

GUIZOT.

An Interview with the Venerable and Illustrious Statesman of France.

THE DISCOVERY OF LIVINGSTONE.

The Herald Deserving "the Gratitude of Mankind."

THE FIRST NAPOLEON AND GUIZOT.

Guizot's Opinions of Gambetta, Thiers, Bismarck, Eugenie, Prince Napoleon and the Pope.

PROTESTANTISM IN FRANCE.

A Critical and Brilliant Estimate of Napoleon III.

THE DEATH OF THE IMPERIAL PARTY.

France Unfit for a Republic—Father Hyacinthe and His Marriage—Napoleon a Journalist, Prisoner and Conspirator.

FRANCE, GERMANY AND ITALY.

France an Invalid and Peace Her Only Salvation.

PARIS, Jan. 31, 1873.

"THE STREET OF THE ORATORY OF SOULS."

These who look at an old map of Paris, dated 1773—a copy of which is now hanging in the room in which the correspondents of the Herald are now writing these lines—will observe that the city practically ends with what is the Madeleine. La Fayette and Belleville, two unsavory names in modern Parisian history, are modest little villages apart, with crooked roads, plainly marked, and a church, surmounted by a cross, signifying that God was there and then worshipped. There is a hill called Chevillet and another called Passy, and a third, partly hill and partly town, called Montmartre. Paris has absorbed them all since that year of memory 1776, and likewise two other villages, called Monceaux and Les Terres. Near these two latter villages is the scene of Baron Haussmann's greatest triumphs. New Paris—gaudy, open, very cold and bleak these wintry days, with snow falling—covers the rural spaces. Monceaux is, perhaps, the prettiest and tinnest park in France—paradise of nursery maids in the warm summer weather. The huge Arch of Triumph looms up in the star of avenues, looking with ghastly irony, one would think, on the ruins of the Tuileries from one side and down the pretentious Avenue of the Grand Army on the other. In this section there is a narrow street running into the Champs Elysees. A quiet street, which has had its own peculiar fame, is now known as Rue Billant. Then, when Gambetta came and took to changing names to suit the vanity of his followers, it was called Rue Jules Favre. But elegant Jules came to grief—serious grief and many tears—as all the world knows, and the street came to be known as Rue de l'Oratoire du Roule, which means that in the last century there was a famous religious house or oratory called Le Roule. House, priests and all have vanished, and vain people breathe the air in the open spaces they left behind them, and called Elysian Fields. This street is their only souvenir, and here lives Francois Guizot, in some respects the most famous man in France.

THE HOME OF GUIZOT.

Your correspondent found himself here by appointment—M. Guizot having expressed his willingness to converse with him upon affairs in France. It was a comfortable apartment, furnished in a comfortable English manner, a profusion of carpets—a thing not common to French houses. There was no luxury; only a few pictures of a serious cast. There was heavy red velvet furniture and a portrait of Guizot himself—taken, one would say, fifty years ago, it is so young and fresh. The books scattered on the table were mainly religious, serious and historical, and one would be as much surprised to see a novel here as to see an acrobat dancing a tight rope in Notre Dame. There is a sentiment of honesty, purity, almost austerity of mind, and regularly paid bills. In this apartment Guizot lives as a kind of political shrine. All men seek him—the young to partake of his experience, the old to share his memories. Now and then one meets a republican, but the old man does not court the fiery leaders of young France. I doubt whether he knows a republican under fifty. As your correspondent was ushered in two gentlemen passed out. One was Duc de Broglie, the other the Duc d'Audoubert-Pasquier.

GUIZOT.

As your correspondent entered the inner room the venerable statesman gave him a warm welcome and beckoned to a chair. In the body Guizot is small, frail, thin; in the eye thinner from his habit of wearing a long brown frock coat. In his coat lapel was the red ribbon of the Legion of Honor. His hair was silvered; the face full of life and brightness; dark gray eyes, that looked earnestly at you from under his black velvet skull cap. A dry man, of earnest mind—keen rather than wide—without the slightest trace of humor, who awes his auditors and compels the decorum and respect that we pay to women. In his conversation nothing was more marked than his dislike to republicans and all republican forms of government. Guizot spends most of his time at his little chateau in Normandy. He has a moderate income—from his books mainly. He was born October 4, 1788, and is now, therefore, in the eighty-sixth year of his age.

GUIZOT AND THE DISCOVERY OF LIVINGSTONE.

