ROYAL STUDIES JOURNAL

2022 IX

Restoration and Resilience. The Last Bourbons and the Revolutionary Past

Flavien Bertran de Balanda
Gérard Gengembre

WINCHESTER UNIVERSITY PRESS

Restoration and Resilience. The Last Bourbons and the Revolutionary Past

Flavien Bertran de Balanda
SORBONNE UNIVERSITE
(with Gérard Gengembre)[1]
UNIVERSITE DE CAEN

Abstract: As early as 1795, immediately after the death of the young Louis XVII in his Parisian prison, the comte de Provence, brother of the late Louis XVI who had been executed in 1793, was hoping the course of history would prove him right. He opted to call himself Louis XVIII, a title which was made official nineteen years later when he became king. Proclaimed in the *Déclaration de Vérone* on 8 June 1795, in the midst of the Revolution, such an act implied that the Revolution was not happening, had never happened, and would never happen again. Our paper explores this new and ambivalent kind of resilience by examining three decisive moments during the reigns of Louis XVI's two brothers, Louis XVIII (1814-1824) and Charles X (1824-1830): the First Restoration and the Hundred Days, with their curious institutional novelties and changes of hands; the early Second Restoration, when the game between the old and the new world seemed on and then over; and the first years of Charles X's reign, when the tensions returned with a vengeance, probably climaxing in 1825 with the Compensation Act, known as "le milliard des émigrés."

Keywords: French Restoration, political legitimacy, sociology of politics, theories of legitimacy, Ultra-royalist, Hundred Days, 1814 Charter, 1830 Revolution

The French Restoration is more than ever approached as a complex period, chronologically as well as notionally, characterized by some as both a tension and a chasm between tradition and modernity: "Time is out of joint,"[2] an "impossible return to the past,"[3] or a "continuation of the Revolution."[4] As early as 1795, after the death of the young Louis XVII in the Temple prison in Paris, was not the comte de Provence, brother of the late Louis XVI who was executed in 1793, anticipating that the course of history would prove him right by calling himself Louis XVIII, a title which would be official nineteen years later when he became king ? Proclaimed in the *Déclaration de Vérone* in the midst of the Revolution and evidently supported by the royalists, such an act—formally legitimate according to the tradition of the monarchy—implied that the Revolution was not happening, had never taken place, and would never happen again. In 1814, this political and ideological *coup de force* intended to symbolically erase not only the Revolution, but also the Empire.

[1] Editor's Note: Sadly, the author Flavien Bertran de Balanda died while this article was under review. His colleague, Professor Gérard Gengembre, undertook revisions to this article to complete the review process which addressed the comments of the reviewer and aimed to stay true to the author's voice and scholarship. We thank Professor Gengembre for his additions to this article so that it could be published as a final testament to the scholarship and academic career of Flavien Bertran de Balanda and we thank his estate for the permission to publish this piece in the *Royal Studies Journal.*

[2] Emmanuel Fureix and Judith Lyon-Caen, "Introduction: le désordre du temps," *Revue d'histoire du XIX^e siècle*, 49 (2014): 7–17.

[3] Francis Démier, *La France de la Restauration (1814-1830): L'impossible retour au passé* (Paris: Gallimard, 2012).

[4] Emmanuel de Waresquiel, *C'est la Révolution qui continue! La Restauration (1814-1830)* (Paris: Tallandier, 2015).

However, this all too present past, which must be warded off, forgotten yet at the same time atoned for in everlasting mourning, was both *horresco referens* and an often-painful reality.[5] The restored monarchy was forced to juggle with a paradox, being in a false denial and having to handle a cumbersome *yesterday* which could not be erased, even though a reinvented alternate *before* would be comforting.[6] As Thomas Hippler puts it, when amnesia and atonement coexist, it creates a "performative contradiction," since—as is constantly mentioned—what you intend to silence becomes a "tearing up of civilization."[7] The challenge was, while acknowledging the Revolution, to think the unthinkable, attempting also to insert it in the new political deal—to *digest* it, as it were. Such a task was not an easy one, as we will demonstrate. The ensuing issues could be formulated within the following question: was the Restoration an aporetic moment, a synthetic one, or either term of a new equation?

This paper intends to explore this new and ambivalent kind of resilience by examining three decisive moments during the reigns of Louis XVI's two brothers: the First Restoration and the *Cent-Jours*, the Hundred Days, with their curious institutional novelties and changes of hands; the early Second Restoration, when the game between the old and the new world seemed on and then over; and the first years of Charles X's reign, when the tensions returned with a vengeance, probably climaxing in 1825. [8]

I. 1814-1815, Act I: Louis XVIII, Napoleon, Louis XVIII. Stability and instability

Μεταξύ could relate to the tugging of two opposed attractors or to a place between them. It could also mean a potentially fecund chasm, halfway between these two meanings. Therefore we propose to use this word to designate the new *political substance* the Restoration exposes.

1. The Charter of 1814: institutional ambivalence or new opportunities?

Commemorating its two-hundredth anniversary, Pierre Rosanvallon, André Laquièze, and the December 2014 issue of *Jus Politicum* have most commendably demonstrated that this constitutional and legal act of foundation of the new regime was clearly ambivalent.[9] Granted on 4 July 1814 by Louis XVIII, this Charter was compliant with the demand expressed by the Congress of Vienna in order for him to be properly crowned or, at the very least, proclaimed. A text of compromise, it preserved a number of acquisitions from the Revolution and the Empire, whilst restoring the monarchy.

---

[5] Fureix, *La France des larmes. Deuils politiques à l'Âge romantique (1814-1840)* (Paris: Champ Vallon, 2009).

[6] Ambrogio A. Caiani, "Re-inventing the Ancien Régime in post-Napoleonic Europe," *European History Quarterly,* 47.3 (2017): 437–460. The paper stresses the use of "Ancien Régime" (438) and how invention, reality, and action do merge (442). On the monarchist alternate history, see Bertran de Balanda, "Une *Contre-utopie* face à l'Histoire: l'Ancien Régime selon Bonald, une uchronie politique à l'âge romantique," in *Le Lys recomposé*, Proceedings of the symposium at the Université de Rouen (March 2018), Laurent Angard, Guillaume Cousin, and Blandine Poirier, eds., *Publications numériques du CÉRÉdI*, "Actes de colloques et journées d'étude," 22 (2019), http://publis-shs.univ-rouen.fr/ceredi/index.php?id=672.

[7] Thomas Hippler, "Oubli, culpabilité, rupture de civilisation: les conceptualisations rétrospectives de la Révolution française pendant la Restauration," in Serge Bianchi (dir.), *Temps révolutionnaire et temps des révolutions* (Paris: CTHS, 2010), 57–69.

[8] Of course, this complex process will eventually lead to the *Révolution de Juillet* in 1830. However, being the year of both Charles X's coronation and the Compensation Act in favor of the *Émigrés*, 1825 can be construed as a significant turning point, as we hope to demonstrate.

