Notes

Epigraph


1 Introduction: Victorian ‘Public Moralists’, Ethnocentrism and the View of France

2. Quoted in Collini 1999, p. 76.
3. The question of ‘English’ as opposed to ‘British’ always bedevils studies of the period which wish to convey what the authors were saying, while trying to not adopt their identification of ‘Britain’ and ‘British’ with ‘England’ and ‘English’ as much as possible (cf. Collini 1991, pp. 6–7). Here ‘England’ and ‘English’ will feature more prominently than ‘Britain’ and ‘British’, because ‘England’ is what the thinkers discussed were talking about most of the time. In an attempt to define his terms (uncharacteristic for the time) Nassau Senior clarified that he would go on in the pages to follow to speak of ‘England – using the word England as a concise appellation for the nation inhabiting the British islands.’: Senior 1842, p. 17.
14. Mill complained in a letter to Comte (22 March 1842): ‘Il est… fort à regretter que les penseurs de nos deux pays soient loin d’avoir les uns pour les autres l’estime qu’ils méritent….Les Anglais cherchent plus volontiers des idées nouvelles chez les allemands que chez les français.’ (‘It is highly regrettable that the thinkers of our two countries are far from having for each other the regard which they deserve. ...The English look more willingly for new ideas among the Germans than among the French.’): *CW*, XIII, pp. 508–9. Cf. Brandes 1924, p. 199.
22. It is a matter of notoriety that Mill’s maid burnt the first manuscript of Carlyle’s French Revolution.
28. See, for some examples: Stephen (Leslie) 1900, III, pp. 12–13; Bain 1882, pp. 78, 93, 161; Forcade 1859, p. 989; Palgrave 1874, pp. 166–7; Brandes 1924, p. 199; Morley 1873, pp. 670–1; Bagehot, ‘The Late Mr. Mill’, Works, III, p. 557.
29. See, for instance: CW, XII, p. 78; XIII, p. 431.
30. CW, I, p. 63 (the fuller statement is quoted in the epigraph of this Introduction). Cf. A System of Logic, where Mill referred to the tendency of ‘English thinkers’ to tacitly assume ‘empirical laws of human nature’ which were ‘calculated only for Great Britain and the United States’. ‘Yet, those who know the habits of the Continent of Europe...’ knew better than do that: CW, VIII, pp. 905–6.
33. Emphasis added: Letters, I, pp. 107–8 (11 May 1848). Frenchmen were duly appreciative. Arnold's first foray into political matters, his pamphlet England and the Italian Question earned him a lot of gratitude in France and no lesser a figure than Villemain spoke of Dr Arnold's son as one ‘who judges us perfectly’ (Arnold, Letters, I, p. 493; Honan 1981, p. 304). And as Arnold was
proud to tell his audiences in America, Sainte-Beuve had written to him in the same flattering vein (‘Numbers’, Prose Works, X, p. 154. Cf. Brown 1931). Mill’s ‘curiosité sympathique’ about things French was no less noticed. (Cf. Forcade 1859, pp. 988–9; Chass 1928).


37. Inaugural Address Delivered to the University of St. Andrews (1867), CW, XXI, p. 226.

38. ‘State of Society in America’ (1836), CW, XVIII, p. 94.

39. CW, XXIII, p. 443 (this article was first published in Le Globe in French, on 18 April 1832).


42. Chateaubriand 1850, II, p. 965.


45. Maine 1861. Mill had also commended Maine’s work repeatedly.


48. Faverty 1951, p. 120 (the author gives reference to (a) Celtic Literature, and (b) Letters, ed. by Russell, I, p. 130).

49. Cf. Jones 2000, pp. 63–8. Jones entitles this section of the book: ‘Culture and Democracy: Matthew Arnold versus Bagehot’ and offers an excellent analysis of a fundamental difference between the two thinkers in their respective approaches to cultural authority versus diversity and ‘discussion’ within a polity. (Cf. Kent 1978, pp. 94–5.) However, I am arguing here that they were at one when it came to the usefulness of ethnic or racial diversity.

50. Letters, II, p. 49 (28 January 1861). That Arnold went on immediately following the statements quoted to recommend to his sister something (related to America) from the latest volume of Guizot’s memoirs may not be a completely accidental association, given how forcibly Guizot had argued exactly to the effect ‘what should we all be [in Europe] if we had not one another to check us…’ and given also how well-versed in Guizot Arnold was (see also infra, Chapter 2).

51. Emphasis added: Arnold, Letters, II, p. 370. The over-preponderance of single elements was exactly what Guizot had blamed for the rapid extinction of ancient civilizations such as that of Greece or the stunted growth and subsequent stationariness of oriental civilizations, in the Second Lecture of his Histoire de la Civilisation en Europe (Guizot 1997, pp. 28–32). And Mill, who had ‘dinned into people’s ears that Guizot is a great thinker and writer, till they are, though slowly, beginning to read him’ (CW, XIII, p. 427–16 April 1840), also dinned into their ears his ‘profound’ historical lesson;


53. Victorian thinkers were far from clear or consistent in defining and distinguishing between these different kinds of groups. See more on these issues in Chapter 4.

54. Chapter XVI, Considerations on Representative Government (1861).

55. For an example, see: CW, XX, p. 235 (‘Michelet's History of France’, 1844).

56. CW, XIII, pp. 508–9. Cf. Newman (Gerald) 1987, pp. 1–2: ‘Voltaire…characteristically observed that “when a Frenchman and an Englishman think the same, they must certainly be right.” The remark captured both the dissimilarity of the two national patterns of thought, and the conviction that truth was a province specially shared between them.’

57. CW, XIII, p. 457.

58. Cf. Mill, CW, I, pp. 169–71; XII, p. 42; Arnold, Prose Works, II, p. 11; V, pp. 33–4; VIII, p. 8; Arnold, Letters, IV, pp. 442–3; Bagehot, Works, IV, p. 113 (‘People [in England] are so deafened with the loud reiteration of many half-truths…’); Stephen 1867, pp. 78–9 (‘Mr. Arnold has a strong grasp of one aspect of the truth, and it is a very important one, but he falls into a very common kind of mistake when he puts it forward as the whole truth.’).

59. CW, I, p. 171.

60. Cf. Alexandrian poet Constantine Cavafy’s masterpiece under that title. A couple of Joachim du Bellay’s poems would do as well.


63. According to Peter Mandler, ‘Mill never developed his theory of national character, or applied it specifically to the English’ (Mandler 2000, p. 238). The latter part of this statement, which is an assertion made also by Janice Carlisle in a different context (Carlisle 1991, pp. 144–5), has to be qualified. The English character – the character of the whole nation, not just of ‘the dispossessed’, as Carlisle argues (and here Carlisle is wrong, whereas Mandler is right in asserting that Mill did talk of the character of the whole nation) – and its improvement was Mill’s main preoccupation throughout his reflection and discussions on national characters. There are texts which go some way towards indicating that it was the study of the peculiarities of the English character that was in the centre of his ‘ethological’ concerns. Besides his general theoretical assertion that one can never get to know a foreign country as well as one’s own (CW, XVIII, p. 93), there is also his emphatic statement in a letter to Comte that since his early youth he had been occupied in the study of the English character, accompanied by the complaint that Continental observers were falling into gross misunderstandings of the character of their insular neighbour: CW, XIII, pp. 696–7 (26 March 1846). Cf. CW, XV, p. 656.

