woods on Wimbledon Common. It lay a few hundred feet west of the windmill, a bright wooden construction that had been a significant landmark since 1817.

Shortly after 7 a.m. on Tuesday 3 March, Louis Napoleon came down Parkside with his two seconds, D'Orsay and Parquin, and turned right into the short lane leading directly to the windmill. At about the same time, Léon arrived in a separate carriage with his two seconds, Ratcliffe and Kien. As the party who believed he had been 'called out', Louis Napoleon – who was, of course, an acknowledged expert swordsman – exercised his right to choose weapons, electing to duel with rapiers. But shortly after they reached the depression, Léon suddenly claimed that he had been the insulted party and demanded they use a brace of pistols, which had conveniently already been brought by Ratcliffe. A heated debate followed over which party had the right to make the final decision, and as the whole episode was rapidly degenerating into a farce Louis Napoleon and D'Orsay suggested they draw straws as the fairest means of deciding the type of weapon. But Léon categorically refused and the exasperated and indulgent Louis Napoleon was obliged to give in.

Just then, however, and to everybody's apparent surprise, Inspector Nicholas Pearce of the Metropolitan Police Westminster Division appeared and intervened, soon followed by Inspector Francis Partridge, Sergeant Charles Otway, and several constables. Pearce:

About 2 o'clock this morning I received information from Superintendent Baker that certain parties had an intention of meeting in a hostile manner on Wimbledon Common … in consequence of which I went into St James's Street, where I saw a post-chaise drive up to the door of the hotel about 7 o'clock … it moved slowly on in the direction of Piccadilly, followed by Colonel Ratcliffe, and stopped again at Tattersall's, where another person followed towards Hyde Park Corner. The chaise was then driven westward, and I followed … On arriving at the Common I saw the entire party collected near to the windmill … having dismounted and left the horse in the care of a countryman, I proceeded to where the chaises were standing, and then I saw the defendants walking away from them some yards down to a hollow part of the ground … I approached Colonel Parquin, seeing two letters in one hand and the two swords produced in the other, I took them from him … the pistols produced, in a case, were lying on the ground, near to another brace which were wrapped up in paper … [D'Orsay] asked me what I wanted, my authority for interfering, and who it was that gave me information of the circumstances … on being refused, the entire party were quietly conveyed to the station-house.[44]

They were subsequently taken to waiting cabs and driven to the police court at Bow Street where they were formally identified and bound over to keep the peace before

the magistrate, David Jardine. Since duelling was not yet a military offence – it required both civil and military censure before it could be outlawed – and since no actual harm had come to anyone, Louis Napoleon and the others were charged with ‘unlawful assembly’ and a ‘breach of the peace’. After receiving an official caution, Louis Napoleon and Léon gave bail for £500 apiece and surety of another £500 each ‘to keep the peace with … each other for the next twelve months’. D’Orsay, Ratcliffe, and Parquin were obliged to put up £100 bail and two sureties of £50 each, while Kien got away with £100 bail.[45]

Before the duel, in February, Louis Napoleon had already heard the story, through private letters, that Léon had been released from *La Maison de Clichy* with his debts paid provided that he would spy on him. There was no suggestion at that time that he had been asked to do anything more sinister. It is unlikely that Louis Napoleon believed this, and if he refused to see Léon it was because he had already decided, years earlier, that he did not like him. There were certainly enough Orleanist *mouchards* in London without having to use Léon, and if the French Government had sought to plant somebody much closer to Louis Napoleon than was possible with professional agents they made a poor choice with him. It was true that Léon had seen Guizot, ambassador in London since 27 February, but this was on a matter unconnected with Louis Napoleon.

In 1840 there was only one daily paper in Paris that could be described as ‘Bonapartist’. *Le Capitole* had been founded in June 1839 by François de Crouy-Chanel with Louis Napoleon’s financial assistance (140,000 francs), largely to profit from the interest in France on the issue of the *retour des cendres* – the return of Napoleon to France. Three days after the duel, the editor began to publish a series of articles openly stating that Léon was an Orleanist agent. At the same time a minor London weekly, the *Argus*, took up the story, running a series of similar articles concentrating on Léon’s character as a ‘professional duellist’,[46] ridiculing the entire concept as ‘dishonourable’ and adding a scathing letter by one of Léon’s creditors. Léon responded on 19 July with a pamphlet, published immediately in Paris and written directly to *Le Capitole*, giving his version of events from his release to the duel and including all his relevant letters. But the accusations stood.

Léon took the editor of *Le Capitole* to court in Paris for defamation on 3 September, where he won his case and the editor was fined 5,000 francs. Furthermore, *Le Capitole* published a public retraction of its accusations, but nonetheless claimed that they had been based in good faith on those printed in the *Argus*. However, by then it was far too late. Lord FitzHarris, for example, had been convinced of Léon’s guilt on the very day of the duel. In his diary he wrote: ‘Prince Louis Bonaparte was to have fought this morning with Count Léon, who has been sent over here by the French police, either to get rid of him or to get him expelled [from] the country by inducing him to infringe the laws’.[47] FitzHarris was certainly close to the event – later in the same entry he noted the correct surety Louis Napoleon had to find, a fact not made public until the following day – but more likely he was repeating stories already circulating among Louis Napoleon’s closer associates.