Your correspondent explained to M. Guizot that he called upon him, not from motives of idle curiosity, but in obedience to the commands of the editor of the Herald, who was now giving to the American people the views of the leading men of France on the present situation of affairs. In a country with so many diversified interests as France there was no way of reaching an intelligent appreciation of its wants and purposes unless by seeking the counsel of men who, like himself, had lived in a large share of its history.

The venerable statesman replied that he quite understood the motives which prompted the visit of the Herald representative, and he was very glad to say anything to the American people, especially through such a newspaper as he understood the Herald to be. "Wait not," he said, "the Herald which sent a correspondent and an expedition to discover Dr. Livingstone?"

Your correspondent replied that the expedition had been organized by Mr. James Gordon Bennett, the present proprietor of the Herald. M. Guizot remarked that it was "a noble idea, bravely carried out, and that the whole world had cause of gratitude to Mr. Bennett and his representative." Then, after a pause, he said, "Is the Herald a Christian journal? Has it any special religious policy?"

"IS THE HERALD A CHRISTIAN JOURNAL?"

Your correspondent answered that, in the broad, catholic sense of supporting moral principles, good government, purity of thought and social progress, the Herald was a Christian newspaper; that in a country like America, where there was so much religious intolerance, where all sects were equal

fore the law, and a man could worship Jesus, Mohammed or Buddha, as his conscience disposed him, no daily newspaper allowed itself to any sect. The Herald, however, recognized the usefulness and utility of every phase of religious faith as giving strength and moral tone to a State. And, accordingly, it had adopted a plan of publishing every Monday morning full reports of the sermons preached by leading divines on the day before. M. Guizot listened attentively to the explanation of the Herald's relation to religion and Christianity and said, "This is very curious and interesting, and is a proof of the religious temper of your people, as well as of the enterprise and catholic spirit that marks the conduct of the journal."

THE FIRST NAPOLEON AND GUIZOT.

While the conversation was in a desultory condition your correspondent asked M. Guizot whether he had had any personal acquaintance with Napoleon I. "No," was the response, "I never spoke to Napoleon I, although, of course, I saw him on many occasions. I was always opposed to the First Empire. During the reign of the First Napoleon M. de Fontanes appointed me professor of history at the Sorbonne. An intimation was given that in my inaugural I should be expected, or, rather, it would be pleasing to the authorities, for me to speak in commendation of the great Emperor. I at once declined, and offered M. de Fontanes my resignation. He did not accept it nor press his wish. In the whole of my first course of lectures I did not even mention the Emperor's name. M. de Fontanes endeavored to change my purpose, but I had my convictions, and did not mendicant his name. M. Guizot did not seem disposed to dwell upon the First Napoleon, and with this anecdote the matter dropped.

GAMBETTA A "MAUVAIN SUJET."

As the talk proceeded allusion was made to M. Gambetta, and your correspondent asked M. Guizot what he thought of the young radical leader. "I have never," he said, "seen M. Gambetta. But he is a *mauvais sujet*. He frequents, or has frequented, cabarets (or, as we would say, barrooms), and so forth. I have no doubt he has more ability and more education than most of his followers. I believe, too, he is more moderate in his views. But one thing as to the political position of that party. If M. Gambetta and his friends ever attain power they will be overwhelmed by the party of the Commune. I am not saying that M. Gambetta has any sympathy with the Commune or any connection with it. I quite acquit him of that suspicion."

Your correspondent, remembering the interview with M. Gambetta himself sent to the Herald recently, and the views there recorded, said that the Commune hated M. Gambetta more bitterly than even M. Thiers and would shoot him had they power.

"YES," SAID M. GUIZOT, "I AGREE WITH YOU. AND I CANNOT HELP BELIEVING THE COMMUNE WOULD HAVE THE POWER TO SHOOT M. GAMBETTA WERE HE AGAIN TO GOVERN FRANCE."

PROTESTANTISM IN FRANCE.

As the readers of the Herald know, M. Guizot has, during his retirement, been devoting himself to the religious advancement of France, and especially that of the Protestant Church. This subject seemed to interest him, and our conversation soon touched in that direction. "As you, perhaps, are aware," said M. Guizot, "I am a Protestant. The Protestant Church is in a small minority in France. I presume there are about one million Protestants in a population of 36,000,000. Nor does our membership increase. We remain stationary. In France there is a strong line of demarcation between Protestant and Catholic families, for instance. Whether for good or evil, the great majority of French people are within the communion of the Church of Rome. They are nominally Catholics, and so far as France has any religious feeling it is Roman Catholic. Most Frenchmen are sceptical on matters of religion, but they like to see their wives and daughters devout."