64. Letters, III, p. 22 (24 March 1866).


68. Stephen 1864(b), p. 683. Cf. Stephen 1866(a), p. 163: ‘Mr. Arnold may rest his reputation on this. Noble disdain for all shopkeepers, past, present, and future... cannot well go much further... and, in order to do so more effectually, he puts his curses into the mouths of a gang of foreign Balaams, who certainly do the work for which they were fetched more efficiently than their prototype.’
71. Collini 1999, p. 139.
72. Bain 1882, pp. 78, 161; Palgrave 1874, pp. 166–7; cf. ibid., p. 155.
74. Emphasis added: Forcade 1859, pp. 988–9. When Michelet published the fifth volume of his Histoire de France, which he spoke of as ‘ce volume si peu favorable aux Anglais’ (‘this volume [which is] so little favourable to the English’), he asked Gustave d’Eichthal if he could help him to enlist for its defence ‘la haute impartialité d’un Anglais, de M. Mill’ (‘the high impartiality of an Englishman, M. Mill’) (quoted – from a letter by Michelet to Gustave d’Eichthal – in Mill, CW, XIII, 432–3n). (On Michelet’s difficult relation with England cf. Crossley 1997.) So did Tocqueville when he was accused of belligerency by Lord Brougham in 1843 (see infra, Chapter 5).
77. Emphasis added: Stephen 1859(c), pp. 76–7. Stephen did not allow this qualification to influence him too much though: ‘Still, after making allowances for these and other similar causes which may have accidentally heightened the contrast which he has drawn between this country and France, enough remains to make us feel that England is treated with scanty justice, whilst France receives much more than its due’ (ibid., p. 77).
78. CW, XII, p. 42. Cf. Autobiography, CW, I, pp. 169–71, where Mill spoke of half-truths, and of ‘the battle about the shield, one side of which was white and the other black’. Cf. also his comments on half-truths in ‘Coleridge’, CW, X, p. 123. Cf. Turk 1988, pp. 213–32.
79. We will come across examples of Mill’s attempts to combat half-truths and bring the British and the French together (most notably in times of international crises) in Chapter 5. To mention just one possible example here, it is arguable that Mill’s stubborn refusal to make any public statements concerning the Franco-Prussian War, while he had, at the same time, strong feelings and urgent recommendations to make to the British public (which he made, as it were, by proxy), was part of his determination to not put any oil in what he always saw as the fully flamed fire of British anti-Gallicanism. While he was speaking to Frenchmen all his mind in letters about what he saw as their responsibility for the war, the punishment they deserved, the lessons they should learn from that just punishment, and the ‘très grand defaults’ of their ‘caractère national’, he replied to British friends who were asking him to join them in public demonstrations against the French that, while he agreed with them, yet: ‘But, while I do all I can in private, I think it best for the present, both for public and for private reasons, that my
name should not appear. This letter therefore is confidential’ (CW, XVII, p. 1795. Cf. ibid., p. 1767). For a man who was living half of the year in Avignon, the ‘private reasons’ may be easy to guess. The ‘public’, though, may be connected with what I am discussing in this Introduction.

80. ‘England and Ireland’, CW, XXV, p. 1096. On the occasion where he said this in 1848 he meant Carlyle.

81. He had used this phrase while speaking of Lytton-Bulwer, but there can be little doubt that he regarded himself as one of ‘the moral teachers of England’, ‘labouring for the regeneration of England’s national character’.

82. ‘The English National Character’ (June 1834): CW, XXIII, 717–27.

83. Emphasis added.

84. Faverty 1951, p. 68.


86. Bagehot was referring on this occasion to Arnold’s recommendation of the role of Academies like the Académie Française: Physics and Politics, Works, VII, pp. 50–2.


89. In original: ‘politeia’; some translate it as ‘constitution’. In either case, the message is the same. The translation is mine.

90. The former emphasis (‘absence’) is in the original, the latter is mine.


92. CW, XIV, pp. 15–16.

93. CW, XIV, p. 16, fn. 11. Emerson’s speech had been reported in The Times of 14 March 1849 (for more see: Hayek 1951, p. 142).

94. Stapleton 2000, p. 249. Cf. the remark of his brother, Leslie Stephen, that what J.F. Stephen desiderated in Mill’s theory of liberty was ‘the great patriotic passions which are the mainsprings of history’: see Stapleton 1998(a), p. 247.


96. CW, XVIII, pp. 86–9, 182–3; XVII, p. 1769.

97. CW, VIII, p. 923.

98. Newman (Gerald) 1987, pp. 243–4. The issue of what has been said of Mill’s attitude to nationality/nationalism more generally is huge, and I will try to limit myself here to what applies directly to his relation to France and what he had in common with Arnold. For more on the broader questions, see my forthcoming book on Mill on Nationality (London: Routledge).


100. This phrase occurs in the oft-quoted (not least as the epigraph in Maurizio Viroli’s book trying – unconvincingly, in my opinion – to distinguish between a bad ‘nationalism’ and a good ‘patriotism’ (see Viroli 1995)) passage where Mill outlined the three conditions of stability in political society, including as one of these conditions ‘a strong and active principle of
cohesion among the members of the same community or state': *CW*, VIII, p. 923 (*A System of Logic*, Book VI, chapter X).

103. Stapleton 1998(a), p. 244.
108. Emphasis added.
111. Spencer 1873; cf. Wingfield-Stratford 1913.
114. ‘My Countrymen’, *Prose Works*, V, p. 27.
117. ‘My Countrymen’, *Prose Works*, V, p. 27.
125. See his letter to J.W. Parker: *CW*, XV, p. 652. It was duly reviewed, very favourably, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* (Forcade 1859).
128. Stephen 1866(a), p. 163.
129. Emphasis added: Stephen 1866(a), p. 162. Senior believed that England did not care at all about what foreigners thought of her, and contributed an interesting analysis of the reasons for English disregard for the opinion of foreigners (Senior 1842, pp. 18–20, 31, 32–3, 42, and *passim*).
131. An analogy one can think of is Mill’s rationale for his rejection of the secret ballot. He wanted people to vote openly in order for them to feel constrained to make electoral choices which they would be able to justify publicly in front of their fellow-constituents, choices therefore for which they could invoke reasons based on common interests and shared principles. If one applies this idea to the international arena, nations would have to ‘prove’ their greatness by invoking what they were contributing to the common fund of humanity, to civilization, and what they were excelling in according to commonly accepted criteria.
2 Was France ‘the Most Civilised of Nations’?