All these rumours were patently absurd, and the one suggesting that Léon had been suborned by the French Government to eliminate Louis Napoleon betrayed a naivety frightening in a man who would one day become foreign secretary. Throughout the turbulent and fiery history of the Bonaparte family one thing Corsican clannishness always prevented was the possibility of one member physically harming another. If the duel between Louis Napoleon and Léon had gone ahead and neither side deloped it would have been a first and last in Bonaparte family history. It is beyond credibility

that Léon would have been willing to kill the principal member of *La Famille* for a bit of money from his political opponents, although he may have done so as a natural consequence of the duel if it had not been stopped in time.

It is equally incredible to suggest that anybody in the French Government would have been willing to risk such a crude and potentially disastrous course of action. This was not the style of Thiers, then minister of foreign affairs and also president of the council in his second ministry. It was not the style of the minister of the interior, Comte de Rémusat, who would shortly be weeping with emotion as he announced the return of Napoleon to France. Nor was it the style of the prefect of police, Henri Gisquet, a man of integrity who paved the way for the sincere professionalism of the *Sûreté* and related policing bodies under the Second Empire. And to suppose that Louis Philippe would have had anything to do with such an idea would be to betray ignorance of the entire structure of the July Monarchy. Keeping an eye on Louis Napoleon, thus making his life difficult, was one thing; sending assassins abroad to murder him was quite another.

The other contemporary theory put about was that the French Government, remembering Melbourne's words, had tried to make Louis Napoleon break a law and consequently be expelled, whereupon he could be dealt with in some supposedly legal way outside England. This was based on Léon's vacillation on the Common and the fact that somebody had indeed informed the police of the duel beforehand. But the Orleanist agents must have known that under English Common Law no foreigner was ever rendered *expulsé* for the misdemeanour of contemplating a duel. Moreover, it is not likely that Léon would have been willing to undergo the ultimate sacrifice in order for his friends to bring a charge of murder against Louis Napoleon on behalf of the July Monarchy. In any case it is not even certain that a charge of murder would have resulted in Louis Napoleon's expulsion.

But perhaps the most crucial piece of evidence establishing the innocence of the July Monarchy, and the mundane nature of the entire incident, is one few Englishmen and no foreigner would have known. In 1839, the post-mill on the Common was a solitary structure a little way from the mill-house. The Metropolitan Police employed the owner and miller, Thomas Hunt Dann, as a permanent special constable whose job it was to report, or even arrest, duellists and other potential law-breakers on the Common, the conical wooden tower being accessible to the very top. Knowledge of the duel was no secret by the afternoon of Monday 2, and any informed Englishman would have known that duels in metropolitan London were not fought anywhere other than Wimbledon Common. That evening someone, possibly Léon himself, informed Dann of the duel, and Dann – who for his own protection was referred to as a 'countryman' – did his duty and passed the information on to the police house in Putney a short ride away. This was then relayed to Superintendent Thomas Baker of 'C' Division (St James's district) where Louis Napoleon was living. All Dann had to do the following morning was climb his mill, observe the duellists arriving, and signal to Pearce to make his move after allowing the duellists to take their places. Partridge, Otway, and the constables would have been close by, perhaps even in the front room of the mill house, waiting for Dann to tell them when Pearce was ready to be followed.

The authors of all the propaganda were in fact irresponsible anti-Orleanists and Napoleonists in Paris, who contrived the spy and assassination stories not to attack Léon but to use him – as an expendable irrelevance – to discredit the July Monarchy by making people believe that they were capable of such action. Léon, who did not possess a stable or courageous character, genuinely resented the implication. This,

coupled with his frustration at being constantly snubbed, caused him to defend his 'honour' by calling out his cousin. It was significant that only Parquin was noted as having regretted the actions of the police, and an honest view would suggest that everyone else present, including the pusillanimous Léon, sighed with relief when Inspector Pearce showed himself.

* * *

On 12 May 1839, when Marshall Soult was installed as president of the council and minister of foreign affairs, an uprising was organized by the *Société des saisons*, a revolutionary group founded the previous year by Auguste Blanqui, Sigmund Barbès, and Martin Bernard. Their quarrel was not with Soult personally but with the July Monarchy. It was the severest insurrection of Louis Philippe's reign. Barbès marched on the *Palais de justice* at the head of about 200 revolutionaries, Blanqui with the same number to the Hôtel de Ville, while Bernard remained in reserve with 300 men ready to fight off any resistance set up after the expected take-over of the Government. But few Parisians responded to the call. Most were in fact shocked, and after troops were called in to support the National Guard about seventy insurrectionists and thirty soldiers were killed. Barbès and Blanqui were captured and sentenced to death, later commuted to life imprisonment.