[9] Pierre Rosanvallon, *La Monarchie impossible. Histoire des Chartes de 1814 et 1830* (Paris: Fayard, 1994); Alain Laquièze, "La Charte de 1814 et la question du gouvernement parlementaire," *Jus Politicum*, 13 (2014): 1–13; Philippe Lauvaux, "La technique de l'octroi et la nature de la Charte," *Jus Politicum*, 13 (2014) Open Access, online.

Rather than pointing out its incomplete aspects or its nature as a compromise, both of which are obvious, we prefer to insist on its essential character as a hybrid text, which raises numerous questions. By summoning an immemorial past, did Beugnot's preamble really avoid mentioning the last twenty-five years, or did it include them in a larger course, implicitly born of a modern process vindicating the political power?[10] By virtue of the king's granting of some sovereignty to the people, was he thereby granted his own limited but intangible sovereignty? On the other hand, was the reference to divine Providence a tribute to the traditional interpretations of legitimacy, or did it sacralize the whole historical process, and therefore define the Revolution as a mystical prelude to a new Alliance? And, lastly, would not the "chain of past ages," although it was not said which ages are to be thus linked, function both as an essentially sacred and strong connection though flexible enough to attach even unforeseen events?[11] One could attempt in many different ways to question how the so often binary writing of the seventy-six articles managed to discreetly suggest that the revolutionary legacy was maintained as well as cautiously contained.

Emmanuel de Waresquiel has notably proposed that the Charter was preserving, even renewing, the monarchical supremacy, while presenting it as liberal only by comparison with neighboring countries:

> being much more than a return to the past, or a transitional text, or the result of some transaction, the Charter could be construed as a refoundation of the old monarchical absolutism […] it was meant […] to absorb the Revolution within the monarchy and certainly not to dissolve the monarchy in the Revolution.

However, "the Charter probably launched the fairest, the most liberal and tolerant regime in Europe."[12]And yet, it was quite unlikely that Napoleon's return to power was going to last very long.

2. Legitimacy in question

One could think that, thanks to the unforeseen restoration of an Empire paradoxically relegitimized by its previous abdications (6 April 1814 and 22 June 1815), the Hundred Days (1 March- 22 June 1815) would have brutally decided the issue. From Bonaparte's first departure (to Elba, 20 April 1814) to Louis's second coming (after a long exile since 20 June 1791), he arrived in Calais on 4 June 1814 and left on 19 March 1815, marking the end of the First Restoration. He then returned from Ghent on 8 July, thus initiating the Second Restoration. Everybody was preoccupied by this unsolvable problem: how to define political legitimacy after the Revolution. Political philosophy was agitated by an unprecedented debate, which opened an array of new paths, even though it seemed to result in a series of irreconcilable statements. Benjamin Constant's *De l'esprit de conquête et d'usurpation dans leurs rapports avec la civilisation européenne* (1814), Lazare Carnot's *Mémoire adressé au roi* (July 1814), and François-René de Chateaubriand's many works, including the

[10] Head of the Police (Directeur général) since 13 May 1814, after having served in several official positions during the Empire, Jacques Claude, comte Beugnot (1761-1835) was commissioned in a hurry to write a preamble to the Charter under the king's supervision, which he did during the night of 3 June with the help of his secretary, Victor Alexandre Masson. See Waresquiel, "Le préambule de la Charte du 4 juin 1814," *Jus Politicum*, 13, http://juspoliticum.com/article/Le-preambule-de-la-Charte-du-4-juin-1814-942.html.

[11] Matthijs Lok, "'Renouer la chaîne des temps ou repartir à zéro?' Passé, présent, futur en France et aux Pays-Bas (1814-1815)," *Revue d'Histoire du XIX^e siècle,* 49 (2014): 79–92. Lok insists on the continuity proclaimed by the choice of "XVIII" instead of "I^er," as was practised in the Netherlands.

[12] Waresquiel, *Penser la Restauration 1814-1830* (Paris: Tallandier, 2020), 74, 90, 92.

famous *De Buonaparte et des Bourbons* (April 1814), could be read as the expression of an epistemological anxiety translated into a controversial marathon, run "while cannons are firing" and setting the milestones for any future hermeneutics defining the true foundation of power—which promised in fact to be pluralistic.[13]

The writer, political theorist, and activist, Benjamin Constant (1767-1830), is one of the main thinkers of French liberalism. His brochure is a pamphlet denouncing Napoleon (with whom he would reconcile during the Hundred Days):

> Surely, Bonaparte is a thousand times more guilty than those barbarous conquerors who, ruling over barbarians, were by no means at odds with their age. Unlike them, he has chosen barbarism; he has preferred it. In the midst of enlightenment, he has sought to bring back the night. He has chosen to transform a mild and polite people into greedy and bloodthirsty nomads: his crime lies in this premeditated intention, in his obstinate effort to rob us of the heritage of all the enlightened generations who have preceded us on this earth. But why have we given him the right to conceive such a project?[14]

A mathematician, member of the revolutionary *Comité de Salut public* (Committee of Public Safety), and later of the *Directoire* (Directory), Lazare Carnot (1753-1823) was nicknamed the "Organizer of Victory" during the Revolutionary Wars. In 1795 he appointed Napoleon Bonaparte as general in chief of the Army of Italy but resigned from public life when his republican convictions set him against the Empire. In 1812, however, he served again, and during the Hundred Days was appointed Minister of the Interior. The Second Restoration exiled him as a regicide. His *Mémoire* is a critique of the policy implemented by the government of the restored monarchy.

De Buonaparte et des Bourbons is a vindictive pamphlet by which François-René de Chateaubriand (1768-1848) applauds the return of a legitimate king and the Allied Powers for their victory against the usurper, the tyrant, the monster "Buonaparte." The royalists made a point of using the Italian name of their archenemy to assert the illegitimacy of a despised "foreigner" and refused to acknowledge his imperial name, Napoleon.

The counter-revolutionary trend of thought, not yet considered to be "reactionary," wanted to take part in this flourishing production, and Joseph de Maistre entrusted Louis de Bonald with his *Essai sur le principe générateur des constitutions politiques*, to be published in 1814.[15] While he was an émigré, Bonald (1754-1840) had published in 1796 the *Théorie du pouvoir politique et religieux démontrée par le raisonnement et par l'histoire,* the first French milestone of counter-revolutionary political theory. Savoyard philosopher and diplomat, Maistre (1753-1821) published his own *Considérations sur la France* in 1797, and the authors became pen friends. Though they differ in their interpretation of events and trends and their conceptual apparatus, their common purpose is to understand what caused the Revolution and to define and analyze the origin, nature, and structure of societies, in order to philosophically and historically define the nature and the legitimacy of political power.

[13] "Au son du canon," Chateaubriand, *De Buonaparte et des Bourbons* (Paris: 1814).
[14] Benjamin Constant, *Political Writings*, ed. and trans., Biancamaria Fontana (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 161–163.
[15] Louis de Bonald adds to it the *Considérations sur la France* (1797). On this rowdy episode between the two friends, see their correspondence and Pierre Glaudes' introduction to the *Considérations* in his edition of Maistre's *Oeuvres*, (Paris: Laffont, 2007).