3. Senior 1842, p. 6. Senior also wrote of England that she over-estimated her civilization (ibid., p. 18).
5. He continues: ‘– then, as now, the French were thought to have a monopoly on being civilized – ‘: Eagleton 2000(a), p. 9.
7. In fact, ‘[o]ne reason for the emergence of “culture”, then, is the fact that “civilization” was beginning to ring less and less plausible as a value-term’: Eagleton 2000(a), pp. 10–11.
9. That Arnold included Mill as one of these enemies caused the latter to protest and is obviously unfair, as the rest of this chapter should make clear. Cf. Robson (John M.) 1968, pp. 125–6.
17. On Buckle and his *History* see: Semmel 1976, pp. 370–86. I am mentioning Guizot here because both the title and the whole conception of the project (studying the history of civilisation in England by comparing it with the histories of the countries around it) are clearly reminiscent of Guizot’s *Histoire de la Civilisation en France* (1829–32). For a very casual and all-embracing use of ‘civilisation’ cf. Senior 1842, pp. 5–6.


34. See Varouxakis 1999 (especially pp. 296–305). A question that is bound to arise in this context is: If Guizot’s historical works were so significant in Britain, why have there not been more acknowledgments of his importance and influence on their thinking by individual thinkers? Besides the murkiness of ‘influence’ in general, there are at least two other, more concrete answers, one general and one specific to Britain. To start with the general, one reason why Guizot has received less attention than he deserves, and, in our specific example, why Mill’s indebtedness to Guizot had not received its
due by students of Mill’s thought, must be the similarity of many of Guizot’s views to those of Tocqueville. This similarity has led scholars to attribute to Tocqueville’s influence a number of ideas that both Mill and Tocqueville, and many others all over Europe, found in Guizot. The similarity in many of the pronouncements of the two French thinkers is due to the fact that Tocqueville was profoundly influenced by Guizot, whose pupil he was, literally. There is ample evidence that he regularly attended Guizot’s lectures (that were later published as *Cours d’Histoire Moderne*) in the years 1828–30, kept notes, and read – more than once – the published version. The notes Tocqueville kept have been published in his *Oeuvres Complètes*, XVI (*Mélanges*), pp. 439–534 (for the evidence to this effect see: Varouxakis 1999, p. 294 and particularly note 9). Now, as regards Guizot’s influence and recognition in Britain, there is one more reason. Guizot had become very unpopular in Britain because of the Spanish marriages affair (1847) and his popularity received a final blow when the regime under which he was the dominant minister was toppled as well as disgraced in February 1848. Here is what Macaulay wrote in a letter of Guizot, when the latter was in exile in England, in March 1848: ‘I left a card with Guizot, but did not ask to see him. I purposely avoided meeting him on Friday at Lord Holland’s. The truth is that I like and esteem the man. But I think the policy of the minister both at home and abroad detestable. At home it was all corruption, and abroad all treachery’ (Macaulay, *The Letters*, IV, p. 362 – 13 March 1848). On Mill’s seesaw attitude towards Guizot as a statesman see *infra*, Chapter 5.


38. Emphasis (both times) added: Mill (James) 1975, pp. 224, 228–9.

39. See, for instance, Bagehot, *Works*, IV, p. 108; also references specifying ‘commercial civilization’ or ‘material civilisation’: ibid., pp. 35, 88. For Bagehot’s comments on Guizot and his writings, see ibid., pp. 55–6, 440–4.


41. Emphasis added.


44. *CW*, X, p. 123.

45. Raymond Williams, commenting on the part of the text from Mill’s ‘Coleridge’ where Mill had presented the arguments of those who fixed their attention ‘upon the high price which is paid for’ the advantages of ‘civilization’, and apparently not being attentive to Mill’s two uses of ‘civilization’ in the other texts discussed here, opined: ‘This is an aggregation of a number of kinds of criticism of what Mill calls “Civilization”, but which, from the details of certain of its points, might better be called Industrialism’ (Williams (Raymond) 1961, p. 67). It would have been closer to Mill’s terminology to say ‘civilization in the narrow sense’.
46. Cf. CW, XVIII, p. 119.
49. CW, XII, p. 37 (8 October 1929 – emphasis in original).
51. Emphasis added. These views of England and its ‘narrow’, ‘social civilization’ had also been inculcated from a very early age in another of our Victorians, the young Matthew Arnold whilst he was a Sixth-Former at Rugby: ‘He also digested, at least in part, [Guizot's] Histoire de la Révolution d’Angleterre, en 1640, for Sixth-Form French, along with Guizot’s choleric view of the British as practical and sound in action, but lost and indignant in the realm of ideas’ (emphasis added: Honan 1981, p. 42). And, long later, he still appreciated Guizot’s historical works. We find Arnold in 1875 writing in a letter his recommendation for the improvement of the Oxford curriculum: ‘If they merely put in these works in other languages into their History curriculum – Thucydides, Tacitus, and, either Montesquieu’s Esprit des Lois, or Guizot’s [History of] Civilisation in France, the Tripos would be incalculably improved, and would be a real training’ (Letters, IV, p. 292). In the latter work Arnold must have found terms which he used very often in his frequent denunciations of the civilization of England and of its middle class, their ‘social civilisation’, or their ‘narrow civilisation’.
52. CW, XX, pp. 374–7. Cf., again, what young Matthew Arnold had to say on the Germans in a letter, in 1848, some of which seems almost verbatim taken from these pages of Guizot’s Histoire de la Civilisation en France: Letters, I, p. 114.
53. CW, XX, p. 378.
54. Guizot 1972, pp. 269, 279.
55. See CW, XX, pp. 290–4.
56. CW, X, pp. 31–74.
57. Cf. Stephen 1866a, p. 163.
59. CW, X, pp. 34–5.
60. See, for instance, ‘The English National Character’ (1834): CW, XXIII, pp. 717–27; also: CW, XII, pp. 38–9, 192; XIV, p. 95; XXIII, pp. 443–7, 527–8. Cf. Bagehot, Works, IV, pp. 113–14: ‘Intellect still gives there [in Paris], and has always given, a distinctive position. To be a membre de l’Institut is a recognised place in France; but in London, it is an ambiguous distinction to be a “clever fellow”.‘
61. See CW, XXIII, p. 721. Cf. ibid., 375. And in a letter to Sarah Austin (26 February 1844) Mill had written about Samuel Laing’s latest book on the continental countries: ‘It is strange to find a man recognizing as he does that the Norwegian, and German, and French state of society are much better for the happiness of all concerned than the struggling, go-ahead English and American
state, and yet always measuring the merit of all things by their tendency to increase the number of steam engines, and to make human beings as good machines and therefore as mere machines as those' (CW, XIII, p. 622). Cf. Laing 1842. Laing has been called ‘one of the few overt defenders of philistinism in Victorian times’, who rejected ‘culture and learning entirely’ and had concluded ‘that there is a fundamental antagonism, no less, between capitalism and culture’: Porter 1991, p. 355.


66. Forcade 1859, p. 989 (cf. supra, Chapter 1).


68. See, on the first point: Honan 1981, p. 42; and, on the second: Letters, IV, p. 292.

69. Cf. Crossley 1993, p. 84: ‘There is in fact an Arnoldian ring to many of Guizot’s pronouncements for, like the author of Culture and Anarchy, he understands civilisation in the broad sense as a moral force, as a humanising power which brings the inward moral and spiritual development of the individual into harmony with the forms of social and collective life.’