THE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE.

A question arose as to the effect of the promulgation of the dogma of infallibility upon the Catholic party in France. M. Guizot said, "There can be little question, I think, but that Catholicism in France has received a heavy blow from the declaration of the dogma of Papal infallibility. Many French statesmen regret the destruction of the temporal power of the Pope. Protestant as I am, I never advocated its destruction. It came naturally and logically to the Popes. But the changed order of things has taken it away. In the early, feudal times, sovereign power and immunity were necessary to the personal security of the Pontiff. Otherwise any turbulent King or Kaiser could have seized his person and put him in prison. It was necessary that he should have royal powers in Rome, in order that his sacred power should be respected out of Rome. But we are no longer feudal, and medieval ideas have gone with the medieval times. The Pope need not fear personal indignity, nor will his power be lessened as the head of the Church because he is no longer sovereign of his small dominions. It would be wise for the Pontiff to accept the changed order of things, and to remember that, as a purely spiritual sovereign, he has new and must always have more real power, ten times told, than any earthly ruler."

PIO NONO A FANATIC.

The conversation continued in reference to the personal character of the present Pope. In response to the questions addressed by your correspondent on that subject M. Guizot said, "Pius IX. is almost a fanatic as regards the attributes and prerogatives of his office. I cannot believe that he will ever become reconciled to Victor Emmanuel. I see no chance of any harmony between the King of Italy and the Pontificate during the lifetime of Pius IX. A few days since M. de Bourgoing, our late Ambassador, was sitting in this very armchair, putting his hand on your correspondent's chair, and I said, 'Ah, bien, my dear M. de Bourgoing, suppose a man of ordinary common sense were to go to the Pope and strive to show him that it is a hopeless task for him even to think of forcing the Italians to abandon Rome, now that they are really in possession, and that the Holy Father, as recognized absolute head of the Roman Church, is really more powerful than the most potent monarch with which it would be well to have to do.' 'Say,' responded M. de Bourgoing, 'he would say nothing, but simply order from his presence any one who would use such arguments to him.'"

WHO WILL BE THE NEW POPE?

A suggestion arose as to what would be the effect of the death of the Pope. M. Guizot said, "I hear from Rome that there is every reason to think that the successor of the Pope will be a prelate of more modern and moderate views. As for Pio Nono, you know he began his Pontificate as a reformer and an innovator. Now he has swung to the extreme of the other side. One might say that the Pope is the Comte de Chambord, and that infallibility is his white flag."

THE PROTESTANT SYNOD IN PARIS.

After a pause M. Guizot said, "Recalling to the affairs of the Protestants in France, the most recent and essential fact in its history was the meeting of the Synod last Summer to decide upon certain questions of doctrine. I was instrumental in convening the Synod. A large majority of the consistories throughout France desired the convocation of a Synod to settle various doctrinal points. I therefore requested M. Thiers to convene the meeting. He did not assemble as he thought the majority in favor of the various projects submitted to the Synod showed that it was in the right, that the Church really desired the convocation, although I was accused of illiberality. My position was a simple one. Either we were Christians or we were not. We were either Protestants according to the formularies of the sixteenth century or we were not. So I asked the Synod to decide whether people could be Protestants without holding Christian doctrines. I did not think that, for instance, men could deny the divinity of Christ and call themselves Protestants, according to the confession of Augsburg. Remember that I had no feelings of harshness towards those who did not agree with me in these tenets; I only wanted the matter clear. Go and found a new sect, as you do in America; be Deists or Unitarians, or what you please; but do not persist in claiming to be what in all respects you are not—Protestants. This was simply my position, and as the members of the Synod agreed with me I carried my point."

FATHER HYACINTHE AND HIS MARRIAGE.