Every author had his own conception of legitimacy. Constant defined as legitimate any political system based upon political representation and freedom of speech, including a part of delegation of power, which definitely separates the political freedom of the *Anciens* from the one of the *Modernes*.[16] Another liberal, his friend Madame de Staël (1766-1817), hailed in her *Considérations sur la Révolution française* the much-anticipated birth of a "constitutional legitimacy." Though published posthumously in 1818, this book, revised and re-worked over a long period, can be seen as M[me] de Staël's philosophical testament, or at least as her conclusive vision of history, based on her faith in the progress of reason and of the ideas born out of the Enlightenment. Chateaubriand saw the word as equivalent to "restored monarchy," a meaning which would be vindicated by usage, but equated it both with dynastic continuity and freedom, opposed to the Neronian tyranny, i.e the reign of "Buonaparte." Mystical as always, Maistre postulated that the origin of legitimacy is unknown to men, and that it reveals itself in the course of time, as an invisible "circle" surrounding the monarch. Bonald defined the "legitimate state" as being compliant with God's will, i.e. the natural order, and the "legal state" as the work of men, destined to join up with the former:

> Absolute power is independent from its subjects; arbitrary power is independent from the laws: when you establish the people as a power, you do not give them an absolute power, since they are dependent upon all the power hungry and a pawn for all schemers; you necessarily bestow upon them an arbitrary power, i.e. a power independent from all laws, even those they give to themselves; […] all that is legitimate is divine, since legitimacy is nothing else but compliance with God's laws […] there is a *legal* state of society, which is man made, and a *legitimate* one, which is God's will, the expression of the eternal order, and the consequence of the primitive and fundamental laws of human society.[17]

On the opposite side, let us read the words of M[me] de Staël, Necker's daughter.[18]

> Legitimacy, as it has been recently proclaimed, must be contained within constitutional limits. It does not matter whether the previously existing limits were insufficient to fence off the infringements of the power, or whether they have been gradually transgressed and obliterated over time: these limits should be set today, even though their ancient origin be impossible to prove.[19]

---

[16] See, in particular, Constant's lecture given in February 1819 at the "Athénée français." As in his previous writings, Constant repeated the principles set in the two major unpublished works written during the Napoleonic period, which constitute the bedrock of his whole conceptions: *Fragments d'un ouvrage abandonné sur la possibilité d'une constitution républicaine dans un grand pays* and *Principes de politique applicables à tous les gouvernements*—not to be confused with *Principes de politique applicables à tous les gouvernements représentatifs,* published in 1815.

[17]"Le pouvoir absolu est un pouvoir indépendant de ses sujets; le pouvoir arbitraire un pouvoir indépendant des lois: et lorsque vous érigez un peuple en pouvoir, vous ne lui donnez pas un pouvoir absolu, puisqu'il est dépendant de tous les ambitieux et le jouet de tous les intrigants: vous lui conférez nécessairement un pouvoir arbitraire, c'est-à-dire un pouvoir indépendant de toutes les lois, mêmes de celles qu'il se donne à lui-même; […] dans ce sens, tout ce qui est légitime est divin, puisque la légitimité n'est que la conformité aux lois dont Dieu est l'auteur. […] Il y a un état *légal* de société qui est l'ouvrage de l'homme, et un état *légitime* qui est la volonté de Dieu, comme étant l'expression de l'ordre éternel, et la conséquence des lois primitives et fondamentales de la société humaine," Bonald, O*bservations sur l'ouvrage ayant pour titre*: *Considérations sur les principaux événements de la Révolution française, par Mme la baronne de Staël* (Paris: Le Clère, 1818), included in *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. II (Paris-Montrouge: Migne, 1859-1864), 593 and 627.

[18] Jacques Necker (1732-1804), born in Geneva, worked as a banker in Paris and became Director-General of the Royal Treasury in 1777. Back and forth in office between 1777 and 1792, he was a controversial figure who desperately tried to reform the financial system in order to prevent the Revolution, or so he thought.

[19] "La légitimité, telle qu'on l'a proclamée nouvellement, est donc tout à fait inséparable des limites constitutionnelles. Que les limites qui existaient anciennement en France aient été insuffisantes pour opposer une barrière aux

It seems that the general confusion brought about desperate attempts to conceptualize, and, by reference to Guglielmo Ferrero's concepts defined in *Pouvoir. Les Génies invisibles de la cité*, one seeks out the "invisible genies" which rule society.[20] According to Ferrero, these "genies" are:

> the two principles of legitimacy: the ancient one, based on the hereditary power of tradition, and the modern one, based on the democratic procedure, the vote of the people and the right of opposition. They alone can redeem society from its worst scourge: a mutual fear of the ruler and the ruled that in revolution is bound to grow by its own power into terror and tyranny.[21]

As for the Charter, and the previous draft of a constitution, the many lampoons which—due to obscure or famous names expressing the passionate discussions—took place while it was being written, are more illuminating than the debate within the government itself.[22] Also revealing are those occurring shortly after, when the *Acte additionnel aux constitutions de l'Empire* (Additional Act to the Constitutions of the Empire) was drawn up. Signed on 22 April 1815 and approved by a plebiscite on 1 June, the *Acte additionnel* was designed by Benjamin Constant, and its liberal turn extensively amended the previous Napoleonic constitutions. In a way, it could be compared to the Charter of 1814.

Even before the draft of the planned constitution was completed, enlightened public opinion revisited the notion of constitutionalism itself. Prior to Louis XVIII's promise to heed the "ancient constitution" while giving it a "liberal" turn, questions were raised about the organic concept of communal norm, its origin, and men's capacity to declare it *ex nihilo* or not. Rousseau was raised from the dead or buried once again; England was praised, or more prudently ignored. This revived a question referring implicitly to 1791, on the impossible task of grafting an English cutting on the old French tree, a frequent metaphor in those days. Prophetizing like Cassandra a catastrophic downfall of the monarchy and the triumphal return of the Revolution, the opponents to the Charter and to any constitution in general turned precisely to English history: in his pamphlet, *De la Royauté en France*—never published, though the proofs were circulated in high places—Bonald prophetized a French 1688, introducing an anti-constitutionalist recurring theme destined to become fashionable.[23] He insisted that, by creating the Charter, the Restoration had signed its own death sentence; the damage was done, as he puts it, "le ver est dans le fruit."[24]

---

empiétements du pouvoir, qu'elles aient été graduellement enfreintes et oblitérées, peu importe : elles devraient commencer d'aujourd'hui, quand on ne pourrait prouver leur antique origine," de Staël, *Considérations sur les principaux événements de la Révolution française*, in *La Passion de la liberté,* Michel Winock, ed. (Paris: Robert Laffont, 1818), 293. On Bonald's and de Staël's conceptions of legitimacy, see Bertran de Balanda, "La France était constituée. Germaine de Staël et Louis de Bonald juges de la Révolution française (1818)," *Cahiers staëliens, 69, Actualité de la recherche staëlienne* (2019): 229–247. See also Gérard Gengembre, "Un roman sur la politique et sur l'histoire ou Bonald lecteur de Mme de Staël," *Europe*, 693/694 (1987): 89–100 and Stéphanie Tribouillard, *Le Tombeau de Madame de Staël. Les discours de la postérité staëlienne en France (1817-1850)* (Genève: Slatkine, 2007), 10–131.

