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The Conseil d’Etat of the Second Republic was dissolved on 2nd December 1851. A letter of protest, signed by eighteen of the forty Conseillers, was sent to Boulay de la Meurthe, Vice-President of the Republic.¹ The Conseil was distrusted by Louis Napoleon; although initially well-disposed towards him after his election, it had generally sided with the Legislative Assembly in its clashes with him. Less than a month before the coup d’état, the Conseil clearly demonstrated where its sympathies lay; in November 1851, a large majority backed the Assembly and not the President over the project of law on “la responsabilité des dépositaires de l’autorité publique” (the “Loi des Questeurs”).²

The decree which dissolved the old Conseil also proposed to submit to the nation a new constitution which promised, amongst other things, a “Conseil d’Etat formé des hommes les plus distingués, préparant les lois et en soutenant la discussion devant le Corps législatif.” Until the formation of this new body, twenty-eight members of the newly formed Consultative Commission, under the presidency of Jules Baroche, formed an administrative section which was given the task of fulfilling the duties of the old Conseil.

* I should like to thank the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique for the financial assistance which enabled me to do the research for this article. I should also like to thank the staff of the following archives: Archives Nationales, Archives de la Seine, Archives de la Guerre, Archives de la Marine, Archives de la Légion d’Honneur and the Section d’Histoire de France at the Bibliothèque Nationale. Finally, may I express my gratitude to Monsieur Guy Braibant, Maître des Requêtes, Mademoiselle Rabant, Librarian, Monsieur Cerffond and other members of the staff of the Conseil d’Etat who were so friendly and helpful during the time I worked there. For sources not specifically mentioned in footnotes, see Appendix I.

¹ The protest, together with an accompanying letter, is now in the Bibliothèque du Conseil d’Etat. It was published in Études et Documents du Conseil d’État, Paris 1948, p. 27.

² J. Boulay de la Meurthe, Notice sur Henri Georges Boulay de la Meurthe, Paris 1873, p. 64.
The task of forming the new Conseil was completed in the first three weeks of January 1852. Casabianca, who had recently been asked to organise the new Ministry of State, and Baroche appear to have had the main responsibility of sifting through the hundreds of applications. All appointments were clearly discussed in the Council of Ministers. A list was drawn up on 21st-22nd January but had to be quickly and radically altered after nearly a quarter of the men on the list withdrew in protest against the decrees of 22nd January on the confiscation of the Orleans family goods. Amongst the men to withdraw were three Conseillers and four auditeurs of the Conseil of the Second Republic who were reappointed to the Conseil. A new list was established and promulgated on 25th January. The haste with which the changes were effected was such that three men who had withdrawn on 22nd January were still on the list published three days later.1

The Government’s freedom in selecting the new Conseil was limited by a number of requirements. It was clearly impressed upon the Government that an element of continuity with the old Conseil was desirable; however much it disliked the Conseil, the Government would need the expertise of some of its members. The Prince President therefore contacted Marchand who was one of the longest serving members of the Conseil d’Etat. Marchand, in his reply to Louis Napoleon,2 recognised that there existed a great deal of ill-feeling against the Conseil. This Conseil, he noted, had been elected by the Constituent and Legislative assemblies; "il y avait donc au Conseil comme dans les chambres, des républicains ardents, des républicains modérés, des légitimistes, des adhérents de juillet et parmi ceux-ci d’anciens conservateurs, des membres de l’opposition et du tiers parti.” But the Conseil never divided on political lines. There was one main division; the division between those Conseillers who considered the Conseil as a political body and those who regarded it as an essentially administrative body. The supporters of the second view were normally to be found amongst the professional Conseillers – those who had belonged to the Conseil of the July Monarchy and had been re-elected in 1849. “Les politiques, les gens d’affaires, voilà quelle était la grande division dans le Conseil.” He then added that the “gens d’affaires”, the administrators, had voted en bloc in favour of the

---

1 For the purpose of this article I have excluded these three men and included their replacements. I have examined the events of January to May 1852 concerning the Conseil d’Etat and the confiscation of the Orleans family goods in an article which is to appear in the 1969 Etudes et Documents du Conseil d’Etat.

President in November 1851. It is clear that the Government acted upon the observations of Marchand when forming the new Conseil.

The Government’s freedom of choice was limited in a second way: it required not only legal specialists and people familiar with the workings of the Conseil but also experts from a much wider variety of backgrounds. It needed financial experts and men of administrative experience in the various ministries as well as specialists from the armed forces.

Finally, the Government’s wish to choose the most talented men available was tempered by political considerations. The faithful had to be rewarded and the doubtful had to be rallied. The scramble for place was intense and undignified but not unexpected. The Government was obliged to use this source of patronage very carefully in the hope of not offending too many of the politically influential. Most Ministers appear to have had some say in the appointments; Herman, Allard and Vieyra-Molina all owed their places to the intervention of Morny, the Minister of the Interior, who also managed to secure a place for Léopold Le Hon, the son of his current mistress. Vuïtry was clearly backed by Fould, the Minister of Finance, whilst Le Roy de Saint-Arnaud, the Minister of War, was responsible for the appointments of his brother and half brother who were both members of the Paris bar. He was only too pleased to see them “enfin sortis de ce Palais ... où il n’y avait que des utopistes ou des défenseurs de libertés dangereuses”.

We may assume that the Minister of State felt no crise de conscience over the appointment of his son as an auditeur, and may equally assume that Maupas, Minister of Police, was no stranger to the appointment of his brother as Maître des Requêtes. Amongst the men with the most pressing claims to a place in the new Conseil were those members of the Legislative Assembly who had been prominent supporters of the Prince President. Vieillard, ex-tutor and friend of Louis Napoleon and member of the Assembly, was given the task of drawing up a list of his colleagues worthy of being included in the new Conseil.

1 One malevolent observer of the time could write that the only reason the members of the Consultative Commission met was to “se surveiller et à se dénoncer mutuellement à l’Elysée. Cela est tout simple. Ils veulent tous être sénateurs ou conseillers d’Etat et ils travaillent à diminuer la concurrence.” Letter Duvergier de Hauranne – Thiers, 29 December 1851, quoted in J. Maurain, Baroche, Ministre de Napoleon III, Paris 1936, p. 112.

Conseil. Montalembert was given the task of suggesting the names of two men; Veuillot, his first choice, refused the honour.¹

The composition of the new Conseil reflected the compromise between the competing claims of technical competence and political patronage. Yet in many ways, the compromise worked surprisingly well. If, from the Government's point of view, the Conseil suffered from serious weaknesses, these weaknesses were not based on lack of talent. If the occasional fils à papa proved to be an unhappy choice as auditeur, most of the new men proved their worth and real ability.

THE APPOINTMENTS OF 25TH AND 26TH JANUARY 1852

Article 2 of the organic law of 25th January which established the Conseil d'Etat, declared the Conseil to be composed of
1. A Vice-President;
2. Forty to fifty Conseillers d'Etat en service ordinaire;
3. Conseillers d'Etat en service ordinaire hors sections; their number should not exceed fifteen;
4. Conseillers d'Etat en service extraordinaire; their number should be restricted to twenty;
5. Forty Maîtres des Requêtes divided into two classes of twenty each;
6. Forty auditeurs divided into two classes of twenty each;
7. A Secretary General having the title and rank of Maître des Requêtes.