Louis Napoleon found himself linked to those involved in reports published in the Paris press through accusations repeated in London. He immediately wrote to *The Times*:

> I see with pain … that it is wished to cast upon me the responsibility of the late insurrections. I rely upon your kindness to refute in the most distinct manner this insinuation. The intelligence of the bloody scenes which took place has caused me as much surprise as grief. If I were the soul of a plot, I would also be the chief actor in it on the day of danger; nor would I shrink back after a defeat.[48]

But the French Government had real cause for concern, and their suspicions were at least based on reasonable suppositions. Earlier in the year two openly Napoleonist clubs had been founded in Paris, the *Club des Cotillons* and the *Club des Culottes de peau*, while Crouy-Chanel's *Le Capitole* continued to sell well on Louis Napoleon's money. The recall of Sébastiani and his replacement by Guizot was suddenly interpreted in one particular way. FitzHarris reckoned that 'Connected as he [Sébastiani] had been with the Bonaparte family, he would not keep as active a surveillance over Prince Louis … as was desired by the French Government'.[49] This was a view echoed in some sections of the press as well: 'M. Guizot, whose enmity to the Bonapartes was well known, was selected to watch over him in the honourable post of ambassador'.[50] Guizot later admitted as much: 'It has been often said that the Government … were foolish enough in 1840 not to heed the Bonapartist movements, and to be left uninformed on all points. This is an error; neither M. de Rémusat … nor I … had fallen into such a state of negligence'.[51]

In fact, many in England had fallen for a piece of clever political chicanery, and Louis Napoleon became a convenient means of deflecting embarrassment over Muhammad 'Ali, pasha of Egypt. After thirty years reforming Egypt as the viceroy to Sultan Mahmud II, 'Ali turned against his overlord, and Mahmud's attempt to oust his rebellious vassal from Syria ended in defeat at Nazib on 24 June 1839. A few days later the sultan was dead, and his young heir, 'Abdul-Majid, immediately offered 'Ali the hereditary viceroyship he had been demanding in addition to all the lands he had conquered.

This problem had been one for England as well as France. Before the rebellion, ‘Ali had been a friend to both nations, often playing one off against the other. After the insurrection, however, he turned to France for support, as England opposed him in order to maintain the integrity of the Ottoman Empire against the perceived aspirations of Russia. Sébastiani, however, opposed his Government’s policy over ‘Ali because of the potential threat to Anglo-French relations. Soult moved for Sébastiani’s recall, but so as to conceal the division within the Government over this issue *Le Moniteur universel* put about the smokescreen concerning Louis Napoleon. This is what FitzHarris read and reinterpreted in his journal, and from where every English paper derived its information.

Anglo-French relations inevitably cooled dramatically over the Muhammad ‘Ali issue. Soult was defeated in the Chambers on February 25 by his refusal to grant the Duc de Nemours, the king’s second son, a dowry on his marriage to Princess Victoire of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, a cousin of Ernst II, Prince Albert’s older brother. That same day, Thiers was asked to form his second ministry, which he did on 1 March. In spite of claiming that the cornerstone of his foreign policy was, and had always been, the ‘English alliance’,[52] Thiers began a policy of military intervention in Syria on behalf of ‘Ali, a formerly popular idea until it was realized that war with England might very well be the principal result.

Nevertheless, Thiers was now in a position to propose what would be his greatest Napoleonic triumph – the return of the emperor’s body to France. The idea itself was not new. In September 1830, Colonel Jean Jacqueminot, a former Revolutionary lawyer, Napoleonic senator, and deputy for Vosges since 1828, unofficially petitioned the Chamber of Deputies for a *retour des cendres*, a move that found some support both among them and out in the streets. On 2 October, General Jean Lamarque – who even asked Lucien Bonaparte if he would be willing to spearhead the request in an official capacity – proposed it more formally. The deputies listened politely to the emotive rhetoric, but the motion was passed over; Lucien in any case declined. The time, in 1830, was not right.

But in 1840 the timing was perfect, and on May 26 Thiers gave a stirring speech before the Chambers. Lamartine, whose repeated notion that ‘France is bored’ had already become a catch-phrase, gently reminded his colleagues of the danger:

> While this generous nation honours her great men, still, she knows how to distinguish their faults from their services … she knows even how to distinguish them from their party, and from those who become a menace in their name; and that, when she raises this monument, and as a nation receives this great memory, she does not desire to see arising from these ashes war, tyranny, pretenders, and imitators.[53]

Lamartine did not mention Louis Napoleon by name, but he had no need to: the implication was clear. Lamartine was congratulated by Molé and François Villemain, the Sorbonne professor of comparative literature then enjoying a stint as minister of education, as well as by *Le Moniteur universel*. But Thiers carried the day with ease, and he had the wholehearted backing of his king. On May 1, the feast of St Philip the Apostle, Louis Philippe had said to him: ‘I am giving you a present for my name-day. You wish to bring back Napoleon’s remains to France. I consent’.[54]