[20] Guglielmo Ferrero, *Pouvoir. Les Génies invisibles de la cité* (Paris: Plon, 1988 [1942]).

[21] Kurt Riesler's review of *Pouvoir: les genies invisibles de la cite* by Guglielmo Ferrero features in the *American Journal of Sociology*, 48, no. 3 (November 1942): 424–425.

[22] On these anti-constitutionalist pamphlets, see Olivier Tort, *La Droite française aux origines de ses divisions 1814 1830* (Paris: CTHS, 2013), 153. As yet an unknown political figure, Villèle wrote one and so did Bonald, who decided not to publish it. See Bertran de Balanda, "*De la Royauté en France* (1814). Autour d'un pamphlet inédit de Louis de Bonald: ressusciter la légitimité?" *Nineteenth Century French Studies*, 47 (2019): 196–214.

[23] As above, referring to earlier parts of the book.

[24] Among many occurrences, let us quote a letter addressed during the summer of 1819 to the Comte de Senfft: "Le mal est dans la Charte, et tous les efforts du gouvernement et toutes les instructions et les démarches des ministres ne vont qu'à l'exécuter le plus littéralement qu'il se peut" ["Harm lies within the Charter itself, and every effort of the

3. Political reshaping

In these contradictory debates *à propos* the Charter, discussing the origin, nature, and exercise of political power, its legitimacy, and its reshaping in a *France révolutionnée*—a country where everything had been transformed by the Revolution and the Empire, a country desperately in need of stability—the so called *trends of thought* appear to have been rearranged such as the Revolution had sought to establish them, and precisely as the Empire had endeavoured to silence them. Something was taking shape, not quite a political chessboard yet but certainly its outline, a complex set of coordinates where legitimacy could be placed. Two axes can be delineated. One was notional, with freedom, autonomy, and perfectibility vs order, authority, and tradition; the other, empirical: Ancien Régime vs reforms of 1789, Terror, Directoire, and Napoleon's reign. As sketchy as it is, this model suggests a marked intent to map the political reality. After the upheaval, it was time to return more serenely to the drawing board and to ask a series of pertinent questions. Which constitution would be best suited to a new historical departure? Which social consequences and acquisitions of the Revolution should be endorsed? On what basis ought the political be refounded? What kind of monarchy should be restored?

II. 1815, Act II: the second Restoration begins, yet the monarchy is nowhere to be found

On 14 and 28 August 1815, the first general election of the Second Restoration, after the Hundred Days, opened a most interesting period—in particular marking the early days of the Chamber of Deputies, nicknamed the "*Chambre introuvable.*"[25] 350 seats out of 400 went to royalist candidates, most of them *ultras*—fierce counter-revolutionaries and supporters of a return to the Ancien Régime—and the remaining 50 to liberals. It was a census-based suffrage which allowed only 72,000 citizens out of a population of 30 million to vote.

1. The Monarchy according to the Charter: the birth of the political game

The Charter begot its first miracle, an amazing outcome which the king acknowledged with this epithet, "*introuvable.*" The institutions which were upheld in the Charter, and their *modus operandi* inherited from the Empire enabled the election of all its enemies, dedicated to destroying it or nullifying it, or to forcing it to comply with their views. In retrospect the Charter was reconsidered, whether damned *sotto voce* or falsely vindicated, even engendering a self-proclaimed "*constitutionnel*" trend.[26] The issues unnoticed by its authors were now evident, and all that was blurred or vague generated a fierce battle between its exegetes. To quote Chateaubriand: what is a monarchy according to the Charter?[27]

As expected with a representative government, it was a balance between several oppositions. There was an opposition from the Left and the Center, frightened by an assortment of counter-revolutionary fanatics: bewigged *Émigrés,* aristocrats who had fled the country in the

government, every directive or step from the ministers are intended only to enforce it as litterally as possible"], *En Marge de la Sainte-Alliance. Lettres de Bonald au comte de Senfft*, Jean-René Derré, ed. (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1967), 68–69.

[25] Chambre des députés. There was also a Chambre des Pairs (Chamber of Peers), with members nominated by the king.

[26] For example, Bonald, whose correspondence expresses his intense dislike of the Charter, pretends to be its most authoritative and well-meaning exegete when he addresses the Chamber of Deputies, claiming that the liberals are its real enemies, a familiar ploy with the *Ultras*.

[27] Chateaubriand, *De la monarchie selon la Charte* (1816).

early years of the Revolution, demanding the restitution of their ancient privileges; some Church dignitaries eager for purple splendor; and *Chouans* who, during the civil war, principally in western France had fought "pour Dieu et pour le roi" from 1793 on, and now were looking for revenge. There was an internal opposition within the State too, especially when the impetuous royalists, even more so than the king himself ("plus royalistes que le roi"), dared to lecture him. Let's add to this array of adversaries a nascent opposition among those disappointed from the start by the government, ready to fight from 5 September 1816, when the *Chambre introuvable* was dissolved, to the 1824 general election and even beyond, later turning into a "counter-opposition." The political game came up naturally with its modern form, a change of power made possible by the existence of a choice of options, which unfortunately would be missing during the Monarchie de Juillet (July Monarchy), as Patrice Rolland points out.[28] Liberalism was characterized by its commitment to its doctrine and its enmity towards the *Ultras*, and vice versa. Ultra-royalists demanded a return to the Ancien Régime and a radical abolition of anything inherited from the Revolution, calling for the punishment of its former actors and present proponents.

Moreover, each current had its own diversity, such as the far Right with the "*exagérés*" et "*pointus*." Under new names surfaced old polarities, all the more so as many members of the Chamber of Deputies had lived through those times, some having even taken the bench on either side of the revolutionary assemblies.

2. The "White Terror"

The first few months of the Second Restoration saw not only an increasingly violent discourse, such as that of François-Régis de La Bourdonnaye, a radical MP calling for irons, hangmen and torture,[29] but also a "Terreur blanche," a so-called "white Terror" seen as a counter-revolutionary terror aiming to eradicate the Revolution by playing its own game.[30] Its legal aspects did postpone any effect of Louis XVIII's desire to reconcile the country, thanks to "union and oblivion." This moment had been downplayed in the historiography of the Restoration[31] until recent studies reassessed it.[32] From its "spontaneous" launching after Bonaparte's second departure, it settled scores against "Jacobins" and "Bonapartists" alike, while killing protestants as well. The following "legal" moment, reestablishing the "*Cours prévôtales*" (special jurisdictions), did not stop with the speedy trial and execution of Marshal Ney.[33] It seemed that his blood was not enough to avenge Louis Antoine de Bourbon, duc d'Enghien, since other less famous trials took place during the

[28] Patrice Rolland, "Les leçons d'un texte constitutionnel," *Jus politicum, op. cit*., 9.