72. He went on: ‘The idea of perfection as a general expansion of the human family is at variance with our strong individualism. … Above all, the idea of perfection as a harmonious expansion of human nature is at variance with our want of flexibility, with our inaptitude for seeing more than one side of a thing….’: Culture and Anarchy: An Essay in Political and Social Criticism, Prose Works, V, pp. 85–229, particularly pp. 94–5.

73. Prose Works, V, pp. 96–9. Arnold often spoke of ‘civilisation’ and ‘humanisation’ as being interchangeable: ‘And man is not to be civilised or humanised, call it which you will, by thwarting his vital instincts.’: emphasis added: ‘Preface to Mixed Essays’ (1879), Prose Works, VIII, p. 371.


75. See, for example: ‘Equality’, Prose Works, VIII, p. 286.


80. Cf. Mill’s explicit acceptance, in his later writings and correspondence, that ‘civilization in the narrow sense’ was probably a necessary stage on the road to a fuller improvement of mankind (see supra).


85. Emphasis added.
86. Cf. Hamerton 1876. For very interesting remarks on Hamerton’s writings and impact see: Marandon 1967, passim.
87. He repeated this even more emphatically and expanded on the issue in: ‘The Incompatibles’ (1881), Prose Works, IX, pp. 242, 270–1.
89. Cf. Letters, IV, p. 163.
91. Emphasis added.
93. We may note here that this insistence was a major difference in emphasis between Arnold’s definition of civilization and that of Guizot, who had emphasised the intellectual and moral development of individuals, of great examples of individual excellence, without insisting on the spread of these qualities throughout society as a prerequisite of true civilization.
95. In a letter of 3 August 1859 Arnold had again referred to ‘what Sainte-Beuve calls an “intelligence ouverte et traversée”’: Letters, I, p. 481.
101. Letters, I, p. 95 (10 March 1848).

3 French Politics Through British ‘Glasses’

3. Emphasis added: Trevelyan 1908, p. 117.
4. Trevelyan 1908, p. 654. Cf. on Macaulay’s attitude towards the Revolution of 1789 and the lessons (in favour of reform) he wished the British Parliament to draw from it in 1832: Collini et al. 1983, pp. 196–7. Bagehot wrote in 1869: ‘A defeat of French Liberals is not their defeat only; it is a defeat of all Liberals. Throughout Europe for years free action and free thought were beaten and helpless because of the calamities of 1793 and the calamities of 1848.’: Works, IV, p. 134.
8. CW, XII, p. 55. For what the crowd seems to have asked for in July 1830 see: Newman (Edgar Leon) 1975, pp. 17–40. For a survey of historians’ divergent views on what happened in 1830 see Pilbeam 1991, pp. 1–12.


11. CW, XXII, p. 288.


16. CW, XX, pp. 167–215. For an account that connects adeptly Mill’s journalistic coverage of French affairs in the early 1830s with the reform agitation at home see Robson (Ann) 1986, pp. xlv–lxxi.

17. It must have been the events that took place a month after he wrote his most optimistic article (of 30 March 1834: CW, XXIII, pp. 692–5), the April 1834 insurrections and their aftermath, that shuttered any hopes Mill might still have retained for progress in France as a result of the July Revolution.


23. Emphasis added. Cf. Bagehot’s later remark (in September 1870) that ‘By long and painful experience, France has attained what may be called a routine in revolutions.’: Works, VIII, p. 182.


26. Selected Writings, I, p. 422.


28. Emphasis added: CW, XIX, p. 583. Bagehot was to speak similarly of governmental change by ‘spasms of revolutionary ardour’ (see infra, Part III).


30. In particular with regard to Carrel’s impact on Mill’s editorial ventures and ambitions, see Robson and Robson 1985, pp. 235–8, 240–1, 248. Mill seems to have given Carrel no less credit for his qualities as a commentator of the French political scene. As he wrote, in September 1835, to no less a commentator of that scene than Tocqueville, about Carrel, ‘him I conceive to be, next to you [the] best authority I know on the state of France’: CW, XII, p. 272. Cf. ibid., p. 309.


32. See, in particular on the dimension referred to here, CW, XX, 209–10, where Mill quotes from Nisard’s article on ‘Armand Carrel’ in the Revue des Deux Mondes of October 1837 (see: Nisard 1837, pp. 14–15, 16).
33. CW, XX, p. 209.
38. See, for instance, CW, XXIII, pp. 694–5.
39. The conclusions presented here are based on the examination of a bewildering number of newspaper writings and letters; but a useful text that somehow epitomises his attitude can be found in: CW, XXIII, pp. 661–3.
42. See, for instance: CW, XXIII, pp. 340–1, 530, 661–3.
44. CW, XX, pp. 200–1.
45. CW, XIII, p. 731.
47. The Letters, IV, p. 362.
50. Collected Letters, XXII, p. 257 (28 February 1848). Some weeks later, when the Chartist agitation was reaching its peak, Emerson reported to Matthew Arnold that ‘Carlyle was much agitated by the course of things: ... He gives our institutions as they are called – aristocracy – Church – etc. five years, I heard last night’: Arnold, Letters, I, p. 101 (12 April 1848).
52. Cf. Arnold’s comments to that effect: Letters, I, pp. 91, 93.
57. Emphasis added.
59. Carlyle 1892, pp. 15–52.
62. CW, XXV, pp. 1099–1100.
66. In this Greg differed from Lord Brougham or Senior, who both defended Louis Philippe (the former incomparably more than the latter).
68. Cf. Acton, Selected Writings, II, p. 73: ‘...there is something in the French nation which incapacitates it for liberty;...what they have always sought, and sometimes enjoyed, is not freedom;...their liberty must diminish in proportion as their ideal is attained’. Cf. also: Acton, Selected Writings, III, p. 15; Mill, CW, XIX, pp. 420–1.
70. Emphasis added: Greg 1848, p. 366.
71. Emphasis added.
72. And like most observers, Greg thought that another discouraging feature of the situation was ‘the singular absence of all great men’, with the partial exception of Lamartine (again typical). For the extent to which Lamartine was the darling of the ruling elites in Britain, even of those most apprehensive about the new republic, see: Bensimon 1999.
73. Cf. Acton, Selected Writings, III, p. 600.
76. Cf. Bagehot, Works, XII, pp. 271–2; IV, p. 112. Even while in his most exuberantly Francophile phase, Mill agreed also: see CW, XXIII, p. 402.
77. Greg 1848, p. 368.
78. See: The Examiner, 1848, p. 243.
80. For this parallel between Burke-Paine and Brougham-Mill see Levin 1998.
81. The previous occasion was when he came to the defence of Tocqueville in 1843.
82. CW, XIII, p. 731 (29 February 1848).
83. For Mill’s first comment on the form of government see, in particular: CW, XX, pp. 330–1. However, as he was to argue in 1849 (in the ‘Vindication of the French Revolution of February 1848’), though a republic was ‘the most natural and congenial of all forms of free government’ for France (because of the traits of the French national character), ‘it had two great hindrances to contend with’, namely ‘the political indifference of the majority’ and ‘the dread inspired by the remembrance of 1793 and 1794’. These two causes ‘will render its existence, even now when it is established, more or less precarious’: CW, XX, p. 332.
84. CW, XIII, 731–2 (29 February 1848)); cf. Bain 1882, p. 94. Mill was expressing a view shared by many in France in 1848: see McLaren 1971, pp. 57–8; and Robson (John M.) 1985, p. cviii (n. 40).
87. CW, XIII, pp. 735–6.


