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(For Aspern and Essling, Sir James claims 44,000 French casualties out of the approximate 55,000 engaged and invents the statement that they "had to abandon most of their wounded.")

The whole book is studded with such chunks of nonsense: at Marengo, Kellermann charges with "two squadrons of the Consular Guard"; the Russians "recaptured Eylan" during that battle; one day's fighting disappears from the Battle of Leipzig; the separate 1814 battles of Brienne and La Rothière mysteriously become one affair; at Waterloo French infantry columns attack British infantry squares. The strategical "analysis" likewise contains nothing new, much that is dubious, and some flat errors. The whole effect is one of hasty writing and complete carelessness as to the results.

In sum, the book cannot be recommended for either pleasure or profit.

Falls Church, Virginia

John R. Elting

PRESSE ET JOURNALISME SOUS LE SECOND EMPIRE. By Roger Bellet.


The "Collection Kiosque" is another example of the French talent for popularization. The volumes already published are, as the title of the collection suggests, on the press. Several are studies of some aspect of the French press, but most of them deal with an event or movement as seen through French periodicals. Bellet's work is a bit of both; it is a history and description of the press during the Second Empire with the press as its main source.

The history, which is scattered throughout the volume, is too sketchy to be of much use to the historian. The author contrasts the 1850's, a period of "stagnation" for the press, with the 1860's, a period of "movement." His account of the government's attempts to control and guide the press are familiar, but his well-chosen examples of censorship suggest that inflexibility and lack of imagination may be occupational diseases of the censor.

More interesting and new than his history of the press is Bellet's description of French journals and of the work and customs of their editors and writers. The variety of the press during the Second Empire reminds one of a well-stocked supermarket magazine rack. The ingenuity of French publishers seeking to sell their products to the vastly increased reading public at times even surpassed that of twentieth-century American publishers; the owners of the journal La Naïade, for example, printed fifty copies on rubber for use in public baths, where they served both as reading matter and as towels. The feuilleton, a continued novel usually written especially for the press according to a tried formula, accounted for the success of some journals. Timothée Trimm, the first modern columnist, contributed to raising the circulation of Le Petit Journal to an unprecedented figure of 300,000. Largely by means of extracts from the press and memoirs, we follow a number of journalists from the moment of their decision to become writers to their subsequent first trembling visit to the famous editor and the acceptance of their initial article (usually uncompensated) and finally to their establishment in the profession.
After strolling with Bellet along the boulevards and streets of Paris, through the journalists' cafés, to the fields of honor where they so often faced each other, and after meeting as individualistic a group of men as the profession has ever known, the reader would be ungrateful to complain that the author failed to use archival material and the results of recent scholarship, sources that might have been helpful on problems such as the economics of journalism and the relationship between the government and the press.

San Jose State College

David I. Kulstein


Posthumous son of the Duc de Berry and grandson of Louis XVIII, Henri Comte de Chambord (1820–1883) never reigned in France and, when he died, the House of Bourbon died with him. Royalists placed their hopes in l’enfant du miracle, but his most concrete effect on the destinies of the promised land he scarcely touched after 1830 was to make possible the Third Republic by making a monarchist restoration impossible.

The greater part of Mr. Brown’s book indicates the reasons and beliefs behind Chambord’s failure to take advantage of the favorable situation of 1871–1873. Royalist politics as Professor Osgood outlined them a few years ago are not his main theme. Despite chapters on legitimist politics and diplomatic maneuvers, the book focuses on the royal personage itself, described from early youth to an end that contributes the cautionary tale of a healthy fat pretender dying because he died to be king.

Chambord’s papers were destroyed after his death, but Brown has gathered his documents with exemplary industry and tells his story deliberately, with much detail of the pretender’s life and ways. Little is said about the basis of legitimist support, about its socioeconomic implications, about the differences between rival monarchist groups and ideologies, about the rather intriguing (and by now familiar) conjunction between political reaction and a certain kind of social reformism. Here, however, is the first English-language biography of the man whom the Orléanists rightly called *Monsieur de Trop*, and, despite the biographer’s sympathy for his subject, the book does nothing to contradict that view. Willy-nilly, it depicts a dull figure that bears out Thiers’s judgment: “Un enfant ou un sot, douemain... obstiné,” driven by the notion of his royal duties away from what he would really have liked to be: “a bourgeois and very rich. . . .”

The story really proves how much men count. One wonders what a personality like the Duc d’Aumale’s would have achieved in the Bourbon’s place. In the event, Chambord’s importance was purely negative. His principles ensured inefficacy; his presence kept the Orléanists out. Hugo described his adherence to the white flag, which ended all chances of restoration, as a noble suicide. But the stuffed corpse persisted Ionesco-like long after it had become an anachronism, and its admirers with it. Monarchism remained a threat to the republic; legitimism ceased to be one after 1873. Brown’s conclusion that Chambord “restored purity