While conversation was in his religious strain reference was naturally made to Father Hyacinthe and his work. "Confess," said M. Guizot, "that it does not seem as if Father Hyacinthe would meet with any great success in France. I regard him as a thoroughly honest man, and in his mind work intensely earnest. But the French mind craves logic. Frenchmen know well that there is no halting place, no middle ground, between atheism and Catholicism, and that a man must be a whole Catholic or none at all. One cannot be a half Catholic. This is the position of Father Hyacinthe. Added to this there is a prejudice in the minds of Frenchmen against the marriage of the clergy, and the marriage of Father Hyacinthe has offended public opinion greatly. It may interest you to know, perhaps, that before he married he sent to consult me upon the advisability of an act which, among other things, would separate him forever from the Church of Rome. I answered that he should think a long time before doing a thing so fundamentally opposed to his career and calculated to embarrass his position as a reformer in the Church. Furthermore I said that before marrying he must make up his mind to go all lengths in opposition to Rome, and to feel assured that he was really in earnest and prepared for all the consequences of his new situation. My daughter went to hear Father Hyacinthe preach the other Sunday at the Oratory. She tells me she was more impressed with his eloquence than by any special depth or originality in his sermons." Passing a moment, M. Guizot asked your correspondent if he knew the wife of Father Hyacinthe. After responding, he said, "I am told she is a very superior woman, and calculated to have very great influence upon her husband."

THE INTERNAL CONDITION OF FRANCE. We came then to speak of the internal political situation of France. M. Guizot expressed himself on this subject with a clearness and exquisite choice of word and phrase which make it almost a hopeless task for your correspondent to translate and remember without marring the clearness and beauty of the original. This was a main difficulty with your correspondent throughout the interview, and in this report he can only hope to present the substance and idea of the great statesman's observations. The color and glow, and precision of expression, which Guizot possesses in a remarkable degree, your correspondent despairs of reproducing.

POLITICAL AND SOCIAL CONDITIONS IN FRANCE.

"The internal condition of France," he said at length, "is, as you may easily see, complicated. France may be divided into four great parties—the legitimists, who follow the Comte de Chambord; the Orleans party, to which I belong myself; the imperialists, who see Napoleon as their head, and those who call themselves republicans. This is the political subdivision. In addition there are classes, or social strata, which can only be broadly defined—as, instead of an active, recognized, living aristocracy, the Revolution merely left the remnant of an aristocracy. We have in France the peasants, the workmen of the towns and cities; the bourgeoisie, or the great middle, business class, who control most of the money; and a small upper class (*classe elevée*), composed of noblemen, literary men, great proprietors and so on. Looking closely at these classes we at first have the peasantry. They are by far the largest share of the population—seventy per cent as is estimated. They work hard, have no political foresight. The politics of a peasant lie between his interests and his imagination. So long as the peasant sells his produce and meets fair markets; so long as the taxes of his commune are not high and the government constructs public works; so long as he sees the authorities building bridges, railroads, canals and public highways; so long as improvements are being made which increase the value of his lands and add to his yearly earnings, the peasant cares little who rules over him or what form of government France possesses. This will explain that love of the Empire which was so frequently remarked in imperial times. The peasants liked the Emperor and cared nothing about the Empire. To Napoleon III. they were personally attached, knowing little and caring less about the system of government. Napoleon III. was a vast personal power in France and it would be absurd to deny it. The peasants admired him and gave him their votes, and it does not seem probable or natural that they will transfer their allegiance to his son, the Prince Imperial. The bourgeoisie, on the other hand, are in the main Orleanists. Wealth or comfort makes them quiet. They are not at all demonstrative, and are certainly far from being ardent or vehement in their devotion to the House of Orleans. They want order, rest and a steady government—no matter who governs. They would, for instance, never disturb the existing order of things to put the Comte de Paris on the throne, and yet they would welcome an Orleans monarchy. The bourgeoisie will never take any advance step, any initiative in political affairs. We see a great defect in our middle class, that its members, who are among the most worthy, most sagacious and most wealthy citizens, do not take more interest in politics."

THE NOBILITY.

Your correspondent ventured to observe that in America the same complaint was made—that the honest, wealthy merchant classes, who had so much to stake in the cause of good government, remained aloof from political affairs. The result was that the baser elements of society frequently gained power and governed the people. M. Guizot listened and then continued,—"The upper class," he said, "belong largely to the old nobility. They are mainly legitimists and believe in the head of the Bourbons, the Comte de Chambord. These men were always famed for the fervor and impatience of their convictions. But I see in late years that they are becoming more tranquil and considerate in their opinions and willing to consider other interests and views. The legitimists and Orleanists, for instance, are growing more and more together, and should the Comte de Chambord pass from the scene all parties would proclaim the Comte de Paris."

REPUBLICANISM IN FRANCE.