91. Unlike his deceased brother, Godefroy (whose intimacy with Jane Welsh Carlyle while in exile in London had given rise to a lot of gossip), Eugène Cavaignac was not one of the radical republicans, but rather a moderate.

92. CW, XIV, p. 12.


94. He gave an example of what he meant by the last phrase: ‘As an example I may mention the grand idea of the Provisional Government, that of making all education, even professional, gratuitous…’.

95. Cf. ‘England and Ireland’ (13 May 1848), CW, XXV, pp. 1099–1100.


98. Mill conveniently presented the divisions among the republicans and among the members of the Provisional Government itself as having started after the June insurrection. Senior’s account which speaks of serious divisions and enmities long before seems to be much more accurate in this respect (Senior 1973a).


100. Letters, I, p. 94.


104. Letters, I, p. 94 (10 March 1848).

105. The phrase ‘vis a vis of’ is one of many examples of what the overzealous defender of John Bull at the time meant, when he wrote of Arnold: ‘He is so warm upon this subject [of French intellectual superiority] that he has taught himself to write a dialect as like French as pure English can be.’: Stephen 1864b, p. 683.


111. Senior 1973(a). This was a review article on Lamartine’s Histoire de la Révolution de 1848. He had already commented on the revolution earlier, with the review article ‘The French Republicans’ (Senior 1848).
113. Senior 1973(a), pp. 7–8.
115. Senior 1973a, pp. 28–32.

116. Emphasis (both times) added: Acton, ‘Sir Erskine May’s Democracy in Europe’ (1978), Selected Writings, I, p. 79 (the ‘saviour of society’ alluded to was, of course, Louis Napoleon).


118. Mill, CW, VIII, pp. 946–7; Morley 1997, p. 61. In Morley’s On Compromise reference is given to: Mill, A System of Logic, Book VI, Chapter XI; in fact, the text quoted by Morley is from Book VI, Chapter XII.


120. Emphasis (both times) added: Trevelyan 1908, p. 654.


122. Which makes Christopher Harvie’s comments on him in this respect quite unfair. In fact Mill’s attitude was exactly like that of Harvie’s academics ‘who loathed the Emperor with almost irrational intensity’: see Harvie 1976, p. 154.

123. See CW, XV, p. 534 (30 June 1857).


125. CW, XIX, p. 584. (For Dupont-White’s special and complex case see: Hazareesingh 1997(b)). And on 17 September 1862, Mill wrote to T. Gomperz: ‘In Europe things appear to be going on well, as far at least, as mental progress is concerned. This is very visible in the higher order of writers in France’: CW, XV, p. 795. Cf. ibid., p. 952. Cf. Girard 1985, pp. 188–9.

126. CW, XV, p. 929 (18 March 1864). Arnold received a couple of such invitations as well: Letters, III, pp. 13, 51 (his reasons for rejecting them were more practical).

127. In May 1863 the Republicans had won eight of the nine seats in the capital: see Plamenatz 1952, p. 124. For Mill’s comments see: CW, XXXII, p. 141; CW, XV, p. 917.


131. CW, XVII, p. 1609; ibid., 1611.


133. Plessis refers, as an example, to Carnot’s defeat by a fellow republican: Plessis 1985, pp. 164–5.

134. Mill was referring to ‘the Temps newspaper’ and to ‘Jules Favre, Jules Simon, Carnot, Garnier Pagès, Lanjuinais’: CW, XVI, pp. 1224–5 (29 December 1866).


138. ‘Duveyrier’s Political Views of French Affairs’ (1846), CW, XX, p. 297.
139. Cf. Claeys 1987, pp. 143–4, on Mill’s worries about the popularity of ‘the essentially “Continental” doctrine of revolution’ during these years.
142. See, for example, CW, XVI, p. 1304, where he spoke of ‘the superiority of England over France in the love and practice of personal and political freedom’. Cf. CW, XIX, p. 565.
143. CW, XIX, pp. 420–1; ‘Centralisation’, CW, XIX, p. 610 (the emphasis is mine). Mill wrote in The Subjection of Women that ‘[t]he love of power and the love of liberty are in eternal antagonism. Where there is least liberty, the passion for power is the most ardent and unscrupulous’. ‘The desire of power over others’ was ‘a depraving agency among mankind’: CW, XXI, p. 338.
144. Acton wrote that the purpose of all the Continental governments, framed on the pattern of ‘the ideas of 1789, incorporated in that [French] Constitution of 1791’ was ‘not that the people should obtain security for freedom, but participation of power. The increase in the number of those who share the authority renders the authority still more irresistible’: ‘Cavour’ (July 1861), Selected Writings, I, p. 441.
145. ‘Chateaubriand had grumbled that the French do not like liberty, but go instinctively to power’: Weber 1990, p. 186.
146. In a review article that same year Lord Acton described ‘the attempt of France to establish a durable edifice on the ruins of 1789’ as ‘the vicious circle of the last seventy years’: Acton, Selected Writings, II, p. 76.
148. Works, XII, pp. 321–2. Reports on the disillusionment with the Republic were coming long before 1851. As Macaulay wrote from Paris on 11 September 1849: ‘No private person shows, as far as I have seen, the least love or respect for the present form of government. The word republic is hardly uttered without a sneer’: The Letters, V, p. 72. Cf. ibid., p. 75. And Ruskin reported in October 1848 that the bourgeoisie were, ‘as well as the soldiery, thoroughly sick of the republic’: quoted in Batchelor 2000, p. 75.
150. Macaulay too was for the President. He wrote in a letter on 3 December 1851: ‘I am, on the whole, for the President and the army…. It is idle to complain that an army domineers over a society in which whatever is not army is Chaos.’: The Letters, V, p. 210.
151. The phrase from Mill is to be found in A System of Logic, Book VI, Chapter XII (CW, VIII, p. 946), and is immediately followed by the text where Mill criticised severely the results of French ‘geometrical’ reasoning, in the passage quoted by Morley in On Compromise (see supra, Part II).
153. See: St John-Stevas 1965, pp. 51–2. It may also need to be remembered that Bagehot was just recovering from some kind of depression, which was the real reason for his sojourn in Paris (see ibid., pp. 49–52). Like with so many other Englishmen before and since, it worked: Paris did wonders for his
spirits, as his (highly recommended) letters to his mother and friends testify (Works, XII, pp. 320, 324, 330–1, 331–2).