The Conseil was thus divided into two groups, the service ordinaire and the service extraordinaire. The service ordinaire was in turn divided between those Conseillers attached to the various sections of the Conseil and for whom the post was supposed to be full-time, and those conseillers who were unattached to any of the sections. The Conseillers hors sections had the right to participate and vote in general assemblies of the Conseil where most of the important decisions were taken. Most of the time, however, they held full-time appointments elsewhere in the public service. As Conseillers they received no salaries. All the Maîtres des Requêtes and auditeurs were attached to the various sections of the Conseil. The title of Conseiller en service extraordinaire was reserved for men who had previously served in the service ordinaire but who had ceased these functions. They could

attend and vote in general assemblies of the Conseil only when specifically requested to do so by the President of the Republic. All members of the Conseil were appointed and dismissed by the President of the Republic. Membership of the service ordinaire was made incompatible with membership of the Senate or the Corps législatif.

On 25th January, the appointments were announced of Baroche as Vice-President, of forty Conseillers en service ordinaire, of twenty first class Maîtres des Requêtes and twenty second class, of eighteen first class auditeurs and thirteen second class. The following day, eleven Conseillers hors sections were appointed. No Conseillers en service extraordinaire were nominated (the first such appointment took place in July 1857).

The appointment of Baroche was not unexpected; since early December 1851 he had been Vice-President of the Consultative Commission. Both as Procureur Général in Paris and as Minister, he had proved himself to be a faithful servant of the President. By limiting himself to the execution of the will of his master he fulfilled his conception of duty. For the next ten years he dominated the life of the Conseil, never hesitating, if necessary, to bully the Conseil if it was unduly reticent about passing some imperial scheme. For many, he was too jealous of his own prerogatives to effectively safeguard those of the body he represented. He kept all the important tasks for himself and systematically stifled the initiative of many of his inferiors. Like many members of the dynastic opposition during the July Monarchy, he was frightened into conservatism after the June Days; for Baroche, eternal vigilance was the price of security. Able, hardworking, cautious, rather narrowminded – these were the hall marks of his personality.¹

From the forty Conseillers en service ordinaire were chosen the presidents of the six sections.² The headship of a section carried considerable power, responsibility and prestige. Political friends of the President, Rouher (Legislation), Delangle (Interior) and Parieu (Finances) were chosen to head those sections which could have a political character or role. For the three sections dealing with matters of a largely technical nature, “professionals” were chosen; they were Maillard (Contentieux), Magne (Public Works) and Admiral Leblanc (War).

¹ There are a number of very good studies of Baroche; amongst the better ones are those of Pierre de la Gorce, Histoire du Second Empire, Paris 1905, Vol. II, pp. 18-19, and Oscar de Vallée, M. Baroche, Paris 1875. The best work is, of course, that of J. Maurain, op. cit.

² The six sections were: Guerre et Marine; Travaux Publics; Agriculture et Commerce; Législation, Justice et Affaires étrangères; Intérieur; Instruction Publique et Cultes; Finances.
The average age of the forty Conseillers en service ordinaire was fifty, although the average conceals a wide range of ages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oldest Average Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 1/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The oldest Conseiller, Maillard, was 78 whilst Rouher and Parieu, both Presidents de section, were only 37. Not surprisingly, as a general rule, the younger the man, the more humble was his rank in the Conseil likely to be, although there were exceptions. There were, for example, thirty five Conseillers younger than Gasc, the oldest first class Maître des Requêtes. Similarly, two first class and seven second class Maitres des Requêtes were younger than the oldest auditeur. The youngest member of the Conseil, Léopold Le Hon, first class auditeur, was a month short of his twentieth birthday.

Not unexpectedly, the composition of the new Conseil reflected the power of the aristocracy and the urban bourgeoisie. A study of the birthplaces of the one hundred and twenty three men shows the importance of Paris and its region:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seine</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seine-et-Oise</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aisne</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouches-du-Rhône</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manche</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yonne</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corsica</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhône</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haute-Garonne</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Well represented regions\(^1\) were Picardie with eight (seven from the Aisne), Rhône-Alpes with seven and Provence-Côte-d’Azur-Corsica with the same number. Amongst the poorly represented regions were Franche-Comté and the Nord with only one representative each. Two regions, Champagne and Brittany, had no representatives at all. A

\(^1\) For this article I have quite simply adopted the twenty-one modern regions.
large majority of the men came from towns with a certain administrative activity or cultural life. Apart from the fifty men born in the Paris area, a further twenty nine were born in departmental chefs-lieux and sixteen in the chefs-lieux of an arrondissement. The dominance of Paris is particularly marked amongst the young members; all but one of the second class auditeurs were born in the Paris region. Six members of the Conseil were born abroad; they were generally the sons of colonial administrators.

The dominance of Paris and the urban areas reflects the fact that a large number of men had fathers who were either government officials or in the liberal professions. This latter point is confirmed by an analysis of their fathers’ professions:

**FATHERS’ PROFESSIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>C.E.s.o.</th>
<th>M. de R.</th>
<th>aud.</th>
<th>hors s.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Army and Navy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomats</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other senior officials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other minor officials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barristers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notaries</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architects</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankers, industrialists, merchants and shopkeepers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                             | 40       | 40       | 31   | 11      | 122   |

1 A word of caution: in the great majority of cases, I have adopted the profession of the father at the time of the reorganisation of the Conseil - or as close as possible to that date. In a small number of cases, however, I have been obliged to take the father’s professions from the members’ birth certificates. Several fathers held a number of posts during their careers; I have included the one he spent most time in; this is the case, for example, of those government officials who spent only short spells in the Conseil d’Etat. All fathers owned some property, but in the category “landowners” I have included only those with no other occupation. The profession of Boilay’s father has not been included as no indication was given in the biographies of the time. His birth certificate, one of the very few not reconstituted by the Archives de la Seine (it was finally traced to his dossier in the Chancellerie de la Légion d’Honneur), reads “fils de Sophie Boilay et de père absent”.
These categories inevitably hide great differences of status. Amongst the magistrates, for example, there were three humble Procureurs (Denjoy, François and Allard) and men of more exalted rank like Comte Portalis and Mesnard, both Présidents de Chambre at the Cour de Cassation and Senators of the Empire. The soldiers ranged in rank from captain (Bréhier and Narcillac) to General (Daumas, Arrighi de Padoue and Darricau). The category “other senior officials” hides the distinction between an Administrateur Général des Douanes (Maillard) and the Governor of the Bank of France (Argout). Nonetheless, the table does give some indication of the family background; it is generally a background of high social status and financial comfort. The new men came from educated families with traditions of service to the state.