On May 5, the nineteenth anniversary of Napoleon’s death, Thiers made his first formal request to Palmerston through Guizot. Four days later Palmerston replied that:

> Her Majesty’s Government hope that the readiness with which this answer is given will be looked upon in France as a proof of the desire … to obliterate every remnant of these national animosities which, during the life of the Emperor, assayed the French and English peoples in arms against each other, and

Her Majesty's Government trust that if any such feelings still continue anywhere they will be buried in the grave to which these remains are about to be consigned.[55]

But Palmerston was not reacting to any pressure put on him. Absorbed by the continuing problem of Muhammad 'Ali in the Middle East, he regarded the whole business as nothing more than 'a very French *demarche*'. 'This will amuse the public mind for six months to come and make those full-grown children think less of other things'.[56] He could not, of course, have been more wrong.

On 6 June, General Henri Bertrand, an old Napoleonic officer, offered Louis Philippe the Sword of Austerlitz for him to place in Napoleon's tomb. Louis Napoleon was mortified, as this was the sword the Duc de Reichstadt had bequeathed him. Bertrand had had no right to keep it, let alone pass it on to an Orleans king. Louis Napoleon wrote to *The Times*:

The Sword of Austerlitz ought not to be in the hands of enemies … Let us be deprived of our country, let our property be withheld … we know how to suffer without complaint, while our honour is unassailed; but to deprive the heirs of the Emperor of the only inheritance which fate has left them, to give to one prosperous from Waterloo the arms of the vanquished, is to betray the most sacred of duties, is to lay upon the oppressed the obligation of one day saying to the oppressors – 'Restore to us what you have usurped'.[57]

On June 6 and 10, *Le Moniteur universel* published royal ordinances explaining to Louis Philippe's citizen-subjects the entire scheme, stating that the Prince de Joinville would be entrusted with the mission aboard the frigate *La Belle-Poule*. Instructions from Thiers – unknown to Louis Philippe – in fact gave command to Philippe de Rohan Chabot, under-secretary to the French embassy in London.

Louis Napoleon also played a part in this. The Irish patriot and politician Daniel O'Connell and his parliamentary colleagues were helping Melbourne in exchange for concessions and reforms in Ireland. O'Connell had been vigorously opposing Palmerston over his refusal to repeal the Act of Union of 1801, and he took any opportunity to attack Palmerston in the House. Even before Guizot's request, Louis Napoleon unintentionally provided O'Connell with ammunition when he informed him of the mooted project. O'Connell on his own account then badgered Palmerston in the Commons until the foreign secretary had been forced to publicly state that he would have no objection to the translation of Napoleon's remains, provided that the French Government approached him in the appropriate manner.

English opinion on the *retour des cendres* was surprisingly muted, and it would seem Palmerston had expressed the feeling of the nation. In France it was, of course, another matter, as Napoleon became all things to all men. Palmerston, in order not to insult the French as Lord Liverpool had done, granted them a concession and allowed Napoleon to be referred to as 'The Emperor' on all diplomatic despatches sent during the translation. Accordingly, it was the Emperor Napoleon who left St Helena on Sunday 18 October, reached Cherbourg on 8 November, and who arrived in Paris on Tuesday 15 December.

By that date Louis Napoleon planned to be in control of Paris and welcoming the body of his uncle to the abbey of St Denis, the putative burial place of St Dionysius, bishop of Paris and patron saint of France, and designated by Napoleon as the Bonaparte mausoleum. Throughout the summer the fact that Louis Napoleon was up to something was widely known in London among the politically informed, but there was little other than mystery and confusion surrounding him. On 30 June, Guizot wrote to Rémusat:

You ask me to watch the Bonapartist party; it is not easy. The party is airing itself and making a great stir. Prince Louis is incessantly in the Park and at the Opera. When he enters his box his aides-de-camp stand behind him. They talk much and loudly; they describe their projects and their correspondence. The display of hope is splendid; but when one seeks to look at it closely, and catch what is real and active under this noise of words, one finds almost nothing. On leaving the Park and Opera the Prince and his party relapse into an obscure and a lazy life. However, I know that there is a question of chartering a ship, and of attacking at sea, on its way back from St Helena, the frigate bearing the remains of Napoleon. The remains are to be carried off as family property, or the French frigate is to be met, and to be followed into the port of [Le] Havre at all risks.[58]

These two patently idiotic plans were part of Louis Napoleon's own misinformation to cover the fact that a ship was indeed soon to be chartered. The plan he had in mind, however, was considerably more practicable. Even though it too would fail it would do so not on account of any initial mismanagement on his part.