[29] See Olivier Tort, "Le discours de La Bourdonnaye sur l'amnistie (11 novembre 1815). Un archétype du rôle des conflits de mémoire dans la marginalisation de l'extrême-droite," *Histoire, Economie & Société* (2005): 233–252. In the spring of 1816, it is proposed before the Chamber of Deputies to reinstate the gallows. François-Régis de La Bourdonnaye (1767-1839) was an ultra-royalist deputy and the leader of the "pointus" faction.

[30] White was the color of the new flag of the restored France, opposed to the revolutionary and imperial blue, white and red flag. During the Revolution, the counter-revolutionary fighters, whether *Chouans, Vendéens or Émigrés* troops, were nicknamed *les Blancs*.

[31] See for example Guillaume Bertier de Sauvigny, *La Restauration en questions. Joie, hardiesse, utopies* (Paris: Bartillat, 1999), 49–58.

[32] Pierre Triomphe, *1815 - La Terreur blanche* (Toulouse: Privat, 2017); Laurent Nagy, *D'une Terreur à l'autre. Théories du complot et nostalgies de l'Empire, 1815-1816* (Paris: Vendémiaire, 2012).

[33] Michel Ney (1769-1815), one of Napoleon's most famous marshals, had sworn to Louis XVIII he would capture Napoleon when the "usurper" set foot in France in 1815, but he rallied the Emperor instead and led the cavalry at Waterloo. Accused of treason, he was tried and executed on 7 December 1815.

same period.[34] For instance, the records of the trial of Émile Babeuf's *Nain tricolore*, a satirical journal, seized from its first issue, were quoted at length in *Le Moniteur* and the main Parisian and provincial papers. Accused of calling for the overthrow of the dynasty, a death penalty case, the defendants—journalists and the publication's director—were condemned only to hard labor. Fortunately for them, the Cayenne penal colony had not yet been created.[35] They were sent to the Mont Saint-Michel and released ahead of time.[36] When it came to the "*Patriots*" affair, the outcome was more sinister. The only crime of the presumed conspirators was to drink heavily and sell membership cards to pay for their drinking sprees.[37] The judges were not amused, and the participants were publicly executed in the summer. Whether inspired by popular initiative or by the judicial system, these tragedies looked like 1789 and 1793 seen through the looking glass.

3. Rolling back the Revolution

All in all, motivated by their vengeful ideology, the ultra-royalist parliamentary group, the counter-revolutionary leaders, and a sizeable part of the public opinion were adamant that the Revolution had to pay back, facts and symbols alike. See, for instance, two initiatives from the 1815 House, with opposite fates but similar in purpose. First, Roux de Laborie proposed to restitute to the clergy the keeping of the Register of births, marriages, and deaths (*Registre d'état-civil*), which would have reinstated an Ancien Régime custom in a crucial and most sensitive administrative issue and presented to the Church a significant and dignified recovery of its former sociopolitical prerogatives.[38] Though rejected, this proposal generated passionate debates and revived the fear of a return to the pre-revolutionary past. It was tempting for the Left to link this proposal with the general policy of the State to restore a decent way of life to the cloth, after twenty-five years of persecution and dispossession.

The second proposal was more successful. On 8 May 1816 Louis de Bonald got a majority for the law abolishing divorce which had been instituted in 1792.[39] This *ultra*-figurehead, who had tirelessly fought against divorce since the Consulate, was seen as a living symbol of the counter-revolutionary doctrine. Bonald and his friends hailed this new law as a symbolic and decisive victory, although it had no real impact on the actual way of life, since it could not have been enforced retroactively, and since the 1804 *Code civil* had made it almost impossible to get a divorce. Thanks to this triumph, in fact the only achievement for the "*Chambre introuvable*," and thinking they had rolled back the Revolution the "true Royalists" congratulated themselves.[40] Defined by the conservative doctrine as the "cornerstone of society," as a social microcosm, and primitive

[34] Louis-Antoine de Bourbon-Condé, duc d'Enghien (1772-1804) had in 1792 been commander-in-chief of the "Armée royale française" against the French republican army. He took refuge in the Principality of Baden, from which he was abducted, brought back in France, tried and executed on 21 March 1804. He was indeed a determined opponent to the Consulate, but he was falsely accused of conspiring against Bonaparte.

[35] In French Guyana.

[36] The Abbey of Mont-Saint-Michel was a prison during the Revolution and the Empire, and would remain so until 1863.

[37] The Patriots, a group of twenty-eight presumed conspirators, were arrested and tried in June 1816. They presented no real threat to the government.

[38] Antoine-Athanase Roux de Laborie (1769-1842), barrister, journalist, and royalist MP, who was briefly deputy secretary of the provisional government in 1814.

[39] See Bertran de Balanda, "Louis de Bonald et la question du divorce, de la rédaction du Code civil à la loi du 8 mai 1816," *Histoire, Économie & Société*, 3 (2017): 72–86.

[40] See for example Bonald, "De la Chambre de 1815," *Le Conservateur* (July 1819), reprinted in *Oeuvres complètes*, II, Migne, ed. (Paris-Montrouge, 1859-1864) 695 *sq*.

state of the community, marriage so reinstated and vindicated as being indissoluble was seen as tantamount to a fundamental restoration of society, which the Revolution had unsettled.[41]

Clearly, the ghost of the Revolution still haunted the period. Elected to eradicate the Revolution, but overly counter-revolutionary, the *Chambre introuvable* was dissolved on 5 September 1816. Whether that royal decision was due to the king's own annoyance, Decazes' advice,[42] or the Allied Powers' admonitions,[43] the motivation matters little. At this stage, it might be thought that the dual threat had been warded off. In fact, it continued to discreetly influence the debates, and would come again to the fore with a vengeance under Charles X's reign.

III. 1825, Act III: Rise, fall and ambivalence of the *Ultra* paradigm

Its most prestigious surviving figure, the Comte d'Artois, second brother of Louis XVIII, combined the Ancien Régime as it was and the ideal Ancien Régime the *Ultras* dreamt of, the great awakening of the Counter-Revolution. He reunited the memories of Versailles's ruinous golden age and Coblentz's hollow pomp and circumstance, the wantonness of the old Court and the holier than thou ostentatious piety of the conservative circles.[44] Above all, within the Pavillon de Marsan in the Tuileries Palace,[45] his long conniving entourage hoped for an easy end to the regime's liberal beginnings.[46] Everybody knew that, unlike his brother, he would rather sport Henri IV's white plume than pursue his policy of reconciliation.[47] Furthermore, d'Artois could count on Villèle's support, in office since 1821[48] and, in the 1824 House, on a *Retrouvée ultra* majority.[49] With the presumed support from the landed *notables*,[50] whose influence had been reinforced in 1820 thanks to the *double vote*, the road seemed opened to a reactionary onslaught.[51]

---

[41] Bonald, "Sur le divorce," *Le Rénovateur* (25 May 1833), reprinted in Migne, *Oeuvres completes*, II, 175.

[42] Élie Decazes (1780-1860), minister of Police, was one of Louis XVIII's favorites and had the king's ear.

[43] Louis XVIII was irritated by the Ultras' excesses and agitation, which annoyed Decazes as well, who advised the king to call a new general election. The Allied Powers were concerned that too reactionary policies and measures would inflame the kingdom and pushed for a dissolution.