A question having arisen as to the condition of the republican party in France, M. Guizot said,—"You, of course, know that I am not a republican. I am now what I have been all my life, profoundly convinced of the wisdom of a constitutional monarchy. For years I served Louis Philippe as his constitutional minister. I believe in constitutional principles as seen in operation under the British Crown. I prefer the British to the American system. A federal republic is the best for the United States, because no other form was possible after the War of Independence. I am sorry it should have been found necessary in America. This is certain, however—that whatever is good for America is not of necessity good for France. Citizens of every country, where there is a wise and stable government, grow devoted to it. I see that all Americans who come to see me are republicans, and I have met no Englishmen who have not an attachment as profound and loyal to the Queen and her royal sovereignty. I am sure that the English would fight with as much devotion and zeal for the Crown as you Americans did ten years ago for the Union. Why is this? Because each people feels that it has the form of government which best suits its wants and the conditions of national existence. Goodness in government is relative, as is other things. What is good for one people is not for another. I believe, for instance, that a republic is not suited to France. But, remember, I am giving you a personal opinion. Many of the most illustrious sons of France have rallied to the flag of the Republic. Among others I see my old friend and colleague, the Duc de Noailles, has given in his adhesion to the Republic. Of course, you know the family, one of the oldest and proudest in France, and, by the way, the son of the Duke is French Minister in Washington. Well, a few days ago the Duke came to see me and said, to my surprise, that he was convinced the Republic was the only form of government that would endure in France. The Duke himself is a learned and distinguished man, and his opinions are worthy of the highest consideration."

A REPUBLIC UNSUITED TO FRANCE.

"With me like these," said your correspondent, "accepting the Republic, why should it not become the form that all classes will eventually find best suited to the national welfare?"

"To that I am coming," said M. Guizot. "I am

opposed to a republic in France, because I think that men like the Duc de Noailles and his son are brilliant exceptions to the rest of the republican party. I think, also, that in France there are few men who are republicans from sincere, earnest conviction, from a belief that the people are capable of self-government. I see no evidence of such a conviction. Recently, I had an occasion to see the prefects of three of our principal departments. They tell me that in their departments the republicans are all in an insignificant minority. There is no general, genuine, national movement in favor of a republic."

"But, if you will permit me," said your correspondent, "this being the case, how do you account for the fact that at all the recent elections in France, not only republicans, but radical republicans, have, with scarcely an exception, been returned as Deputies?"

"That," said M. Guizot, "is a natural question. But if you observe critically the electoral returns in these cases you will find that there is an absurdly small proportion of electors to the population. Furthermore, we know that the leaders of the republican party are eager, disciplined, with their forces organized, and that all the voters in that party were sure to vote. This shows the strength of the party. Yet, in no case, with all this political activity and organization, and everything to win on the republican side, did the number of votes cast for any republican Deputy exceed more than one-third of the number of voters recorded on the government register. It is not fair to conclude, therefore, that there are as many conservative Frenchmen as one republican voter. If you will, to one opposed to a monarchy? The leaders of the republican party are not, very many of them, enlightened. Many of them are merchants simply. Few of them have any culture. Of course there are clever and enlightened men among them. There is one, for instance, a good friend of mine, whom I esteem highly—M. Vacherot. He is one of my colleagues at the Academy of Inscriptions, a Deputy in the Assembly and an ardent, conscientious republican. Yet, when in conversation the other day he lamented the want of a constitutional monarchy. We had had such a monarchy, he said—at one time for fifteen years, and later for eighteen years—and France was never freer or more prosperous than under those reigns. The Republic, he continued, had ill fortune to come at the most difficult moment—when all things conspired to make it fail. He concluded by deploring the apparent impossibility of founding at this time a constitutional monarchy."

THE IMMEDIATE DISSOLUTION OF THE ASSEMBLY A CALAMITY TO FRANCE.

After presenting his views on the theory of government best suited to France, the conversation passed to the present political situation. Your correspondent ventured a question as to the power and duration of the National Assembly. M. Guizot replied,—"It would be a great misfortune if the Assembly were to be dissolved before the last German soldier left France. This I will show in a moment. The paramount idea in the mind of M. Thiers—is the consolidation of a successful dominant conservative party. There would be no difficulty in accomplishing this result were it not for the impossibility of restraining the extreme men of the monarchial parties. Many of these men are not only extreme, but fanatical, in their views, and cannot be controlled. On the Right there are men who are always indiscreet and precipitate, and do harm more frequently than good to any cause they serve. Only control these excessive and unruly gentlemen, whose political ideas are swayed by their passions, and there would be no trouble in founding a conservative party which would be supported by the public opinion of France. Were such a party to take shape there should be no doubt some more able of the Bonapartist party—such men as M. Magne, who never gave the Emperor a fanatical support—joining its ranks."