Meanwhile, Louis Napoleon was able to indulge in an interesting distraction. In 1840, Elizabeth Abell was living in Portman Square preparing her *Recollections of the Emperor Napoleon during the First Three Years of his Captivity on the Island of St Helena* (1844). Between 17 October and 10 December 1815, Napoleon had stayed with an English family on St Helena, the Balcombes, at 'The Briars' while Longwood House was being 'prepared' for him. Mrs Abell was then Betsy Balcombe, terrified of meeting 'the monster' Napoleon, but with whom a relationship of trust and candour soon developed, one not experienced between Napoleon and any adult on the island. Sir Hudson Lowe ended this friendship when the Balcombes were expelled from St Helena following his complaints of their familiarity with 'General Buonaparte'. Louis Napoleon would certainly have heard of the Balcombes, but only in 1840 would he have realized how important Betsy had been as the last source of human comfort for Napoleon in his otherwise lonely captivity. Mrs Abell, then widowed, spent many hours with Louis Napoleon allowing him to read her completed manuscript; it was an honour he would not forget.

Louis Napoleon's uncles had no knowledge of the second *coup*, any more than they had had of the first. Jérôme returned to England from Ostend on the *Menai* on Saturday 11 July and then disappeared. Joseph, now a sick man and constantly accompanied by his doctor – the Italian patriot calling himself Augustus Granville who had warned the authorities of Napoleon's intended escape from Elba – left England for Rotterdam aboard the *Batavier* on Saturday 1 August for that nineteenth-century cure-all, a 'change of air'. Louis Napoleon was also careful not to involve any of his English friends in order to protect them as well as himself; so many of them were close to the Government that any leaks might have jeopardised the entire enterprise. However, the Legitimist Press in Paris did not see things that way. Ever since the rumours had begun they had been suggesting that Louis Napoleon had had secret meetings with the foreign secretary, an accusation *The Times* vigorously denied, as only that formerly great newspaper was once able to do:

We are authorized to state, that there is not the slightest foundation for the assertion made in some of the French papers about an interview between Lord Palmerston and Prince Louis Bonaparte: no such interview has taken place, and neither party has called upon or visited the other. Surely such a report did not require contradiction. Any Frenchman who could believe the monstrously gross imputation must have a mind so childishly imbecile as may be fit for a lunatic asylum.[59]

Louis Napoleon continued to flaunt his avowed destiny right up to the day of his departure, always with that aquiline brooch of his, and always with the assurance of a 'Man of Destiny' guided by his 'Napoleonic star'. The reactions were still those of bemusement, indulgence, incredulity, or as though nothing had changed since 1831.

Fortunately, they can be followed right up to the point of departure. Sir Henry Holland:

I dined at his house in Carlton Terrace [*sic*] some ten days before the attempt on Boulogne, without any suspicion of the event impending, though the party was chiefly composed of those who accompanied him in this ill-fated expedition.[60]

James Planché, an English dramatist, critic, and heraldic expert of Huguenot descent, did not know Louis Napoleon:

August 2, 1840: On arriving opposite Gore House, I thought I would 'drop in' for half an hour. There had been a small dinner party, and only four gentlemen were remaining … the youngest immediately engaged my attention. It was the fashion in that day to wear black satin kerchiefs for evening dress, and that of the gentleman in question was fastened by a large spread eagle in diamonds clutching a thunderbolt of rubies … I felt convinced that he could be no other than Prince Louis Napoleon … There was a general conversation on indifferent subjects for some twenty minutes, during which the Prince spoke but little, and then took his departure with the Count [De Montholon] … As we went along one of my companions said to the other 'What could Louis Napoleon mean by asking us to dine with him this day twelve-months at the Tuileries?'[61]

Lord FitzHarris:

August 7 – News arrived this morning of Louis Napoleon having landed yesterday morning at Boulogne … This explains an expression he used to me two evenings ago. He was standing on the steps of Lady Blessington's house after a party, wrapped up in a cloak, with Persigny by him, and I observed to them, 'You look like two conspirators', upon which he answered, 'You may be nearer right than you think'.[62]

In fact, FitzHarris had been absolutely right. That very evening Louis Napoleon left for Boulogne with fifty-five 'conspirators' aboard a chartered steamer, the *Edinburgh Castle*, which had been taken out for one month, until the following day, as a pleasure cruiser from the Commercial Steam Navigation Company – subsequently the company was obliged to write to the mayor of Boulogne denying that they had had any idea for what purpose their ship would be used. Most of the party had been on the ship since the previous day at its mooring in London Bridge, but Louis Napoleon and Persigny joined it at the last minute in Greenwich to avoid suspicion.

Alas, Louis Napoleon did not spent the following year preparing a lavish banquet for Planché and his friends at the Tuileries; instead, he spent the next six years in the medieval fortress of Ham in Picardie.

Once again, the men of the barracks were not so easy to convince, and in the ensuing confusion Louis Napoleon accidentally shot and slightly wounded one of the men he had been attempting to entice when he inadvertently discharged his pistol while gesticulating during a scuffle. It was a slight graze for the soldier, but a mortal blow for the *coup*. An orderly retreat then became another fiasco, but one that ended less amusingly than at Strasbourg with the core of the conspirators being shot at while they attempted to reach their ship in a lifeboat. One of them was shot dead, a second drowned, and three were wounded, including Louis Napoleon. Within an hour of landing he was once again a prisoner of the July Monarchy.