[44] The Comte d'Artois had emigrated to Coblentz, which turned into a hive of virulent *Émigrés,* who insisted on maintaining in exile the Court *etiquette.*

[45] Still in place nowadays, the Pavillon de Marsan is located at the north-west end of the Louvre, and joined it with the Tuileries Palace, destroyed in 1871. Competing with Louis XVIII's court, the Comte d'Artois entertained there his own entourage of Ultra courtiers.

[46] Louis XVIII died on 16 September 1824 and his brother, the Comte d'Artois, automatically became king as Charles X.

[47] One of Henri IV's famous mottos during the religious civil war which ended with his coronation in 1589 was "Suivez mon panache blanc" (Follow my white plume). He was an iconic figure for the royalists, *constitutionnels* and Ultras alike, even though, ironically, his reign had been one of reconciliation between Catholics and Protestants.

[48] Joseph de Villèle (1773-1854), a leader of the Ultras, was nominated Prime Minister in the wake of the duc de Berry's assassination on 13 February 1821. Elder son of the comte d'Artois, born in 1778, the duc de Berry was the heir to the throne and would have been king of France after his father's reign.

[49] The 1816 general election brought to the Chamber a majority of *constitutionnels* deputies, and the government policy was somewhat more liberal. Villèle advised Louis XVIII to call a new general election in February and March 1824, which saw a landslide victory of the Ultras. The new Chamber was nicknamed the *Chambre retrouvée.*

[50] The members of the new social elite born during the Revolution and the Empire were called the Notables (people of note, as it were). They favored a conservative policy.

[51] Only the taxpayers could cast a first vote to elect a first batch of deputies, and only the most heavily taxed voters could cast a second vote to elect another batch of deputies. On the *double vote*, see Jean-Pierre Chaline, "Le suffrage censitaire a-t-il été profitable à la Restauration?," *Cahiers de la Nouvelle Société des Études sur la Restauration*, no. XI, 2012, 25–32.

1. 1825: has the right time come?

On 29 May 1825 Charles X's coronation in Rheims seemed to tie the knot. Louis XVIII had wished to be crowned, but twice over circumstances had prevented the event: the Hundred Days in 1815, and his health in 1819. Had the ceremony taken place, his reign might have been perceived differently. However, its absence was interpreted as a compromise with the new age. Yet, Charles X's coronation was meant to appear as a restyling of a founding event. The holy anointment did not refer to Providence, as mentioned in the Charter, i.e. a direct but exceptional intervention from God, but did convoke the divine right, and therefore a sacrosanct tradition, establishing the king as the representative of God on Earth. At the same time, the assembly of the people and the changes brought to the *ordo*, the coronation ritual, taking into account the new institutions, added an alliance with the French people as a whole to the alliance with God. Transcendence and immanence blended ingeniously, presenting the king with a dual part as a representative: of heavenly eternity towards his subjects on the one hand, and of his due benevolence towards his subjects before God and History on the other. Therefore, representation could not be separated from *responsability*. It has been said that only then did the term Restoration find its full meaning. Indeed, it was really just beginning[52].

At the same time, however, a whole array of counter-revolutionary legal measures was being debated: a series of laws on women's congregations, compensating the *Émigrés*, intended to punish the desecration of holy bread, and attempting to re-establish primogeniture in general inheritance laws (the "*droit d'aînesse*"). One step further—or rather, another stroke of the pen—and the nation would have found itself back in the customary mores of 1788. Among these measures, the debate in both Houses on the sacrilege law was most fierce, as shown in the *Archives parlementaires*.[53] Without a blink, Bonald advocated the death penalty, though trading the mutilation of the guilty hand for a public atonement, and declared that such a punishment was nothing but a helping hand from human justice to divine justice, "sending the profanator to his natural judge."[54] On the opposite side Barante, Lanjuinais, and above all Royer-Collard, along with Constant condemned a confusion between the natural and the spiritual, which they saw as an adulteration of the Christian pardon paving the road for a theocratic regime.[55]

Once again, the real judicial impact of these measures is less interesting than their perception by public opinion. In fact, primogeniture, which would not have changed the then current practice, was rejected. Though voted upon, the sacrilege law was never enforced.[56] However, the debates around these proposals—in both Chambers, in the papers, and blooming also in many polemical brochures from both sides—are a testament to their resounding effect and the profound meaning they received from public opinion. Even so, let us stress that this opinion was political, and that the real concerns of the French people lay elsewhere. For instance, the laws

[52] Waresquiel, *Penser la Restauration*, 226: "It is not when the Charter is promulgated, on June 4th 1814, that the term Restoration gets its full dimension, but eleven years later, on the very day of Charles X's coronation."

[53] On this law, see M. Hartman, "The sacrilege law of 1825 in France: a study in anticlericalism and myth-making," *Journal of Modern History*, vol. XLIV, no. 1, 1972; Gérard Pelletier, "Une loi sur le sacrilège ? Le débat français de 1825, *Communio*, vol. 38, no. 1, 2013; Jacques-Henri Lespagnon, *La Loi du sacrilège*, thèse, Faculté de droit de l'Université de Paris, F. Loviton, 1935.

[54] That particular passage was not printed in *Le Moniteur* and is also missing from the *Oeuvres complètes*.

[55] Prosper de Barante (1782-1866), historian, writer and liberal MP. Jean-Denis Lanjuinais (1753-1827), jurist, politically involved during the Revolution, senator during the Empire and *constitutionnel* royalist member of the Chamber of Peers. Pierre-Paul Royer-Collard (1763-1845), philosopher, MP, one of the prominent liberal leaders. On Constant, see above, "Legitimacy in question."

[56] Immediately after his accession to the throne, Louis-Philippe abolished it in 1830.

on the congregations and sacrilege did not stir the crowds, the less conservative section of the population being more irritated by the proliferating Catholic missions combining their religious purpose with a political nature.[57] The famous "milliard des Émigrés" partially comforted these victims, and did not trouble all those who acquired "Biens nationaux" nor their descendents, who had been in a constant state of anxiety since 1814.[58] Having proclaimed that these acquisitions were guaranteed, the Charter kept that promise. Against all odds, less symbolic but more damaging to the small stockholders, the change brought to the State annuities, a consequence of that particular compensation, raised quite a turmoil destined to last[59].