The following table is based not only on the fathers’ professions and, in some cases, his income but also on the position of other members of the family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIAL CLASS OF MEMBERS OF THE CONSEIL D’ETAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.E.s.o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haute-bourgeoisie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourgeoisie-moyenne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petite-bourgeoisie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“origines modestes”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 40 41 31 11 123

Some of the most impressive members of the Conseil were of very humble origins; Baroche, the son of a poor Parisian haberdasher, orphan at eleven years old, never failed to emphasise his unpromising start to life.¹ Magne, son of a “seur et teinturier” continually boasted of being born in one of the poorest quarters of Périgueux,² whilst Delangle, to the immense irritation of Haussmann, paraded his modest origins as yet another mark of his virtue.³ Other men of humble background were Bonjean, son of a poor jeweller from Valence, and Gasc who was the illegitimate son of a poor clerk at the Tribunal criminel of the Haute-Garonne. Perhaps the least promising start to life was that of Boilay, the Secretary General, who was the illegitimate son of Sophie Boilay, “artiste de l’Opéra”; he never knew his father.

The majority of men came from wealthy, educated and often distinguished families. As a general rule, the lower the rank in the Conseil, the more elevated was the social class of the family. Thus, 37

per cent of the Conseillers were from families belonging to the aristocracy or the haute-bourgeoisie; the figure rises to 50 percent for the Maîtres des Requêtes and 65 percent for the auditeurs.

The imperial nobility was well represented; eleven were sons or grandsons of ministers, generals or Conseillers d'Etat of the First Empire. Others were of longer, though no less distinguished, lineage. Baron Cardon de Sandrans could trace his title back through bishops, cardinals, generals and parliamentarians to 1040. Comte de Pons-Renepon, "châtelain de Renepon", was the last of a family ennobled by Charles VI in 1422. The Marquis de Ségur belonged to a family which had already produced four Conseillers d'Etat and innumerable other high placed servants of the crown and the Church.

Many were part of a family network which reached out into all branches of public life. Three examples will suffice to illustrate this:

**Godart de Belbeuf**

- great grandfather: Procureur at the Parlement de Rouen;
- grandfather: Deputy at the États Généraux;
- father: Premier Président at the Cour de Rouen and Senator II Empire;
- father-in-law: Comte Siméon, ex-Conseiller d'État, Senator II Empire;
- brother-in-law: Bernon, Trésorier Payeur Général of the Drôme;
- his only son married the daughter of Morny, Minister of II Empire.

**Bernon**

- grandfather: Trésorier de France en la Généralité de Grenoble;
- father: Great Landowner and Conseiller Général of the Drôme;
- uncle: Chasseloup-Laubat, Minister of the II Empire;
- brother: Trésorier Payeur Général of the Drôme;
- father-in-law: Duc de Richebourg.

**Portalis**

- grandfather: Conseiller d'État and Minister of the First Empire;
- father: Pair de France, Minister, Conseiller d'État, Président de Chambre at the Cour de Cassation, Senator II Empire;
- brothers: 1) Conseiller at the Cour d'Appel de Paris;
2) Trésorier Payeur Général of the Loiret;  
3) Deputy of II Empire.

The Parisian bourgeoisie was well represented with men like Cottin whose background is not untypical of many other Parisians; the son of an industrialist, one brother and two nephews were Parisian notaries whilst another brother was a distinguished barrister at the Cour de Cassation. His eldest son was an Inspecteur des Finances, his youngest a doctor and his only daughter married Frédéric Masson, the Napoleonic historian. Other prominent members of the Parisian bourgeoisie were Giraud, Marchand and Gomel.

Others were from important and well established provincial families. Edmond Charlemagne who was elected deputy of the Indre during the July Monarchy and the Second Republic succeeded both his grandfather and father as representative of the department. His brother, Henri, was Mayor of Châteauroux. His son was later Mayor of the town and the fourth member of the family to represent the Indre in Parliament. Georges L'Hôpital represented Evreux as Conseiller d'arrondissement from 1852 to 1873; his grandfather was Mayor of the town and deputy of the Eure during the Restoration. His father was also Mayor of the town and Conseiller Général of Evreux during the July Monarchy whilst his uncle, Admiral La Roncière Le Noury, was Conseiller Général of the same canton throughout the II Empire and deputy of the department during the Third Republic. Other representatives in the Conseil of important provincial families were Edouard Goupil of the Eure-et-Loir ("sa famille est une de celles qui exercent l'influence électorale la plus salutaire dans mon département"),1 Boudet of the Mayenne, Parieu of the Cantal and Renouard de Bussière of the Bas-Rhin.

One of the most striking characteristics of the family backgrounds of these men was the tradition of public service; more than half the fathers were employed in the service of the state. A large minority of men had family contacts with the Conseil:
Five were the grandsons of Conseillers: Bernon, Camus du Martroy, Portalis, Redon de Beaupréau, Bosredon du Pont.

Nine were the sons of Conseillers: Argout, Aubernon,

---

1 Letter Prefect Eure-et-Loire – Minister of Justice, 21 June 1838, AN, BB30 740.
Dubois,
Boinvilliers (fils),
Camus du Martroy,
Boulay de la Meurthe,
Herman,
Portalis,
Redon de Beaupréau.

Two were nephews:
Beron,
Cuvier.

Two were brothers:
Vaïsse,
Boulay de la Meurthe.

One was the son-in-law:
Belbeuf.

A large number of the 1852 men were linked by family ties; Thayer and Arrighi de Padoue were brothers-in-law, Forcade la Roquette and Le Roy de Saint-Arnaud were half-brothers, Magne and Maigne were cousins as were Fouquier and Argout. Perhaps the most impressive family network in the history of the Conseil was that which linked the families of Allard, Séguir (four Conseillers in the family), Vuitry, Cottin, Haubersart, Roederer and Hély d’Oissel (three Conseillers in the family); this family tradition of service in the Conseil commenced during the ancien regime and is still alive.¹

Family connections with other branches of the state service – the armed forces, the diplomatic corps, the bench and the prefectoral corps – were all strong. So too were links with prominent politicians; two were the grandsons, three the sons, four the brothers and two the sons-in-law of ministers or ex-ministers. Twenty seven, or a fifth of the total membership of the Conseil, were the sons or grandsons of parliamentarians.

From various sources² it was possible to find details of the private

¹ I am most grateful to Monsieur Roland de Margerie (member of the present Conseil d’État) and his wife who kindly provided me with this information.
² Based essentially on four sources: 1) their dossiers, 2) the electoral lists of the Seine in the Archives de la Seine 4163 and DM 259 and of a number of other departments for which details are given in the departmental almanachs Bibliotheque Nationale (BN), série Lc30 and Lc31, 3) AN, F1b I 230 1-21 for those who belonged to a Conseil Général, 4) AN, B330 736-742 for those who belonged to the Conseil d’État of the July Monarchy. On the value of these private incomes, the relationship between the property tax and the amount of private annual income, and a discussion of the private incomes of other groups: A. J. Tudesq, Les Conseillers Généraux en France au temps de Guizot, Paris 1967, pp. 111-159 and p. 272; L. Girard et al., Les Conseillers Généraux en 1870, Paris 1967, pp. 22-26 and pp. 54-84; Th. Zeldin, The Political System of Napoleon III, London 1958, pp. 61-65 (for the private incomes of the deputies of 1852); A. J. Tudesq, Les Grands Notables en France 1840-1849, Paris 1964, Vol. I,
incomes of about half the members of the Conseil. It would appear that a small number were very wealthy; amongst the very rich were Martin de Chassiron (paying 7,546 francs in property tax (cens) in 1847), Thayer (paying 6,165 francs) and Richaud (paying 3,509 francs). Montaud, son of a very wealthy Parisian notary, had an estimated annual private income of 100,000 francs in 1855 whilst Arrighi de Padoue had his calculated at 150,000 francs in 1853. Dariste (30,000 francs), Lacaze (30,000 francs), Parieu (40,000 francs) and Royer ("au moins 60,000 francs") may all be considered wealthy. Very few men may be considered as not having a comfortable private income, although Allard, Villemain, Blanche, Denjoy, Suin and Gavini all had less than 5,000 francs a year.