154. Works, IV, p. 30. The President's term was non-renewable, according to the Second Republic's Constitution. Louis Napoleon had failed to assemble the necessary three fourths majority in the National Assembly that would allow a constitutional amendment to go through, which would give him a second term in office, which he ardently desired. It was a constitutional deadlock, and no solution in sight, except a violent or revolutionary one. This is exactly what Mill had warned against in the 'Vindication', in April 1849.


156. Works, IV, pp. 29–34.

157. Works, IV, pp. 35–44.


164. Works, IV, pp. 77–84.

165. Apparently such ‘stealthy, secret, unknown, excellent, forces’ were soon to be at work, especially in the 1860s, preparing the French for democratic citizenship to an extent Bagehot could not guess. Major among them were, as Sudhir Hazareesingh has recently shown, exactly forces related to the municipalism which Bagehot discarded as insufficient to change the habits of the French ‘character’. See Hazareesingh 1997a; 1998, pp. 233–305, and passim. Cf. Greg 1848, p. 367.

166. Works, IV, pp. 81–3.

167. Works, IV, p. 117.


170. A year earlier, Mill had expressed a similar concern, with regard to whether Italy ‘would form its character as a selfgoverning nation on French ideas or on English’ (CW, XV, p. 798 – 24 September 1862). And, during the two previous years (in 1861 and in 1862), Acton spoke similarly of an English and a French political model which other Continental nations had to chose between, in his articles ‘Cavour’ (Selected Writings, I, pp. 441–2), and ‘Nationality’ (ibid., pp. 414–15, 424).


178. ‘Caesaranism as it now exists’, Works, IV, pp. 111–19 (The Economist, 4 March 1865).
193. See, for one more expression of Bagehot’s wholehearted support for the new republic and for his hopes arising from ‘M. Thiers’ astute policy of gradually accustoming France to associate order and strength, and a certain limited amount of liberty, with the name and form of a republic.’: ‘The Imperialist Manifesto’ (25 January 1873), *Works*, IV, pp. 167–8.
195. *Works*, VIII, pp. 220–1. Cf. Mill’s comments at the time of the Franco-Prussian war, concerning the political indifference of the mass of the French people and its disastrous consequences (*CW*, XVII, p. 1769) and his conclusion that ‘[t]he peasantry of France like to women of England have still to learn that politics concern themselves.’ (ibid., pp. 1774–5).
201. For Mill’s assertion that ‘constitutional royalty is in itself a thing as uncongenial to the character and habits of the French … as it is suited to the tone of thought and feeling characteristic of England’ and his elaborate argumentation supporting it see: *CW*, XX, pp. 331–2.
203. *Works*, VIII, p. 238. These had been the arguments used by Mill already in the early 1830s to explain to the British readers (in the *Examiner* in particular) why Guizot’s and the other *Doctrinaires*’ endeavours to create an upper house
in France in imitation of their beloved British experience were misplaced and doomed (see CW, XXII, pp. 200–01, 343; XXIII, p. 682).

204. Works, VIII, pp. 242–5 (The Economist, 6 March 1875).


207. Cf. Kent 1978, pp. 144–6. Cf. Bagehot, Physics and Politics, Works, VII, pp. 50–1 (then Bagehot was accusing them of wishing 'to introduce here an imitation of the Napoleonic system, a dictatorship founded on the proletariat'; but in the 1870s Harrison was completely disillusioned with Bonapartism and a staunch republican: cf. Prochaska 2000, pp. 123–6).

208. See, on this last point: Harrison 1879; cf. also Harrison 1874; 1877. For an excellent brief account see Vogeler 1984, pp. 127–31.


4 French National Character and French Politics


3. Cf. Bagehot’s statement: “‘Motley was the wear’ of the world when Herodotus first looked on it and described it to us ...’: Works, VII, p. 80.


11. Faverty 1951, p. 27. Carlyle did write in a letter predicting disaster for France (in late 1848) that he and his wife ‘hope[d] better things; having a kind of love for these beautiful unhappy little fools, after all.’ But the compliment is at best mixed even in that statement! (*Collected Letters*, XXIII, pp. 176–7).
13. Faverty 1951, p. 76. Cf. ibid., pp. 97, 98; Poliakov 1971, p. 64.
17. Cf. Pecora 1997–98; Faverty 1951, p. 191 and *passim*; Trilling 1974, pp. 232–43. The 1860s was an important decade in terms of the flourishing of such ‘scientific’ disciplines. Shortly before Arnold came to write the lectures that became his *On the Study of Celtic Literature*, James Hunt had left the Ethnological Society of London and had founded (1863) the breakaway Anthropological Society, in order to promote more directly the relevance of the study of racial traits for political and social issues (for more see: Rainger 1978; Burrow 1968, pp. 121, 130).
23. Faverty 1951, pp. 76–7 (and more generally pp. 76–110). The Englishman's prime defect was lack of intelligence or critical thought, what Arnold called (following, once more, his French mentors) their ‘unintelligence’. At the same time, ‘energy’ was the ‘strong point and favourable characteristic’ of the English. Such views were common-place at the time and by no means original with Arnold (cf. Langford 2000, pp. 29–82, and *passim*). With English ‘energy’ and its twin in the German (fellow-Teutonic) nation, ‘steadiness’, Arnold associated ‘honesty’, regarding it as a Teutonic trait. Last but far from least, as we saw earlier, the English had *morality*, they possessed the ‘power of conduct’, like the rest of the Teutons.


27. Faverty 1951, pp. 95, 124.

28. ‘Numbers’, Prose Works, X, pp. 155–9; ‘A French Worthy’, Prose Works, X, pp. 89–93. Cf. ‘Renan’s “La Réforme intellectuelle et morale de la France”’ (1872), Prose Works, VII, P. 45. Arnold’s explanation of the decline of France as the result of the dying out of the Teutonic element in the population was not so idiosyncratic, although he put his own stamp on the way he formulated it of course. It was widely held in the nineteenth century that the most ‘virile’, ‘solid’ and ‘serious’ element in modern western civilization was the Teutonic. E.A. Freeman, Thomas Carlyle or Thomas Arnold were in good company in strenuously asserting this. For all sorts of imaginative or hair-raising explanations of the defeat of France in 1870 in racial terms and particularly in terms of the French Celts’ defects see Cornick 1996 (particularly pp. 150, 155 (n.43)).

29. For an instance where the author could have raised the issue that something happened between 1867 and 1872 which may have affected Arnold’s views or at the very least his emphasis, see Faverty 1951, p. 137.

30. That there is a contradiction when the proposition that racial extraction determines character and intellectual and moral traits, is accompanied, within the same breath, by the assertion that in the case of the French, it is not their overwhelmingly Celtic blood but rather their Latin civilization that gives the nation its character is one of the ‘confusions’ alluded to earlier. Cf. Trilling 1974, p. 239 (fn) – Trilling was referring to Arnold’s assertion regarding the English admixture; yet, the argument applies to both cases.


32. Emphasis added. Arnold continued here: ‘and it may be remarked in passing that this distinction makes the conditions of the future for Latin Italy quite different from those of Celtic France.’ Cf. Greg 1848, p. 368.