2. Stepping back in time: an obsessive fear

A two-headed obsession has been a frequent topic in historical studies, which highlighted the joint victory of a "France châtelaine" and a "parti prêtre,"[60] both presumed to have disappeared after 1789 but more alive than ever, since they were triumphantly reunited by the official alliance of Throne and Altar.[61] This is neither entirely true nor entirely false. To be sure, Béranger's songs seemed to confirm the popularity of such views, but their exaggerated rhetoric was deliberately subversive.[62] To be an *Ultra* in the late 1820s was different from having been so in 1814 or 1819. Even though you read Martainville's *Drapeau blanc*,[63] you could be a quiet provincial *bourgeois* or a harmless squire satisfied with Villèle's politics,[64] potbellied and lethargic like the political majority you supported (nicknamed the "belly" by its opponents, while its supporters were called the "paunchy ones").[65] If you stood by your convictions from the times of Decazes and the *Conservateur*, you unwittingly had followed the steps of Chateaubriand and caught a touch of liberalism.[66] If you persisted in your gothic absolute opposition, you paradoxically joined the liberal

[57] See Philippe Boutry, "Les missions catholiques de la Restauration: réflexions historiographiques," *Actes du colloque des 23-24 mars 2000 à Limoges*, Paul d'Hollander (dir.), Limoges, PULIM, 2001, 31–56; Abbé Louis Kerbiriou, "Les missions bretonnes. Histoire de leurs origines mystiques," *Annales de Bretagne*, vol. 42, n° 1-2, 1935; Ernest Sevrein, *Les Missions religieuses en France sous la Restauration*, Paris, Vrin, 1959 [1948].

[58] During the Revolution, most possessions of the Church and of the *Émigrés* were seized by the revolutionary state and sold as "Biens nationaux". The acquisitors were guaranteed their possession by the Charter of 1814. A Compensation Act was voted in 1825 in favour of the stripped *Émigré* owners, who shared a total amount of 650 million francs. In order to denounce this law, the opposition, in both speeches and pamphlets, inflated this sum to one billion, hence the so-called "milliard des Émigrés."

[59] See Guy Berger, "Chateaubriand et le débat sur la conversion des rentes et le financement de l'indemnité due aux émigrés en 1824-1825», *Cahiers de la Maison de Chateaubriand*, no. 6 (2018): 123–148.

[60] François Dominique de Reynaud de Montlosier (1755-1838) is thought to have coined the expressions "the manor born France" and the "clerical party." A convinced royalist, he nevertheless expressed a strong hostility to the Jesuits and the supposed stranglehold of an ultramontane catholic church on the monarchy. See also below note 66.

[61] On the reality of this union, see Mathieu Brejon de Lavergnée and Olivier Tort (dir.), *L'Union du Trône et de l'Autel ? Politique et religion sous la Restauration* (Paris : PUPS, 2012). See also Rémy Hême de Lacotte's PhD thesis, *Entre le trône et l'autel : la grande aumônerie de France sous l'Empire et la Restauration (1804-1830)*, Université de Paris IV (2012). For him, this alliance simply confirmed a "purely administrative agreement between Church and State."

[62] Pierre-Jean de Béranger (1780-1857), a very popular songwriter and poet, hailed the legend of Napoleon, mocked the Ultras and was a mouthpiece of the liberal opposition. He was imprisoned on several occasions during the Restoration.

[63] Alphonse Martainville (1777-1830), playwright and journalist, published from 1819 to 1827 a fiercely *ultra* newspaper, *Le Drapeau blan*c.

[64] To the most radical fringe of the Ultras, Villèle was not doing enough and was not going far enough to implement truly counter-revolutionary policies. On the other hand, the conservative sector of public opinion was quite content with his government.

[65] "Ventre" and "ventrus."

[66] *Le Conservateur* was an *Ultra* periodical paper published from October 1818 to March 1820. Among its main contributors were Chateaubriand, Bonald, and Villèle. It strongly stood against Decazes' policies. Chateaubriand would later evolve towards a more liberal approach to politics.

opposition against Villèle. The wealthy landed *notable*, no longer adverse to shareholding, did in fact comfort a new elite, influential and already exclusive. Monsieur de la Jobardière was still a comic character for satirists, but he did not frighten anybody anymore. This figure is from a play created in 1830, written by Armand d'Artois (Armand François Victor Dartois de Bournonville), Dupin and Dumarsan, *Monsieur de la Jobardière ou la Révolution impromptue, comédie en un acte mêlée de couplets*. It is the best known among the caricatures of the *Ultra*, or of the *ancient émigré*, which flourished everywhere since the beginning of the Restoration.

3. Myth and reality

Yet, if some myths faded away, new ones did surface. The use of the word "anticlericalism" seems as anachronistic as inappropriate, since the "enemies of religion" were nothing but an alarming fantasy devised by the Catholic Right. Certainly the "Jesuit plot," pointed out by d'Eckstein[67] or Montlosier,[68] both rightist figures and relished by the Left, was constantly referred to by the opposition from 1826 onwards.[69] Exposing a supposed stranglehold of the Jesuits on the government, Montlosier's pamphlet caused an uproar and prompted a flurry of replies. The inflamed debate gained in intensity by its acquittal after it had been brought to court. Implicitly admitting the existence of the Jesuit order, Frayssinous committed a fatal blunder, and the 1828 ruling which expelled the Jesuits from France put an end to it all.[70]

Already, the "Congrégation"[71] and the "Chevaliers de la Foi" had been assimilated.[72] From the summer of 1827, especially after the decree of 24 June reinstating censorship, a flood of pamphlets attacked Villèle's government, denounced as being "despotic," and the Church accused of dominating the State, with the "Montrouge militia" masterminding it all.[73] In addition to the topical poems by Barthélémy and Méry,[74] let us quote this excerpt from an anonymous publication (in fact due to Antoine Jay) which sums up this hatred for St Ignatius of Loyola's disciples:

> For some years, the advancement of this famous Order had been observed, an independent state within the Church, ambitioning to dominate kings and to dominate through them. The very existence of this natural assistant to despotism is irreconcilable with public freedom. When they came to France, they went underground, but were soon recognised by their unruly missionary activity and the audacious exposure of their doctrine. Friends of constitutional liberty were alarmed, when, throughout France, their disastrous incendiary

[67] Danish-born Ferdinand Eckstein, le baron d'Eckstein (1790-1861), was a literary figure philosophically influenced by German idealism. He founded a paper, *Le Catholique* (1826-1829). In 1827, he published a pamphlet, *Des Jésuites*.

[68] François Dominique de Reynaud de Montlosier, *Mémoire à consulter sur un système religieux et politique, tendant à renverser la religion, la société et le trône* (Paris: Ambroise Dupont, Roret et Moutardier & Cie, 1826).

[69] See Michel Leroy, *Le Mythe Jésuite. De Béranger à Michelet* (Paris : Presses Universitaires de France, 1992).

[70] Denis, comte Frayssinous (1765-1841), was the minister for Ecclesiastical Affairs and Public Instruction in Villèle's cabinet. In an official speech, he foolishly acknowledged the existence of the Jesuit order, thus presenting the opposition with a political weapon.

[71] Founded in 1801 by Jean-Baptiste Bourdier-Delpuits S.J. as an association devoted to the defence of the Catholic religion and to charity, the *Congrégation* was accused of spying for the Papalcy and dissolved in 1809. It was revived in 1819 by another Jesuit, Pierre Ronsin. The opposition denounced it as a Jesuit and Ultra sect and it was dissolved once more in 1830. See Matthieu Brejon de Lavergnée, "Mythes politiques et analyse de réseaux. La Congrégation à Paris sous la Restauration," *Histoire et Mesure,* XXIV*,* 1 (2009), online at https://doi.org/10.4000/histoiremesure.3892

[72] The *Chevaliers de la Foi* is a secret society founded in 1810 in defence of religion and of the legitimate monarchy. During the Second Restoration, its members joined the *Ultra* faction, and the society dissolved itself in 1826.