Two days before Napoleon's body left St Helena his nephew stood before the Chamber of Peers to answer the charge of High Treason. Pierre Berryer, who was also a noted lawyer and orator, agreed to defend him. Berryer, who was no Bonapartist, was also no friend of the July Monarchy, and his presence lent an atmosphere of impartiality to the proceeding. Although Berryer certainly did his eloquent best, Louis

Napoleon knew that he would not escape lightly this time. Nevertheless, the trial was hardly Louis Napoleon's Waterloo. One of the ironies of political trials of this magnitude is that they freely offer the accused a public platform for the expression of precisely those views that put them there in the first place. Louis Napoleon used the occasion brilliantly, making an excellent case for himself and his dynasty, and putting many of the peers to shame. Of the group who had been with him four were acquitted and all the rest would be released by 1848, except the unfortunate Parquin who would die in prison.

The Chamber of Peers had been easy enough to shame. It included fifty-six generals, twenty-one chamberlains, nineteen prefects, fourteen councillors of state, seven ambassadors, six marshals, and four ministers who all owed their positions to Napoleon. Moreover, thirty-eight of them had publicly recognized the legitimacy of the Duc de Reichstadt as Napoleon II after Fontainebleau. Nevertheless, on 6 October they condemned Louis Napoleon to perpetual imprisonment in a fortress within the territories of France.

This extraordinary fact becomes clear, as does much else in the relationship between Louis Napoleon and France, when it is understood that to be a Napoleonist did not necessarily imply adherence to any form of 'Bonapartism'. Napoleon may have been everything but, as Thiers loved to explain, 'Napoleon stood alone; after him – nothing'. A senior civil servant put it even clearer: 'Now that Bonapartism is placed under lock and key … it is possible to pay perfectly peaceful honours to the personal glory of Napoleon'.[63]

On Tuesday December 15, the funeral of Napoleon Bonaparte was conducted with a lavish pomp not seen in Paris since the Bourbons. If it was a victory for Napoleonists it was an uneasy triumph for Louis Philippe, and a short-lived one for Thiers who had been forced to resign on 21 October following his intractable defence of Muhammad 'Ali, whom he had continued to support to the point of potential war with Britain. A final breach in Anglo-French relations had come when the Convention for the Pacification of the Levant was signed in London on 15 July between Britain, Austria, Prussia, Russia, and Turkey, without involving France or even informing Guizot of its contents.

Lord Granville refused to attend the funeral, urging British subjects in Paris to remain indoors and close their shutters. There were more than 60,000 British resident in France – perhaps a quarter of whom lived in or around Paris – excluding visitors, and the vast majority obeyed their representative. One who did not was Thackeray, who found the event amusing and turned it into a satirical chronicle, *The Second Funeral of Napoleon*. Another who watched but found the atmosphere less than amusing was George Sala, grandson of a Roman immigrant who became a Napoleonist while temporarily blind as a child when his sister had read French history to him. In 1839 he had been sent to a day school on the rue St Lazare, but he was withdrawn early in 1841 and sent back to England because of the anti-English feeling in the streets. Sala cited in particular the reaction in Paris to Louis Napoleon's 'madcap expedition',[64] and stated that 'night after night disorderly crowds assembled in front of the British Embassy … yelling for "le sang de Milord Granville"'.[65]

Much was made of the fact that Louis Philippe tried to make himself as inconspicuous as possible during the event. So obviously did he lack prestige that *Le Moniteur universel* was obliged to lie in its official report of the funeral, claiming that when Joinville arrived at Les Invalides his words were 'Sire, I present to you the body of the Emperor Napoleon', to which his father replied 'I receive it in the name of France'. This noble exchange was precisely what Louis Philippe had once hoped

would result from the translation – Napoleon, himself, and France inextricably welded together in one happy Napoleonic-Citizen marriage. Unfortunately, the 'I do' part never happened. Instead, as Joinville was later honest enough to admit:

> The King received the body at the entrance to the nave, and there a rather comical scene took place. It appears that a little speech, which I was to have delivered when I met my father, and also the answer he was to give me, had been drawn up in Council, only the authorities had omitted to inform me concerning it. So when I arrived I simply saluted with my sword, and then stood aside. I saw indeed that this silent salute, followed by a retreat, had thrown something out; but my father, after a moment's hesitation, improvised some appropriate sentence, and the matter was afterwards arranged in the *Moniteur*.[66]

This was all very well, but unfortunately it was the 'arranged' version Louis Napoleon read in prison. The implication of this 'arrangement', so crucial that understandably the official paper had to do it, wounded him deeply. 'While at Paris they are deifying the mortal remains of the Emperor, I, his nephew, am incarcerated alive in a restricted gaol',[67] he wrote to the French Press. Meanwhile, Palmerston was with Guizot assuring him of the obvious fact that Her Britannic Majesty's Government had had no foreknowledge of the Boulogne *coup*; nor had it aided and abetted it in any way.