The great majority of annual private incomes appear to have ranged between 10,000 and 25,000 francs, although it must be remembered that many men were either rapidly making, or could expect to inherit, handsome fortunes. Thus, the estimated annual private income of Fremy grew from 15,000 francs in 1839 to 50,000 francs in 1870. Vuitry's private income increased from 20,000 francs in 1852 to 50,000 francs in 1870 and Royer's from 60,000 francs to 150,000 francs in the same period. The most dramatic change of fortune was surely that of Magne whose lowly self-confessed 3,000 francs of 1835 had grown to an estimated 150,000 francs by the end of the Second Empire. Marbeau had a father lucky enough to be paying 6,332 francs in property tax in 1847 whilst Bernon, Dufau and Bartholoni were heirs to annual private incomes calculated at 50,000 francs, 70,000 francs and 100,000 francs respectively. Heurtier's annual private income jumped from 6,000 francs to 30,000 francs (1855) following the death of his father.

A few men improved their delicate financial situations by the time-

---

1 Of the thirty nine men for whom details were found:

- less than 5,000 francs: 3
- 5,000-9,500 francs: 5
- 10,000-19,500 francs: 16
- 20,000-29,500 francs: 9
- 30,000-39,500 francs: 2
- 40,000-50,000 francs: 1
- more than 50,000 francs: 3

Figures for cens paid in either 1846 or 1847:

- 200-499 francs: 3
- 500-1,000 francs: 12
- more than 1,000 francs: 6
honoured technique of marriage. Denjoy, the son of a minor judge "de fortune modeste", and whose annual private income was admitted to be but 4,000 francs in 1847, married the daughter of the immensely wealthy Comte de Salvandy, Minister of the July Monarchy. General Daumas, son of a distinguished but impecunious Imperial general, was in precarious financial condition until his marriage in 1847 to Made-moiselle McCarthy, daughter of a rich merchant of Bordeaux. This happy event brought him an estate worth 150,000 francs and producing an annual income of 5,000 francs. General Niel, who enjoyed rapid promotion in the army in spite of a "fortune médiocre" (1848), married Mademoiselle Maillères, daughter of the Receveur Principal des Douanes in Paris; the dowry was worth a delightful 120,000 francs.¹

Details of the education of the members of the Conseil underlines the importance and attraction of Paris. Of the sixty one men for whom details of secondary education were found, twenty-eight were educated in Paris lycées;² eleven of these men were born in the prov-

¹ For details of the men mentioned in this paragraph, cf. their dossiers which are listed in Appendix II.
² Nine Lycée Henri IV; six Lycée Louis-le-Grand; four Lycée Charlemagne; four Lycée Saint-Louis; eight "études classiques à Paris" (there is some slight overlapping as three men went to two of the above schools).

For details of secondary educations: their dossiers and
a) Archives de la Seine, Collège Sainte-Barbe:
   104 Association amicale des élèves 1852-1889;
   105 Association amicale etc Annuaires 1790-1837;
   106-108 Association amicale etc Correspondance, lettres de faire-part.
b) Associations des anciens élèves de:
   Louis-le-Grand BN, 8° Jo 4411;
   Saint-Louis BN, 8° R 55(1053);
   Henri IV BN, 8° Jo 379.
c) On the Collège Sainte-Barbe:
   J. Quicherat, Paris 1862, 3 vols, BN, R 47853;
   E. Nouvel, Paris 1948, BN, 4° R 6283.
d) On Lycée Henri IV:
   M. Chaumeix, Paris 1936, BN, 8° 42655(3);
   Centenaire 1804-1904, Paris 1904, BN, 8° R 20306.
e) On Lycée Louis-le-Grand:
   M. Donnay, Paris 1939, 8° R 42655(4);
   Études, Souvenirs et Documents, Paris 1963, BN, 8° R 65757;
   G. Dupont-Ferrier, Paris 1921, 3 vols, BN, 8° R 35677.
f) On Lycée Charlemagne:
   Centenaire 1804-1904, Paris 1905, BN, Rés m R 71.
For details of higher education: there is much more information in the dossiers and biographical studies on university education. Note also:
   Ecole Polytechnique, Livre du Centenaire, Paris 1895-1897, 3 vols, BN, Lf 210 33;
   Ecole Normale, Le Centenaire 1795-1895, Paris 1895, BN, 4° R 1192 and
THE REORGANISATION OF THE CONSEIL D'ETAT

Inces. To the twenty-eight, may be added the eight men educated at the famous Collège Sainte-Barbe, and Dariste and Parieu who were educated by the Jesuits at the Collège de Juilly. Nineteen men were pupils at provincial colleges or lycées.

The pull of Paris is particularly marked in university education; although about two fifths of the members of the Conseil were born in the capital, more than four fifths were educated there. Information was found for all but ten of the men:

**UNIVERSITY EDUCATION OF MEMBERS OF THE CONSEIL D'ETAT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecole Polytechnique</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecole Navale, Brest</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Cyr</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecole de Cavalerie Saumur</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Faculty Paris</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenoble</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rennes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strasbourg</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aix</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toulouse</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Faculty Paris</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecole Nationale d'Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a certain degree of overlapping; Dubois, for example, brilliantly passed examinations at Saint Cyr, the Ecole Polytechnique and the Paris Law Faculty. Vuitry took a law degree (and doctorate) in Paris after leaving the Ecole Polytechnique whilst two men, Royer and Parieu, attended both provincial law faculties and the Paris Law Faculty.

The pre-eminence of law is apparent and not surprising given the nature of the work of the Conseil; ninety one of the men for whom details were available were *licenciés en droit* and of these, at least fourteen were *docteurs*. The attraction of Paris for the law students is truly remarkable; fewer than one in nine of the law degrees were obtained in the provinces.

The new Conseil contained some men with brilliant academic records; the case of Dubois with his successes at the Ecole Polytechnique, Saint Cyr and the Paris Law Faculty, has already been mentioned. Arrighi de Padoue was the first of his year at the Ecole Polytechnique.