M. THIERS.

This led your correspondent to ask what M. Thiers would do in such a party. "M. Thiers," replied M. Guizot, "will, I am firmly convinced, become more and more conservative. I have no idea that he will break with the republicans in the Assembly. I do not think he will even separate himself from the extreme radical wing. But his mind is conservative, and experience has strengthened it in that direction. As he feels the conservative party growing more and more in the Assembly and the country he will attach himself more and more closely to it and strive to direct its steps to power."

THE ORLEANS PARTY.

Your correspondent inquired whether the conduct of M. Thiers would in any way control that of the Orleans party. "I am one of that party," was the response, "and I say simply say, the Orleans party would control the country. We are the France—France alone. No one in the service, prince or follower—not even the Comte de Paris nor the Duc d'Aumale—would ever for a moment dream of forcing himself upon the country. Be sure that when the country calls the Orleans princes will accept any duty. They will never outrage France and violate the law by a *coup d'etat*. Nor have they a selfish devotion to their house. I am very sure that no Frenchmen more sincerely regret than they do the extraordinary attitude assumed by the Comte de Chambord in reference to the white flag. In his devotion to this emblem they see, and not without deep pain, that he has made it impossible for him to reign over France. Nor is this so surprising, for throughout France the old flag is looked upon as symbolizing a return to the *regime* antecedent to 1789. Such a return no one would even discuss, much less accept. Should the Comte de Chambord die, now that imperialism has died with Napoleon III., the contest for power in France would rest simply between the Orleanists and republicans. That would be the only political issue."

NAPOLEON III.

Referring to the remark of M. Guizot that imperialism was dead, your correspondent asked him if he knew the Emperor Napoleon III. "I only saw him four times in my life," he said, "and I was the respondent. 'This was after his accession to the imperial throne. I called to see him about the interests of the French Academy, of which I am a member, and of the affairs of the Protestant Church in France. I remember on one occasion we had a long conversation. This I mention because it was unusual for the Emperor to converse freely. He was very polite and courteous and showed me every attention. He knew I had been his enemy and the enemy of his house. He knew that it was quite impossible that I should become his friend. Yet he spoke to me with the utmost freedom of his position, its difficulties and dangers.'"

THE CHARACTER OF NAPOLEON.

Your correspondent, alluding to the sudden death of the Emperor and the interest which mankind would feel in the criticism of such a character by a man like Guizot, asked the venerable statesman what he thought of Napoleon III. "The prominent trait in his character," said M. Guizot, "and it was an uncertain, devious, contradictory character, was indecision. It was extraordinary—his inability to arrive at a conclusion or really make up his mind. He toyed with politics. He would turn a question around and every aspect, and brood over it for a long time and yet be incapable of arriving at a decision when it was necessary to act. It almost always happened that he took the least decided course. Again, like people who lack genuine decision of character, on some points he was staid and on occasion bold. We saw that under certain circumstances, at Boulogne and Strasbourg, for instance, he could be rash. I cannot regard his mind as first class. It ran into commonplace expressions, and he never seemed to regard them as commonplace. He was a gentleman; I mean a gentleman in the English and American sense. Napoleon III. never willingly gave pain to any human being. To those about him, who served him, he was always kind and considerate. In some respects he was even generous to his adversaries. In this and in other respects the Emperor stood apart from his party. His party often committed acts which he did not approve, and which grieved him exceedingly when they came to his knowledge. In his way—a way I do not approve—he loved France with sincerity. Remember, my friend, that I never was a frenzied, unparrying, indiscriminate opponent of the Emperor's government. As an Orleanist and

a believer in constitutional monarchy I could not support the Empire. But, at the same time, I was for the Empire against socialism, disorder and radicalism; for in politics I am above all a conservative, and I am as much as Napoleon III. was the conservator of order supported him."

THE EMPRESS AS A JOURNALIST.