Disraeli, like everyone else, first heard about the *coup* in the papers, which revealed just how well Louis Napoleon had protected his English friends and the Government from embarrassing compromise. He was curiously indifferent to it:

> The Morning Papers publish 2, 3 Editions every day, & quoted Louis Napoleon, who last year at Bulwers nearly drowned me by his bad rowing, [who] upset himself at Boulogne. Never was anyone so rash & crude to all appearances as this 'monsieur' for he was joined by no one. A fine house in Carlton Gardens, his Arabian horses, and excellent cook was hardly worse than his present situation.[68]

Disraeli had felt the anger rather than the sympathy at a friend's predicament through what must have appeared at the time as sheer stupidity.

Anglo-French relations, already weak, would not have withstood political complicity, even with one member of parliament, and Melbourne's only concern was with the timing of the *coup*, which he called the 'mad attempt of Louis Bonaparte'. Writing to Queen Victoria on 7 August:

> It is rather unfortunate that it should have taken place at this moment, as the violent and excited temper of the French nation will certainly lead them to attribute it to England. It will also be highly embarrassing to the King of the French to have in his possession a member of the family of Bonaparte, and so many Bonapartists, who have certainly deserved death but whom it may not be prudent or politic to execute.[69]

Melbourne, who had been always correct towards Louis Napoleon in London, did not share his Whig predecessor's Napoleonic sympathies, and he was quite right. Attempts were made to link the Government, Crown, and Louis Napoleon into a plausible tripartite conspiracy, but the moves failed dismally because there was absolutely no foundation to them, not even circumstantial. It was Louis Napoleon himself who had seen to that.

*The Times* reported extensively on the Boulogne attempt, and again with absolute impartiality. However, it did not spend weeks analyzing the motives and consequences, devoting an entire page to it on October 1, two full columns on the following day and again the day after that, and finally half a column on Monday 5. When FitzHarris wrote on October 2 that 'Prince Louis Napoleon's trial is begun and

excites no interest whatever'[70] he was almost, but not quite, right. Certainly within a few days it would seem as though Louis Napoleon had never been in England at all, much like the reaction to his previous visits. His public trial was brief, and *The Times* report on the sentence was suitably perfunctory: 'The Court of Peers decided yesterday that the Prince should be sentenced to perpetual imprisonment in a fortress of the Kingdom'.[71] And that, as far as *The Times* was concerned, was that.

## NOTES and REFERENCES to Chapter Five

[1] *Jerrold* ii 58-9/480-1.
[2] *The Times* Thursday 28 Jun. 1838.
[3] *Joinville* 79.
[4] *Jerrold* ii 55-6, Louis Napoleon to Vieillard 10 Jun. 1842.
[5] Ibid. 75-6.
[6] *The Examiner* 7 Oct. 1838.
[7] PRO FO 27/524 (70), Palmerston to Granville 12 Sep. 1836.
[8] PRO HO 5/30 'Bonaparte, Louis Napoleon'. Curiously, he was still not issued with an Alien Certificate of Entry, which he should have retained until departure; a copy, which the 'alien' had to sign, was kept at the port of arrival and became the permanent record. Louis Napoleon's certificate ought to have been no. 6553, and the entire register contains no other example of a waived certificate.
[9] *Jerrold* ii 86.
[10] Ibid. 87.
[11] *St Helier* 87-8.
[12] *Sadleir* 272.
[13] *Journal* 17 Feb. 1839 (Reeve).
[14] *Notes & Queries* III i 157-58, 22 Feb. 1862. Rossetti ended this with a consolatory 'but' that had the effect of added injury: 'I have been told by an officer of dragoons that … he is a most excellent master of fence'.
[15] *Disraeli M&B* ii 93-4. No date for this has been recovered. Disraeli, writing retrospectively, cannot have meant 'wife' to be contemporary. He married Mary Lewis on 28 August 1839 and the Disraelis immediately left for their honeymoon, staying a week at Tunbridge Wells before moving on to Dover and then France and Germany. They did not return until 28 November.
[16] *Sadleir* 272.
[17] *Guest* 42.
[18] This incident is often placed at Lord Harrington's Kensington residence. However, although he owned land south of the old Cromwell Road, east of Gloucester Road, and south of Kensington Road between Gore House and Hyde Park Gate South, 13 Kensington Palace Gardens was not built for him until 1854. It was after this date that the area became fashionable and when two streets acquired his name: Harrington Road (1867) and Harrington Gardens (1880-85).
[19] *Disraeli: Letters III* 200 (971), Disraeli to his sister Sarah 23 Jul. 1839.
[20] *Anstruther* 65.
[21] Ibid. 224.
[22] *Jerrold* ii 115. But an anonymous author gave a very different account of Louis Napoleon's activities in *Tournament at Eglinton Castle on Wednesday and Friday 28th and 30th August, 1839* (Orr & Sons, Edinburgh, p.21), intended as a souvenir: 'A regular set-to with the sticks, betwixt Prince Bonaparte and a very young gentleman, Mr Charteris [Wemyss-Charteris-Douglas], afforded much amusement; but the Prince only came off second best, as he afterwards did with the broadsword in four or five splendid slapping bouts with Mr Charles Lamb. Here the combatants were completely encased in mail, with visors down. Had it not been so, and had the match been one of life and death, the poor Prince would have had no chance with his opponent at this weapon, which seems to be indigenous in the hands of a Briton'.
[23] Ibid. loc.cit.
[24] *Malmesbury* i 106. Disraeli was then on his honeymoon, but he included the tourney (minus the rain) in his last novel *Endymion* (chs 59-60).
[25] *The Examiner* 8 Sep. 1839.
[26] *Glasgow Argus* Monday 2 Sep. 1839
[27] *Jerrold* ii 89.
[28] Ibid. 90.
[29] The Chez Bohaire edition was roughly made and priced at only 50 centimes; the Henry Colburn edition (in French) was lavish and cost 10s 6d. It was translated into English (1840), German, Italian, Spanish, Portugese, and Russian (1841). A separate American edition, translated by James Dorr, appeared in 1859.
[30] *Froude* ii 148-9.
[31] *Cerutti* 22.
[32] A junior assistant in the Prints Room stated that Louis Napoleon and Panizzi were friends from 1831 in Italy. 'Sire, Signor Panizzi craves an interview with your Highness', he said. 'Show him in, show him in!' Louis Napoleon replied. When Panizzi entered the assistant left, but he heard Louis Napoleon