[73] The headquarters of the Society of Jesus were in the suburban city of Montrouge.

[74] *Rome à Paris. Poème en quatre chants*, 1826, and *Jésuites, Épître à M. le président Séguier*, 1826. Auguste Marseille Barthélémy (1796-1867) and Joseph Méry (1798-1866) were satirist poets who wrote together and mocked the Ultras, notably in *La Villiade*, directed at Villèle (1827). They also chanted the Napoleonic legend in a series of epic poems.

> missions rekindled long-forgotten vile superstitions and paved the way to servitude for a whole generation. Public opinion was alerted, but then came a government keen to suppress the freedom of the press, which seized the opportunity and took to court two papers of the opposition, guilty of anti-religious bias, and implemented all it could in favor of this attempt.[75]

Books of the period were exclusively devoted to this subject, like Salgues's *Petit catéchisme des Jésuites*[76] and *Antidote de Montrouge*,[77] the author purporting to be a Jesuit himself. Other themes were linked to it, such as identifying the government with the Holy See, so heralded by the prolific Lamothe-Langon,[78] and Salvandy,[79] who produced many pamphlets, as well as La Gervaisais.[80]

The fear of a return to pre-Louis XV times, even more so than to pre-Louis XVI times, should not been seen as an inflated dread of an inverted History. Pushing it back to a past definitely gone, not to be resurrected as it was, this fear might be construed as a kind of appeasement; as some notion that the passing of time, more efficiently than the institutions, had managed to work out a compromise. However, that is by no means to say that a new revolution was ready to occur yet. It would be prepared by a complex set of causes, underlying and circumstantial alike, irrelevant here.

Nevertheless, we could propose that the last Bourbons, even though they failed to redefine and confine 1789, did manage to put it at a distance, if not by jeering at it then at least by leaving it to drift on the tide of History.

Conclusion: of dreams, nightmares and certain astonished awakenings

As is unavoidable with any summary inventory, we have undoubtedly raised more questions than we have answered. Assessing how the early nineteenth century intellectually took on board the revolutionary and monarchical pasts is a work in progress, which promises to last a great deal longer yet. The history of the years 1814-1830 is currently being reassessed, an ongoing process undertaken by quite a few historians[81].

---

[75] " On s'était aperçu depuis quelques années des progrès de cette société fameuse qui forme dans l'Église un État indépendant, et qui veut dominer sur les rois et par les rois. Auxiliaires naturels du despotisme, leur existence, comme leur corporation reconnue, est incompatible avec les libertés publiques. À leur arrivée en France, ils creusèrent des souterrains et s'y cachèrent; mais on les reconnut bientôt à la turbulente activité de leurs missions, et à la téméraire exposition de leurs doctrines. Les amis de la liberté constitutionnelle s'alarmèrent; leur zèle signala l'effet désastreux de ces missions, qui traînant l'incendie d'un bout de la France à l'autre, ressuscitent d'ignobles superstitions ensevelies dans l'oubli, et préparent toute une génération à la servitude. L'opinion publique fut avertie; alors survint le ministère avide de prétextes contre la liberté de la presse. Deux journaux de l'opposition furent déférés aux tribunaux, comme coupables de tendance antireligieuse; et tout fut mis en œuvre pour assurer le succès de cette tentative," Antoine Jay [1770-1854], *Mémoire à consulter sur les actes arbitraires de la censure* (Paris, 1825), 5.

[76] Jacques-Barthélémy Salgues [1760-1830] *Petit catéchisme des Jésuites, à l'usage des écoles, collèges, noviciats, petits séminaires et congrégations dirigés par la Compagnie*, par le R.P. Picotin, de la Société de Jésus (Paris, Moutardier, 1827).

[77] Salgues, *L'antidote de Mont-Rouge, ou Six questions adressées à Mgr l'évêque d'Hermopolis, sur le projet de rétablir ou de tolérer les Jésuites, et suivies de l'examen de leurs modernes apologistes*, MM. Tharin, de Bonald, etc. (Paris, Moutardier, 1827).

[78] Étienne-Léon de Lamothe-Langon [1786-1864], *Alliance de la censure et de l'Inquisition, acte prouvé par le fait* (Paris, "Au bureau de la France chrétienne," 1827).

[79] Narcisse-Achille de Salvandy (1795-1856), writer, political publicist, who constantly opposed the Ultras and Villèle's policies.

[80] Nicolas III de La Gervaisais (1765-1838) was a prolific pamphleteer. He notably targeted Villèle. On these publications of summer 1827, see Bertran de Balanda, "De la censure à la césure : autour d'une offensive polémique et satirique (juin-novembre 1827),"*Cahiers de la Nouvelle Société des Etudes sur la Restauration*, XVII, 2018 (2019): 49–78.

[81] The best comprehensive works are Emmanuel de Waresquiel and Benoît Yvert, *Histoire de la Restauration (1814-1830). Naissance de la France moderne* (Paris, Librairie académique Perrin, 1996); Francis Démier, *La France de la*

One of the intricate chains of paradoxes we have tried to unknot could be presented this way: if the liberals reluctantly accepted a restored monarchy in order to get rid of imperial despotism, their hope to see the Left and the Center become political forces armed with a doctrine did come to fruition. On the other hand, the royalists hoped that the Charter, that bad dream, would disappear—though, in fact, they could live with it, since it gave them an undreamt-of frame for a form of stable governance.[82] Of course, these two *ideal types* would be redrawn after 1830. But since the Revolution as well as the Monarchy had shown themselves to be diverse (1814 had been different from 1788 or 1688; 1830 would not be another 1789), they could be dissolved or unfolded within larger and synchronous categories, desperately compatible: *Revolution and Restoration, both ongoing and both inseparable*. Hence many more dreams, nightmares, and awakenings.

Restauration (1814-1830. L'impossible retour au passé (Paris, Gallimard, 2012); and Emmanuel de Waresquiel, *C'est la Révolution qui continue! La Restauration (1814-1830)* (Paris, Tallandier, 2015). Founded in 2001, the Nouvelle Société des Études sur la Restauration (NSER – http://www.nser.fr) publishes its proceedings in yearly *Cahiers*.

[82] " What I would rather like with the septenniality [NB: in 1824, Villèle decided that the newly elected Chamber would stay in place during seven years without one-fifth annual renewal, which was the rule until then], is that it would put the royalists to rest for a long period and make them forget about the Charter, so that, were it possible, some happy conjecture would free us from it, and make it vanish into thin air like a dream from last night"; "Ce que j'aimerais assez de la septennalité, est qu'elle laisse reposer pendant un long intervalle les royalistes et leur faire perdre de vue la Charte, en sorte que si, par impossible, il se trouvait des conjectures assez heureuses pour nous en délivrer, elle pourrait s'évanouir comme un songe de la nuit dernière […]." Lettre de Bonald à Senfft du 19 décembre 1821, *En marge de la Sainte-Alliance*, 35.