35. ‘Monsieur Henri Martin, whose chapters on the Celts in his Histoire de France are full of information and interest.’


38. In the detailed exposition that follows Arnold referred to ‘the Latinised Frenchman’ as one of the successfully sensuous races, successful because they had also ‘the talent’ to make the bent they shared with ‘the Celt proper’ (‘sensuousness’) serve to a practical embellishment of their mode of living. This made them successful in material civilization to an extent the Celt proper was not. In other words, he did not identify the French with the Celtic trait he was describing, but rather grouped ‘the Latinised French’ next to the Greek and Latin races in contradistinction to ‘the Celt proper’ – such as the Irishman. (Cf. what I argued earlier about the difference between Celtic Literature and works written after the Franco-Prussian War.)


41. CW, XX, p. 238.
42. For some examples (among many) see: Pecora 1997–98, p. 372; Steele 1970; Mazlish 1975, p. 407.
44. For more on Mill on race see: Varouxakis 1998(a).
47. See, for instance: ‘The Count de Montalembert’ (1858), Selected Writings, III, pp. 9–16 (particularly p. 12).
50. It seems, however, that Acton did not remain all his life as convinced of the importance of the racial factor as he seems to be in this review, given what he came to write in some of his extant manuscripts (see Himmelfarb 1952, pp. 182–3).
52. On Dr Arnold’s view see: Stanley 1860, I, p. 77. On Freeman’s see: Faverty 1951, p. 30; Burrow 1981, passim.
53. See, for an instance, ‘Equality’, where he made such a distinction, explaining that what he had written ‘so far’ applied to ‘the English people as a whole’, and then going on to identify the specific character traits of the different classes: Prose Works, VIII, p. 293.
57. Works, VII, p. 65.
60. Works, VII, p. 80. Cf. ibid., p. 121.
65. Nuances are significant and it should be noted that the way Bagehot’s view of the importance of variety is expressed in Physics and Politics (as well as his insistence in other works on the need for the existence and contributions of men of different characters in each parliament and in each cabinet), is reminiscent of Machiavelli’s arguments in the Discourses.
66. *Works*, VII, p. 57. On views concerning the racial mix that made up France among French historians in the nineteenth century see: Crossley 1993, pp. 200–1, 204–7; Citron 1987; Barzun 1941.


70. *Works*, IV, pp. 50–53.


73. Cf. Faverty 1951, p. 56, for an instance of what Arnold had to say on similar issues (the examples from Arnold could be multiplied easily).


81. Cf. Stephen 1859(d), 1864(b).


87. For more see Varouxakis 1998(b). This claim is not meant to ignore or play down the importance of Mill’s interest in, and conversance with, other national or cultural groups, such as the inhabitants of the Indian subcontinent and Ireland. For their significance in this context, see, for instance, Robson (John M.) 1998, pp. 338–71.


90. *CW*, XXII, pp. 154–6. Mill was by no means alone in attributing importance to the generation factor in France at the period in question: See Spitzer 1987, pp. 3, 4, 270(n.3) and *passim*.


94. CW, XX, pp. 190–2.
95. For more on this issue see Varouxakis 1998(b).
96. CW, XIX, p. 418. He noted that in regard to the ‘infirmities’ he was about to refer to it was ‘not ... obvious that the government of One or a Few would have any tendency to cure or alleviate the evil.’: ibid.
97. CW, XIX, p. 420.
100. Cf. CW, XXII, p. 159; and CW, XX, p. 193. For the same view on the French cf. also: Senior 1973, pp. 1–4, 28–9; Acton, Selected Writings, I, pp. 525–6.
102. CW, XIX, pp. 420–1. The ‘representative government by a limited class’ which ‘[broke] down by excess of corruption’ was, obviously, the July Monarchy; ‘the attempt at representative government by the whole male population’ was that made with the installation of the Second Republic.
103. CW, XIX, p. 421.
104. CW, XXII, p. 134.
105. ‘[T]he events of 1848 have taught thinking persons ... that of all ... circumstances ... affecting political problems, by far and out of all question the most important is national character’ (Bagehot, Works, IV, pp. 48–9.).
106. Miles Taylor uses the phrase ‘Liberalism in one country’: Taylor 1995.
107. As he put it himself in a letter to his mother (24 March 1866) explaining what he had tried to do in his letter to the Pall Mall Gazette, in response to the criticisms of ‘Horace’ (see supra, chapter 1): ‘I was glad to have an opportunity to disclaim that positive admiration of things foreign, and that indifference to English freedom, which have often been imputed to me – and to explain that I do not disparage freedom, but take it for granted as our condition, and go on to consider other things.’: Letters, III, p. 22. See also Arnold’s letter to the Pall Mall: ‘A Courteous Explanation’, Prose Works, V, pp. 25–6.
108. Quoted in: Trilling 1974, p. 345. As Trilling goes on to comment: ‘The French defeat in the Prussian war was retribution for a personal lubricity resulting in political confusion.’: ibid.
109. Prose Works, VII, p. 44.
110. Cf. Judt 1992, p. 308: ‘It is a long-standing particularity ... of the French that they are, in the words of Caesar describing his Gallic subjects, rerum novarum cupidī’ [avid for novelties].
111. Prose Works, III, p. 344.
112. CW, XVII, p. 1769.