Notice Historique: Listes des élèves par promotion, Paris 1884, BN, 8° R 5808;
Ecole Nationale d’Administration, Association des anciens élèves: Revue de la cinquantaine, Paris 1899, BN, 8° R Pièce 13595.
nique whilst Forcade la Roquette, Georges L'Hôpital and Victor de Lavenay were all prize winners at the *concours général*. Hudault was the winner of several prizes at the *concours* of the Paris Law Faculty.

Higher education appears to have been as important, if not more important, than high social status as a qualification for accession to the administrative elite – although one invariably went with the other. Only three men were not university educated; they were Chassériau (official historian of the French Navy), Grétérin (Directeur Général des Douanes since 1836) and Mestro (Directeur des Colonies since 1848). Chassériau was the son of a French Consul in Puerto Rico who came back to France in 1821 “sans fortune et accompagné d’une famille nombreuse”. Because of his father’s financial difficulties, he was unable to attend university.¹ Like Grétérin and Mestro, he had reached the top “par la petite porte”; all had entered their respective ministries as ordinary clerks.

**CAREERS BEFORE 25 JANUARY 1852**

A convenient point of departure for the study of the previous careers of the members of 1852 Conseil is to examine the positions they were holding on 1st December 1851, the day before the coup d’etat.

All branches of the administration were represented in the new Conseil d’Etat. Diplomats, judges and generals rubbed shoulders with ex-prefects, civil servants from the Paris ministries and members of the old Conseil, but a cursory glance at their careers shows that the composition of the Conseil was dominated by three main elements: members of the old Conseil, the political element and the legal element.

The largest single category were the members of the old Conseil; nine Conseillers (of the forty), fifteen Maîtres des Requêtes (of the twenty four) and eight auditeurs (of the twenty one)² were re-integrated into the Conseil. These figures would have been higher had it not been for the resignations of three Conseillers and four auditeurs of the old Conseil who withdrew from the 22nd January list after the publication of the decrees on the confiscation of the Orleans family goods.³ It should be noted, too, that fifteen men, though not members of the dissolved Conseil, had previously held posts in the Conseil; these included Janvier, Conseiller en service ordinaire and Grétérin and Michel

¹ Letter Chassériau – Minister of Navy, 17 November 1826, dossier Chassériau.
² There were three vacancies amongst the auditeurs at the time.
³ They were the Conseillers Hély d’Oissel, Paravey and Péringnon and the auditeurs Batbie, Meurinne, Montesquiou-Fézensac and Martin (du Nord).
## Positions Held on 1st December 1851

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>aud. 2nd</th>
<th>aud. 1st</th>
<th>M. de R. 2nd</th>
<th>M. de R. 1st</th>
<th>C.E.s.o. Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conseillers d'Etat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maîtres des Requêtes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditeurs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Maître des Requêtes*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-auditeur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed forces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomatic corps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefectoral corps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magistrature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other officials</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barristers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too young - no position</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong>*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dismissed in February 1848.
** One university professor and one ex-prefect of Police.
*** Includes one overlap; one man both diplomat and deputy.

Column M. de R. 1st includes the Secretary General.

Chevalier, Conseillers en service extraordinaire, during the July Monarchy. Thus, about two fifths of the new Conseil had experience in previous Conseils; the essential element of continuity was guaranteed. The man with the longest experience in the Conseil was Charles Maillard who first entered the Conseil as an auditeur in 1809 thus providing a link between the Conseils of the First and Second Empires.

The second most important group were the ex-politicians. At the time of the coup d'état, two men, Thorigny (Interior) and Giraud (Education) were holding ministerial posts. Nine others had previously been ministers of the Second Republic. Two of these nine, Magne (Public Works) and Rouher (Justice) were recalled as ministers on the day after the coup d'état. A quarter of the Conseillers en service ordinaire had ministerial experience. An even greater proportion had parliamentary experience. Twenty-six of the Conseillers and Maîtres des Requêtes were members of the Legislative Assembly and eleven others had belonged to previous assemblies:

#### Deputies:
- July Monarchy only: 6
- July Monarchy and Constituent: 3
- July Monarchy, Constituent and Legislative: 3
- July Monarchy and Legislative: 1
Two fifths of the Conseillers and Maîtres des Requêtes had previous parliamentary experience. Many also had experience in local assemblies; twenty nine had been members of a departmental assembly (Conseil Général) and eleven had been mayors or town councillors. The connection between the new Conseil and the political world was reinforced by the family backgrounds of the members; it has already been shown that many were the sons or grandsons of parliamentarians.

The third largest category of professions were the twenty-three barristers and members of the magistrature. But, again, the figures refer only to those men practising law in December 1851. At least thirty-five others had been barristers at some stage in their careers, thus bringing the total to fifty-five or nearly half of the total membership of the Conseil. Of these fifty-five men, thirty-seven had practised at the Paris bar.

Another of the more striking characteristics of the composition of the new Conseil was the relative paucity of prefectural experience; only five had ever been prefects and one, Carlier, the Prefect of Police. Six had reached the rank of sub-prefect and nine had served as Conseillers de préfecture. Also surprising was that only very few men had practical experience in industry and trade; this was a weakness shared with previous regimes. The absence of such men was perhaps understandable in the early nineteenth century but the accelerated growth of industry and commerce was now making experience in these fields more desirable.

It was the combination of experience gained in previous Conseils together with legal and parliamentary experience which was the dominant characteristic of the composition of the 1852 Conseil d'État. In the development of prejudices and attitudes of mind, professional experience was of significance equal to social origins. Most of the men had been "deformed" by the traditions of the Conseil d'État, of the elected assemblies or of the bar. Their careers bred attitudes of mind which were potentially inimical to the anti-parliamentary, authoritarian and occasionally arbitrary nature of the new regime. The political backgrounds of the members could only strengthen the hostility to these arbitrary tendencies.

THE POLITICAL BACKGROUND

Some members of the new Conseil had no pronounced political views. Unassociated with any particular system of government, their tech-
nical competence and administrative ability was demanded by, and given to, all regimes. This group included not only the military element but many of the diplomats and high ranking civil servants. It included such men as Gréterin who entered the Ministry of Finances during the First Republic as an ordinary clerk and whose steady rise up the administrative hierarchy was unchecked by the constant changes of regime. Similarly, Herman served the First Empire as a sub-prefect, the Restoration Monarchy as a prefect, the July Monarchy as the head of one of the divisions of the Ministry of the Interior and the Second Republic as the Secretary General of that Ministry. Charles Maillard, as already noted, served in the Conseil d'État of every regime from the First to the Second Empire. For these men, the notion of public service (and perhaps private interest) was something far more important than the question of regime. They probably had political opinions and prejudices but they were not sentimentally attached to any particular regime or form of government as were many of their colleagues.

By far the most important political group within the new Conseil were the ex-Orleanists. Although the publication of the decrees on the confiscation of the Orleans family goods had led to the withdrawal from the Conseil of a large number of Orleanists, the resultant vacancies were often filled by less scrupulous supporters of the exiled monarchy. Rouher and Magne, who resigned as ministers over the question, were able to fill two of the places left vacant. Other Orleanists, like Léon Cornudet, accepted a place only after a great deal of heart searching. ¹ For many Orleanists, the July Monarchy represented a period of political and social advancement; they replaced the old Legitimist cadres in the administration or parliament or as the leading “notables du pays”. Less attached to the Orleans family than the political system associated with it, they generally had little difficulty in accepting the new regime.² They might have serious reservations about some of the tendencies of the new regime, but it had put a stop to the social disorder and promised to remedy the economic dislocation of the previous four years.