cry 'My dear old friend!' *Guest Ms* A. Walker [grandchild of assistant] to Ivor Guest 1 Apr. 1948. Panizzi had been in England since 1823, but he had been implicated in the insurrections of 1821 and may have met Hortense on his way north from Parma.
[33] *Jerrold* ii 113.
[34] *Athenæum* 3 Aug. 1839 (614). 'Brennus' was the name of two Gaulish leaders in antiquity.
[35] *The Examiner* 22 Sep. 1839.
[36] *The Times* Thursday 31 Oct. 1839.
[37] *The Times* Saturday 2 Nov. 1839.
[38] Expanded in *The Paris Sketchbook* as *Napoleon and his System* (1840): 'His eagle appeared at Strasbourg, and … advanced to the capital; but it arrived at Paris with a keeper, and in a post-chaise; whence, by the orders of the sovereign, it was removed to the American shores, and then magnanimously let loose – who knows … how soon it may be on the wing again, and what flight it will take?'
[39] *Dodds* 76.
[40] Ibid. 86
[41] Ibid. 87.
[42] Ibid. loc. cit..
[43] Ibid. 88. Léon later stated that Ratcliffe had spoken with 'les paroles suivantes de ma part' [*Léon* 15].
[44] *The Times* Wednesday 4 Mar. 1840.
[45] Sir Francis Baring, member for Portsmouth and grandson of the founder of Baring Brothers banking firm, stood surety for D'Orsay and Ratcliffe. Joshua Bates, an American financier and a partner in the bank, stood surety for Louis Napoleon and Parquin. Francis Fenton did so for Léon.
[46] On 24 February 1832, Léon fought Charles Hesse of the 18th Hussars and the natural son of the duke of York in France over a gambling debt. Hesse fired first but deloped and was then mortally wounded, causing his widow to bring a charge of murder against Léon. Simon Dupin, defending, pointed out to the court that, on one occasion, Parliament 'having been called on to determine upon an affair of this nature, rather than act severely, chose to declare that the victim died of an effusion in the chest, enjoining the adversary to be more circumspect in the future' [*The Times* 15 Aug. 1833]. This fine precedent caused Léon to be acquitted while the court laughed. All this was no doubt the cause of the hostility to Léon in the *Argus*.
[47] *Malmesbury* i 112.
[48] *The Times* Wednesday 18 May 1839.
[49] *Malmesbury* i 111-12, 5 Feb. 1840.
[50] *The Courier* Tuesday 4 Feb. 1840.
[51] *Jerrold* ii 119.
[52] *Webster* ii 673.
[53] *Allison* 265.
[54] *G. Martineau* 87.
[55] Ibid. 88-9.
[56] *Webster* ii 683.
[57] *The Times* Tuesday 9 Jun. 1840.
[58] *Jerrold* ii 120.
[59] *The Times* Saturday 8 Aug. 1840.
[60] *Holland* 184.
[61] *Planché* ii 45-6.
[62] *Malmesbury* i 120-1.
[63] *Zeldin* 5.
[64] *Sala* i 134.
[65] Ibid. 135.
[66] *Joinville* 166-7.
[67] *Thirria* i 49-50.
[68] *Disraeli: Letters* iii 285-6 (1083), Disraeli to his sister Sarah 8 Aug. 1840.
[69] QVL I i 228.
[70] *Malmesbury* i 123.
[71] *The Times* Tuesday 6 Oct. 1840. The decision had been reached on Monday and pronounced on Tuesday.