The venerable statesman here paused a moment as though in deep thought. He rested his head on his hand, and suddenly looking up, with a half smile, said,—"The Empress? The Empress was all his life one of those things—a prisoner, a journalist, a Carbonare. You see, he had been imprisoned for six years in Ham. Imprisonment had upon the Emperor an effect that it had upon all but the very strongest minds. It turned his eyes upon himself and made him gloomy and self-searching. Imprisonment narrows a man; and when it came to this man, ardent, dreamy, contriving, it gave to him a narrow, dreamy, contriving expression, it narrowed and darkened his mind. Depend upon it, his two imprisonments—the brief one after Strasbourg and the long one after Boulogne—had a morbid effect upon the imperial character. Nor was this all. Exile is imprisonment—negative imprisonment—not the less oppressive because the sun shines freely and you can drink wine. To the Emperor his English life was virtually imprisonment. His dreams and hopes were all in France. As I said, he was also a journalist—a journalist, said M. Guizot, with a bow and a smile, "that I make with all respect, remembering that I have the honor to address a journalist. But as you may have occurred to you, a journalist advancing the same proposition day after day, and maintaining it by the same arguments, iterating and reiterating day after day as his duty commands, even as the day themselves come and go with the rising and the setting of the sun, is apt to have his mind in a groove or a rut. So the danger arises that journalists as well as politicians are prone to express commonplace views with an air of conviction, as though they were saying something new, and not expressing vague and well-known ideas that contribute nothing to the sum of human knowledge. Well, the Emperor had been a journalist, and in that calling his mind had taken the bent which I describe."

NAPOLEON III. AS A CONSPIRATOR.

"Again," said M. Guizot, "the Emperor was a conspirator. You know, of course, in his young days he had actually been a member of the Italian Revolutionary Society of the Carbonari. In their councils he learned the trade of conspiracy. The famous Comte Cavour, who was a good judge of this calling, is reported to have said that Napoleon III. could excel any man in Europe in conspiring—himself included. This was a frank admission, for Comte Cavour was not an apprentice simply in the craft. As a young man in Italy Napoleon learned how to conspire for others. During his twenty years of rule he applied the knowledge to his own purposes, until at last this habit, like habits generally according to the nature of man, so grew upon him that he really seemed to conspire for the sake of conspiring and because his mind, warped and crooked by misfortune and misadventure, loved devious ways. I have no doubt he fancied up to the end of his career that he was conspiring against Prince Bismarck."

THE FUTURE OF IMPERIALISM IN FRANCE.

Your correspondent asked how would the death of the Emperor affect France. M. Guizot said,—"I have given that subject much thought. Since the death of the Emperor I have seen several of the leaders of the Bonaparte party, and my conclusion is that Napoleon's death will be an irreparable disaster to imperialism. Of course you will not find my opinion in the imperialist journals. No party ever pays its own wages. These hopeful journals see light where there is darkness, and will tell you their claims in now more hopeful than ever. But there are men in France, like myself, removed from active, passionate participation in politics—behind the scenes, as it were—who know better. I recall an illustration. A few days ago Napoleon died I had a visit from M. Foreade la Roque. You know him as a sincere imperialist. He said if the Emperor were taken away the imperial cause would be lost and all but a few fanatics would rally to the conservative party as the party of France and care nothing for this or that dynasty. I think this expresses the views of the ablest and most patriotic Bonapartists. Since the death of the Emperor I have seen others of the same party. They all admit that they are completely down—"