¹ Letters Cornudet to his father, 26 January and 12 February 1852, quoted in Léon Cornudet d’après sa correspondance et d’autres documents inédits, pp. 83-84, an unpublished manuscript kindly made available by Monsieur Le Seigneur, whose wife is the great granddaughter of Cornudet.
² “Aux orléanistes la personne importe moins que le régime et la dénomination du régime moins que les institutions … alors que la fidélité au souverain constitue une définition valable et presque suffisante du legitimisme, l’attachement à la branche des Orléans ne caractérise pas l’orléanisme et en épuise moins encore le programme; il y a bien autre chose dans cette nouvelle force politique que les Orléans.” R. Rémond, La Droite en France, Paris 1954, p. 78.
There were two distinct groups amongst the Orleanists; the conservatives ("les satisfaits") and the men who belonged to the dynastic Left. The conservatives included men like Janvier, Magne and Renouard de Bussière who were all prominent Guizotists in Parliament. For the conservatives, the February Revolution represented the loss of position and prestige. Amongst the large number of high ranking but politically compromised magistrates who were dismissed in February 1848 were Barbaroux (Procureur Général, Ile Bourbon), Delangle (Procureur Général, Paris) and Thorigny (Avocat Général, Paris). Two men of the prefectoral corps of Louis Philippe, Vaïsse (Prefect at Perpignan since 1843) and Denjoy (sub-prefect at Lesparre since July 1847), were dismissed at the same time. The list of dismissals is by no means complete.¹

To the Left of these men were a small number who had previously been active supporters of the dynastic liberal opposition. Typical of these men was Baroche, the new Vice-President of the Conseil; unsuccessful candidate at Mantes on three occasions, he was finally elected, in November 1847, opposition deputy at Rochefort. The group included such prominent parliamentarians as Ferdinand Barrot (the brother of Odilon), Paul Boudet, Lestiboudois and Stourm. Others, like Suin and Quentin-Bauchart (both barristers at Laon and friends of Odilon Barrot) and Gasc (barrister, member of the Toulouse town council and Conseiller Général of the Haute-Garonne) were all prominent in the banquets campaign. Most of these men accepted the February Revolution; Gasc, for example, became a member of the Republican Municipal Commission established in Toulouse whilst Quentin-Bauchart personally suspended the sub-prefect and proclaimed the Republic at Saint Quentin. A number of the supporters of the dynastic Left were elected members of the Constituent Assembly on Republican platforms.

The Orleanists were thus divided between the political conservatives and the political liberals. On social and economic matters, however, they were generally united; the rule of the bourgeoisie, protectionism, "gouvernement à bon marché", gallicanism and, above all, parliamentarianism – these were the hallmark marks of the Orleanist mentality. Fear after the June Days brought the two sides much closer together in the struggle against the radicals; internal rivalries disappeared in the face

¹ Others to lose their posts in 1848 included Chevalier (professeur d’Economie Politique at the Collège de France), Giraud (vice-recteur de l’Académie de Paris), Cuvier (chef de la division des cultes non-catholiques), Boilay (Inspecteur Général des prisons) and Allard (Directeur des fortifications à Paris).
of opposition from a new force. Prominent members of the old dynastic Left eagerly joined the conservatives in persecuting the Republicans. Symbolic of this new-found unity was the joint action of Royer (ex-ministériel) and Suin (ex-dynastic Left) who were the Avocats Généraux at the High Court of Justice at the trial of Left wing leaders at Versailles in October 1849. Similarly, the Comité de la rue de Poitiers brought together the liberals Baroche and Stourm and the conservatives Bonjean and Denjoy.

There were very few Legitimists in the new Conseil. The vicomte de Guernon-Ranville, the vicomte Pandin de Narcillac and the comte de Pons-Renepon were, as their names might suggest, members of well known Legitimist families. They themselves were too young to have played any part in politics. Their presence in the Conseil suggests, however, that the Legitimism of their families was not of the intransigent variety. Baron de Sibert-Cornillon, scion of an old Legitimist family of the Languedoc, resigned from the magistrature in 1830, and was, until 1843, “une des colonnes du parti légitimiste dans le Gard”. He then rallied to the usurping Monarchy and was duly rewarded with his appointment as Avocat Général at Nimes. In February 1848, when he was dismissed from this post, he was apparently prepared to rally to the Republic. Also of Legitimist persuasion during the July Monarchy was Parieu. Unsuccessful Legitimist candidate in 1840, he was elected on a very moderate Republican programme in 1848, backed the royalist coalition in 1849 and then rallied to the President at the time of the coup d'état. Like many of the time:

“De crainte d'anicroche
Je n'ai jamais d'avis,
Je porte dans ma poche
L'aigle et la fleur de lys.”

The Conseil contained a group of about a dozen ex-Republicans. For these men, the February Revolution meant not social demotion but the rightful recognition of their previously ignored talents. Such was the case of Conti who was appointed Procureur Général at Bastia, of Flandin who was nominated Avocat Général in Paris and of Lefebvre who became French Ambassador at Karlsruhe. Edmond Charlemagne was appointed sous-commissaire of the Provisional Government at Issoudun in February 1848 before his election, as a Republican, in April of that year. Alfred Blanche “à fleuri sous le gouvernement provisoire de 1848. Simple avocat à Paris, sans renom, la République

1 Nowhere is this better described than in A. J. Tudesq, Les Grands Notables etc., op cit., pp. 1233-1235.
fit sa fortune”;¹ under Ledru-Rollin he was given an important post in the Ministry of the Interior and under Cavaignac he was appointed Head of the newly formed Ecole d’Administration. The Republic also made the reputation of Boulatignier; during the period from February to November 1848, he was appointed Conseiller d’Etat and professor at the Ecole d’Administration and was elected Republican Representative of the Manche. Until the coup d’état, against which he protested, he was considered to be a moderate Republican.²

The number of convinced Bonapartists “de vieille date” was very small. Only Bataille, Bréhier, Ferdinand Barrot and the two Corsicans, Conti and Gavini, appear to have been active supporters before the December 1848 election. Bataille became involved in bonapartist politics as soon as he left the Ecole Polytechnique in 1834. In 1840, he accompanied Louis Napoleon to Boulogne, was arrested and later sentenced to five years imprisonment. Bréhier was a personal friend of Prince Jérôme; for several years he had been the private tutor to his eldest son. Gavini and Conti were both elected to the Constituent Assembly as Republicans but rallied to Louis Napoleon as soon as he returned to France and were active bonapartist propagandists during the presidential election. A small group of members of the Legislative Assembly rallied to Louis Napoleon after 1850; they saw in him the only effective barrier against the rising tide of anarchy. They were especially active in their support of a revision of the Constitution which would have enabled Louis Napoleon to stand again in the presidential election of 1852. This group included Baroche, Boinvilliers, Rouher, Chadenet, Gasc, Chassaigne-Goyon, Dariste, Quentin-Bauchart and Godelle. These were the men who must have been included on the list composed by Vieillard.³