5 Grandleur and Frenchness: Nationalism, International Relations and French National Character

3. See Hampson 1998, pp. 120–44.
7. Senior 1842, pp. 1–2.
12. Emphasis added: Senior 1842, pp. 4–5. Machiavelli would have disagreed, if he could read the article from the grave. He would have told Senior ‘that the French have always behaved in the same way’, ‘full of avarice, pride, ferocity, and untrustworthiness’. This was what he wrote of them in Chapter Forty-Three of *The Discourses*, where the Florentine insisted ‘that nations retain the same habits of life over long periods’ (Machiavelli 1994, pp. 216–17).
13. See Tocqueville’s speech in: *OC*, III, 2, pp. 288–301. The speech had been reported at length in *The Times* on 2, 3 December 1840. See also: Lawlor 1959, pp. 43–66; Drescher 1964, pp. 152–61; Aron 1965, pp. 17–20; Boesche 1987, pp. 62–5, 212.
17. Emphasis added.
18. Emphasis added.
30. Cairns 1985, pp. xx, xviii. Raymond Aron has also paid some attention to the exchanges between Mill and Tocqueville on this crisis, regarding them as characteristic of broader and recurring attitudes in the two countries with regard to their relationship with each other. Aron appears to side, though tacitly, with Mill against Tocqueville (Aron 1965, pp. 17–20). See also Todorov 1993, pp. 191–207, especially 195–7. Todorov is more overtly critical of Tocqueville’s stance.
31. CW, XIII, pp. 445–6 (letter to John Sterling, 1 October 1840).
34. OC, VI, 1, pp. 330–1.
35. CW, XIII, pp. 457–60.
37. Emphasis added: CW, XIII, pp. 459–60. Two years later, Mill wrote to Tocqueville again, referring to the same affair and the same man: ‘Je voudrais qu’on crucifiât le premier homme qui osât dire à la tribune d’un peuple des injures contre un autre peuple. Il faut des générations entières pour guérir le mal que cela peut faire dans un jour.’: CW, XIII, p. 571 (20 February 1843).
38. Tocqueville 1985, pp. 149–52 (the original: OC, VI, 1, pp. 334–6).
40. Cf. Bentham: ‘national honour consists in justice’; and: ‘the glory of being able to hit the hardest blow ought to be left to schoolboys’: quoted in: Conway 1989, p. 93.
41. Cf. Senior’s statement (in his article of that same year) that the way the French were influenced by their resentment against England resembled that of ‘a child, and an ill-educated child’.
42. CW, XIII, pp. 536–7.
44. This is exactly what Senior asserted in ‘France, America, and Britain’ in 1842.
46. See Lawlor 1959, pp. 67–8. Cf. the explanation of the reasons that must have forced Guizot to pursue such a policy on that instance given to Senior by a Frenchman and reported by him in: Senior 1973(b), p. 139.
47. Though there were some hints at Tocqueville’s themes from 1840, the speech was not bellicose: see OC, III, 2, pp. 338–52, p. 341. Rather, this speech should be seen as the first step in the process suggested by Drescher, of Tocqueville’s imperceptibly moving from calls for great acts in foreign affairs towards ‘vehement pleas for the salvation of political action at home’: see Drescher 1964, pp. 161–2. Though Tocqueville was to attack once more the notion of the Anglo-French alliance in the future (in 1845: see ibid., pp. 162–6), he had by no means done so on the occasion in question, in 1843.
48. See Lawlor 1959, pp. 83–4, 89.
53. CW, XIII, pp. 451–2 (19 December 1840). Mill did not exaggerate the importance of Guizot’s role, given the difficulties of the task he had set himself in trying to avert war and revitalize the (extremely unpopular) Anglo-French alliance (see: Bullen 1974, pp. 23, 26–8 and passim; Bullen 1991, pp. 187–201; Johnson 1963, pp. 268–73). The significance of the crisis of 1840 can hardly be exaggerated either. Senior reported (with apparent agreement) that in 1849 a French interlocutor explained to him that it was the humiliation felt by the French then, and the powerlessness of Guizot’s and Louis Philippe’s governments to gratify French susceptibilities that led to the fatal increase in the regime’s unpopularity and consequently to the Revolution of 1848 (Senior 1973(b), p. 139).
54. CW, XIII, pp. 454–5 (23 December 1840). Cf. CW, XIII, pp. 456–7; XX, pp. 185–6; 259; XII, p. 61; XIII, pp. 654, 714. Significantly, it was again a question of foreign policy and Franco-British relations, the Spanish Marriages, that modified, to an extent, Mill’s favourable view of Guizot (CW, XIII, p. 714).
56. Duveyrier 1843.
59. CW, XX, p. 314. (The French were perceived, as Bagehot was to put it two decades later, as ‘the… interfering French nation’: Works, IV, pp. 128–9.)
60. Senior 1842.
62. See: Macaulay, The Letters, IV, p. 362 (13 March 1848); Mill, CW, XIII, p. 714; Arnold, Letters, I, p. 95 (Arnold believed that it was the King who had lied, not Guizot); Acton, ‘Review of Bright’s History of England’ (1888), Selected Writings, I, p. 166. Cf. Senior 1973(b), pp. 139–40.
64. Senior 1873(a), pp. 60–1.
66. Emphasis added: Senior 1973(a), pp. 64–5. Cf. Senior 1973(b), I, p. 262: ‘This barbarous feeling of nationality… has become the curse of Europe.’
68. Brougham 1848, pp. 120–2, 126.
70. See more on this: Varouxakis 1997, pp. 70–5.
72. For more on Lamartine’s predicament at the time and on how he acquitted himself see: Chastain 1988.
73. For more see Bensimon 1999.
78. Bain 1882, p. 93.
82. Emphasis (both times) added.
91. Emphasis added.
93. Emphasis added. Something similar was noticed also by a German observer who knew the French well: ‘Whoever in France possesses and understands national feeling, exercises an irresistible magic charm on the masses, and may lead or drive them at will’: Heine 1893, VIII, pp. 219–20. Cf. Marx 1991; Senior 1865, pp. 120–2.
95. Arnold had a different view on this point in 1859.
101. ‘Continental Alarms’, *Works*, IV, pp. 121–5, *The Economist*, 5 October 1867. His first reason for optimism was ‘the vagueness of the subject matter of the quarrel. It is difficult even for the French [emphasis added] to go to war from mere jealousy of the increasing power and prosperity of a rival nation, which has done them no wrong, …which is simply endeavouring …to carry out those doctrines of nationality which France has always proclaimed as sacred’ (p. 122).
103. Harrison 1911, II, pp. 2–3: ‘Like nearly all English politicians, certainly all Liberals to a man, I had been a hearty opponent of the French pretext for commencing war’. And ‘all through the summer and autumn... I had warmly hoped for German victories, with the final extinction of the Imperial dynasty and the Napoleonic Legend’.
104. See: Raymond 1967; Cornick 1996.
105. But then, probably they saw the matter in the way Carlyle put it, in November 1870: ‘If, among this multitude of sympathetic bystanders, France have any true friend, his advice to France would be, To abandon all that, and never to resume it more.’: *Critical and Miscellaneous Essays*, V, pp. 49–59, p. 55.
111. Emphasis added.
114. *Critical and Miscellaneous Essays*, V, p. 52. Arch-Teutomaniac E.A. Freeman was among those who wrote also in support of the German claim to Alsace-Lorraine (*The Times*, 18 February 1871).
119. Cf. my remarks in Chapter 1, note 79.
121. CW, XVII, pp. 1764–5; cf. ibid., pp. 1767, 1769.
122. CW, XVII, p. 1799.
123. See: CW, XVII, pp. 1760–1, 1795–6, 1805–6. Italy also should prepare for war, he wrote to Villari: CW, XVII, p. 1807 (16 February 1871).
124. CW, XVII, pp. 1774, 1795; cf. ibid., pp. 1798, 1806.
128. CW, XVII, pp. 1769, 1774–5.
129. CW, XVII, pp. 1761–2.
130. See CW, XVII, pp. 1764–5, 1767, 1769, 1795; cf. ibid., p. 1807.

**Epilogue: La France Éternelle? Comparing with other ‘Glasses’**

2. De Gaulle himself argued that his constitution was ‘consistent with ... the traits of our national character’ (quoted in: Cerny 1980, p. 44).
10. For more on what he means by this see: Rosanvallon 2000, pp. 183–221.
13. Cf. Tombs 1994, p. 173: ‘Because of this centrality of the State in the life of society, all ... political struggles focus, in the last analysis, on influencing or securing control of the apparatus of the State.’
24. It is at least arguable that Mill did not attempt anything like a thorough assessment, in book or article form, of the prospects of French politics in the last years of his life because he did not like what he would have come up with.
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