COMPLETEMENT ABATUS—

by the magnitude of the calamity involved in the Emperor's death. This is natural and logical. The Empire could only return through disaster. How else? We should have added misfortunes, and the country in danger of another Commune. To make such a disaster possible, or to crush it should it come, is a work that cannot be confided to a boy. And the Prince Imperial, no one in the Empire, and worthy, is only a boy. To bring back the Empire, under the only conditions in which it would be possible, is the work of a stern, strong man—a man who will not grow pale at the shedding of blood, but who has a purpose and the will to seek it to the end, come what may. The Prince Imperial may have all manner of good qualities. I have no doubt he is intelligent, spirited, well bred; but he has not, as we say, "made his proofs." Now, his father showed on three occasions in his life that he could show resolution; that he could take his life in his hand and risk it to carry his aim. This he did at Strasbourg, Boulogne and in the *coup d'etat*. He failed, it is true, on two occasions, and failure brought contempt and ridicule upon him. Still they showed that serene, high, almost spiritual courage which enables a man to embark in ventures apparently hopeless. The result was that in my time, when Louis Philippe was king, Napoleon was a source of constant uneasiness to the government. We were never for a moment at rest. There was no anticipating what an adventurer so desperate and so audacious so romantic would not do. The possession of this very quality, unusual as it is, and undesirable as it may be, which the Emperor also of his family seemed to possess—a quality now so essential to success—is one reason why he was so essential to success—his one reason why he was so essential to success. There is some fear that there will be trouble about the temporal power. On that I have spoken. M. Thiers believes in the temporal power of the Pope. He is opposed to the present attitude of Italy. But he has said again and again, and I am convinced he speaks sincerely, that so long as he is in power France shall never disturb Italy. As to the Germans and their occupation, M. Thiers will be able to pay the fourth milliard in the course of this year. He could pay it now, but the result would be a financial panic, disastrous to Germany and to France. So he will make gradual payments. Now by the treaty, upon the payment of this fourth milliard France obtains the right to offer guarantees for the fifth. If these guarantees are accepted we have a right to call upon the Germans to evacuate the departments. But here comes a question. What kind of guarantees will the Germans regard as valid? The matter is almost wholly in their discretion. You may be sure that Bismarck will look far more favorably upon guarantees offered by M. Thiers and this Assembly than he would upon the same guarantees offered by a radical assembly, led by such a man as Gambetta, the most persistent enemy of Germany during the war. I believe if we were to elect such an assembly the Germans would decline to evacuate the eastern provinces, and, above all, would find a pretext for declining to surrender Belfort. No one knows better than M. Thiers that the Germans are only too anxious to find a reason for holding on to Belfort. The military party of France would never willingly have allowed Belfort to revert to France. That party would have taken it if they took Metz. I am quite sure, therefore, that for this reason alone it would be a calamity to have an election next Summer, as is the policy of M. Gambetta. There would be the internal tumult—there would, above all, be this question of the German occupation. This Assembly concluded the treaty with Germany, and it should remain in power until its provisions are consummated. It is too good to have general elections at any time. How much more dangerous and difficult with this German problem solved."

FRANCE AN INVALID.

"Then," said your correspondent, "you think France needs something more than rest. France," he replied, "is still an invalid. I think she is convalescent and on the way to perfect recovery; but she is far from having pristine health and vigor. The future is dark. No one can predict her future. We all hope she will weather the storm ahead, but success will require all efforts. The

ENGLISH FEELING TOWARDS NAPOLEON.

Your correspondent referred to the universal sympathy and admiration felt in England towards Napoleon III. M. Guizot said, "I am astonished at that. But, on the whole, is it not natural? Does it do honor to the credit of England? The English have a feeling which I presume is Anglo-Saxon—that death is sacred. *De mortuis nil nisi bonum* is a precept quite Anglo-Saxon. Remember how popular death made Prince Albert. The journals ceased to abuse him; the nation saw him something other than a beggarly German prince; England mourned him as she mourned no man since Wellington, and statues are built to his honor. Remember, too, that Napoleon III. was always a friend of England. He had time and again chances to wound her, but he was true to his alliance. Then and in this he did a noble act for which civilization should honor him, he practically healed the feud between the two nations. Now I see it otherwise in America. Your journals, if the telegraph reports them truly, judge his cause severely. Nor is that to be wondered at. He was not a friend of the United States. Just as he held his hand from England when he had her at an advantage he sought when trouble came to America to turn it to account. You know he proposed to unite with England in recognizing the independence of the Confederate States. When the crisis was upon us he threw his armies into Mexico. He never would have invaded Mexico had he not believed, with many others, that the North could never conquer the South. And so nothing is more natural than that this feeling should find expression in your journals."

FRANCE BISMARCK.

"You made an allusion," Monsieur," said your correspondent, "to Prince Bismarck, when speaking of Napoleon and Cavour as conspirators. May I ask if you applied that criticism to Prince Bismarck also?"

"By no means," was the response; "I do not call Bismarck a conspirator in the sense I would call Napoleon. He impresses me as the exact opposite of a conspirator. As a diplomatist he has had his schemes and plots and stratagems. But in the main he seems to have been distinguished by a certain brutal frankness. It was this startling and unusual quality which deceived men like Napoleon III.—men who, never meaning what they said, were quite overpowered and amazed to find that Bismarck did mean what he said. It is because the German Chancellor has not been a conspirator that, dealing with conspirators, he has gained his astonishing success."

THE FUTURE OF THE BONAPARTIST PARTY.

Your correspondent suggested that the Bonapartist party