A number of men, though favourably disposed towards the President, initially protested against the coup d’état. Stourm, Cuvier, Boulatignier and Boudet all signed the Conseil d’Etat protest on 2nd December whilst Quentin-Bauchart and Chassaigne-Goyon joined many of their parliamentary colleagues in the protest signed at the Mairie of the tenth arrondissement.⁴ Others, like Rouher, who was later to be called “Vice-Emperor” by the opposition, maintained a hostile, if prudent, silence in the first hours following the coup d’état.⁵ Cornudet, Maître

¹ Profils critiques et biographies des sénateurs, conseillers d’Etat et députés par un vieil écrivain, Paris 1852, p. 119.
² A. J. Tudesq, Les Grands Notables etc., op. cit., p. 1152. Other appointments in February and March 1848 included those of Carlier (chef de police municipale de Paris) and Petitet (sous-directeur de la comptabilité at the Ministry of War).
³ Supra, p. 182.
des Requêtes in the now defunct Conseil, made clear his repugnance of the coup d'état to his close friend Montalembert. The hostility or extreme reserve of men like Marchand, Langlais and Gasc is revealed in Rouher’s notes on the composition of the Consultative Commission in the early days of December 1851, or in the Morny correspondence of the same period. An early and hardworking supporter of the coup who was appointed Maître des Requêtes in January 1852, bitterly pointed out that a number of protestors were given posts as Conseillers.

Members of the new Conseil were characterised by differing political backgrounds. Although they were united in accepting the new regime, their acceptance concealed differing degrees of enthusiasm and the motives involved. Their loyalty to the regime was inspired by a mixture of crude private interest and a gratitude to the President for having saved society from anarchy. But the loyalty was not totally uncritical. Many of them, particularly the ex-Orleanists, were imbued with the parliamentarians’ traditional jealousy of the unchecked Executive and were temperamentally hostile to the authoritarian inclinations of the regime. In this very important sense, their political sentiments reinforced attitudes of mind acquired from their professional training and careers.

Members of the new Conseil were divided over a number of important issues. Pinard, who joined the Conseil later, noted that there were two schools within the Conseil: “la première, ayant pour elle la tradition et les exemples du passé, maintenait sur tous les points les droits de l’Etat, avec un penchant marqué à en exagérer l’étendue. Dans le doute, elle décidait pour lui croyant que là était la garantie et au fond la sagesse… la seconde école, au contraire, obéissait à un autre esprit, dans la pensée qu’elle rendrait l’Etat plus respecté en limitant davantage son intervention.” In fact, the situation was much more complex and confused. There was a division between the political liberals like Quentin-Bauchart and Boulatignier and the political conservatives like Parieu and Magne, although the latter were clearly predominant.

2 Rouher papers, AN, 45 AP 4, and Morny papers, AN, 116 AP 1.
3 Letter Dabeaux – Minister of State, 31 January 1852, AN, F70 636: “Le deux décembre, alors que plusieurs de mes collègues plus heureux que moi protestaient contre les actes de cette mémorable journée… j’étais sur la brèche à la préfecture de police, où je prêtais le concours le plus dévoué à mon ami M. de Maupas.”
4 R. Rémond, op. cit., p. 93: “L’orléanisme fera, le cas échéant, bon marché de la dénomination du régime; il ne transigera jamais sur les libertés parlementaires… l’attachement au parlementarisme est si vif qu’il est devenu pour l’orléanisme une manière d’être, un comportement.”
There was also a split over economic attitudes. Most members, for example, accepted the domestic implications of economic liberalism with its non-interventionist style of governmental authority, but many rejected its free trade implications. Whilst Baroche, Rouher, and more especially, Michel Chevalier and Forcade la Roquette, were known to be champions of free trade, the majority were against lowering the barriers of protection. It was opposition from the Conseil, in May 1852, which led to the abandonment of one of Louis Napoleon’s early projects for the reduction of tariffs.1

The Conseil was also divided over religious issues. A small number like Chevalier and Barrot were non-believers who accepted the Church as a prop against anarchy, a safety valve against the radical excesses of the masses. But the great majority were practising Catholics. The Catholics were, however, divided. Amongst the small group of clericals, Magne and Parieu were the best known; both were later to make reputations as zealous defenders of ecclesiastical prerogatives. Other prominent clericals included Cornudet (who scandalised many of his colleagues by sending all his children to the Jesuit Collège de Vaugirard), Cardon de Sandrans and Ségur; all three were members of the Conseil Général of the Society of Saint Vincent de Paul. Bernard Lacaze, a notorious ultramontane was later, in 1865, to challenge Sainte-Beuve to a duel for having defended, in the Senate, the rights of “libre pensée”.2 Sainte-Beuve sagely declined the offer of this incensed clerical and thus spared Parisian society the undignified spectacle of an armed encounter between a septuagenarian and a sexagenarian. At the other extreme, was a small group of militant gallicans; liberals of the 1830 variety, they were sensitive to the prerogatives of the state, fundamentally anti-clerical and hostile to the encroachments of Rome. Particularly important in this group were the magistrates Bonjean and Delangle. More typical of the Conseil, however, was Baroche; a sincere and practising Catholic, sympathetic to the Church in certain domains (education, for example), he was opposed to the excessive clericalism and ultramontanism of some members of the hierarchy and certain sections of the press.

The anti-clericals of the Conseil could expect the support of the Protestants.3 The best known were Boudet who was a member of the Conseil Central des Eglises Reformées and Renouard de Bussière who

1 J. Maurain, op. cit., p. 159.
3 Particularly useful in tracing the Protestants of the Conseil were the Almanach-annuaire protestant, administratif, statistique et historique pour 1855, BN, Lc25 241 and Almanach protestant 1848-1870, BN, Lc25 240.
was a notable member of the Protestant Consistoire of Paris. The other
Protestants of the Conseil were Charles Robert, Bartholoni, Cuvier and
Alfred Blanche. The only Jewish member of the Conseil was Vieyra-
Molina. A small group of men were prominent freemasons; these
included two of the Protestants, Boudet and Blanche (who was
shortly to become one of the members of the Conseil du Grand Orient)
and nominal Catholics such as Martin de Chassiron (whose father-in-
law, Prince Murat, was the head of the Grand Orient), Comte Dubois,
Flandin and Boinvilliers.

The religious cleavage within the Conseil was manifested in a score
of ways — over education, over the delicate question of the authorisation
of legacies and gifts to religious congregations, over the authorisation
for judicial proceedings to be commenced against priests involved in
scandals, over the introduction of Roman liturgy in certain dioceses,
over the publication of certain papal Bulls. On all these issues was
engaged a prolonged battle between the ultramontanes and the
gallicans. But never was the debate more bitter than over the con-
demnation of certain pastoral letters which contained criticisms of the
Emperor’s policies. The point may be illustrated by a particular case.

At the height of the Italian troubles, Mgr Pie, Bishop of Poitiers,
a turbulent and troublesome legitimist, published an angry pastoral
letter (22 February 1861) which was designed to answer the charges
made in a pamphlet entitled Rome, la France et l’Italie. Written by La
Guerronière, Conseiller d’Etat since 1854, the pamphlet was apparently
inspired by the Emperor himself. In it, La Guerronière made a barely
disguised attack on the temporal possessions of the Pope, arguing that,
divested of its earthly goods, the Papacy would grow in moral stature.
Bishop Pie in his pastoral letter defended the Pope, attacked Cavour,
bitterly criticised the Italian policy of the Emperor and, final sacrilege,
likened Louis-Napoleon to Pontius Pilate. On 28 February, it was
announced in the Moniteur that the Minister of the Interior had
decided to defer the pastoral letter to the Conseil d’Etat. The govern-
ment did not ask the Conseil for permission to take Bishop Pie to a
court of justice; it was content to ask the Conseil to declare the

1 On the freemasons: documents pour servir à l’histoire de la franc-maçonnerie
au XIXe siècle, Paris 1866, BN, 8° H 2665; L. Aimiable and J. C. Colfauur,
Grand Orient de France, Paris 1889, BN, 8° H 2532; Wentz, Opuscules Maçonniques,
Paris 1864, BN, 8° H 2543 (particularly useful); E. Marbeau, “Le Grand
Orient de France devant le Conseil d’Etat: Avril 1863”, in: Revue des Deux-
 Mondes, 15 March 1901, pp. 364 and 369.

2 Most of these issues are discussed in J. Maurain, La Politique Ecclésiastique
du Second Empire, Paris 1930, and A. Debidoir, Histoire des rapports de
existence of an abuse of authority (*abus du pouvoir*), which in itself carried no penal sanction. Suin, one of the leading anti-clericals of the Conseil, was chosen as rapporteur. Letters of support poured into the bishop’s palace in Poitiers from all parts of France and from other European countries. Opinion in the capital was divided.

Rouland, Minister responsible for religious questions, in a letter which notified Pie of the government’s intention of deferring his pastoral letter to the Conseil requested that the bishop present his defense in a *mémoire justificatif*. Far from moving onto the defensive, Bishop Pie attacked. He made clear his reservations about the competence of the Conseil d’Etat to judge the matter and claimed that the Minister of the Interior should be found guilty of an abuse of authority, and not he, for having had posted, on the door of every town hall and church in the Empire, a circular condemning the Bishop’s acts whilst the matter was still “devant les tribunaux”. He denied that he had likened the Emperor to Pontius Pilate; he was merely warning the Emperor of what could happen. The pastoral letter was a plea to the Emperor to save the temporal power of the Pope; it was, wrote the bishop, “un avertissement grave, solonnel, énergique en même temps qu’une suprême parole d’espérance”.

Anatole de Ségur, a friend of Mgr Pie, advised the bishop to entrust his defense to Cornudet. Cornudet accepted on condition that no publicity should be given to his own name. He himself found certain passages in the pastoral letter rather tactless though he nevertheless agreed to do his duty by accepting the defense; “c’est un devoir d’appuyer les défenseurs de l’Eglise auxquels de longues souffrances arrachent un cri de douleur, fut-il trop pénérant.” The matter was debated by the Conseil d’Etat on 27 March. Ségur sent a brief description of the meeting to the bishop. The debate was opened by Cornudet who defended the bishop, arguing that the bishop was provoked and that the provokers ought to be reproached. At this point, there was an angry outburst from La Guerronière who, not unnaturally, felt himself to be under attack. Cornudet’s defense was punctuated by the interventions of Rouland who addressed the Bishop’s advocate with “quelques observations très vives et très amères”. Cornudet replied with great dignity and, as expected, was given some support by Parieu. When the rapporteur concluded in favour of rejecting a condemnation on the grounds of indulgence, Parieu angrily pointed out that such a decision was not a question of indulgence but one of simple justice. He also pointed out that the rapport was the work of Suin himself and not that of the section “qui en dégageait sa solidarité”. When the matter was put to the vote, Conti, Cornudet, Parieu and a small number of other Conseillers voted against the condemnation and
a few others abstained. A majority, however, backed the government; “évidemment, il y avait là bien des gens qui peuvent s’appliquer, eux aussi, le nesciunt quid faciunt, car j’en ai vu bravement voter contre vous, qu’allaient faire ou venaient de faire leur Pâques.” By way of consolation, Ségur added “si les maîtres des requêtes et les auditeurs avaient pu voter, vous auriez eu trente voix pour vous.” The arrêt d’abus was signed by the Emperor three days later, 30 March.¹

The Conseil d’État was not a homogeneous body; the differences of social background, career structures and political sentiments naturally gave rise to differences of opinion over a variety of important questions. Moreover, the important cleavages within the Conseil – the statists against the anti-statists, the political liberals against the political conservatives, the supporters of protectionism against the protagonists of free trade, the clericals against the anti-clericals – were cross-cutting or non-coinciding. To quote but one example: the religious cleavage did not coincide with the liberal-conservative cleavage. There were liberal gallicans (Delangle) and conservative gallicans (Denjoy), liberal ultramontanes (Cardon de Sandrans) and conservative ultramontanes (Ségur), liberal Protestants (Blanche) and conservative Protestants (Renouard de Bussière). Nor did either the religious or political cleavage coincide with the cleavage over free trade. The existence of cross-cutting cleavages in the new Conseil placed a premium upon, and greatly facilitated, compromise within the Conseil. The constantly shifting alliances within the Conseil prevented it from becoming sharply divided into two or three warring factions, thus lowering the temperature of debate. The courteous nature of relations in the Conseil which was much commented upon at the time was a natural consequence of this situation.

The Conseil d’État established in January 1852 was a talented and prestigious elite. The talent was reflected in their future careers; nine Conseillers were later Ministers during the Empire and thirty two were Senators. The Maitres des Requêtes were to supply the Empire with two Ministers, three Senators, twenty nine Conseillers d’État, three prefects, one deputy and one Conseiller at the Cour des Comptes. The prestige of the Conseil was both reflected in, and enhanced by, the honours bestowed upon its members by the government; this may be seen in the promotions in the Order of the Legion of Honour. During

the period January 1852 to June 1857, fifty six of the ninety-one conseillers and maîtres des requêtes were promoted:

- Grand’Croix 2
- Grand-Officier 7
- Commandeur 12
- Officier 13
- Chevalier 22

During the same period, only seventeen of the two hundred and fifty-three members of the Corps législatif were promoted (nine Officiers and eight Chevaliers).¹

The prestige of the Corps was also reflected in the salaries paid to its members (in francs):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>1852</th>
<th>1849 (decree of 6 January)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Président de Section</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conseiller</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maître des Requêtes 1st</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maître des Requêtes 2nd</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditeur 1st</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditeur 2nd</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary General</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conseillers d’Etat were the highest paid officials in Paris. A university professor of many years experience could expect to earn 4,000 francs to 5,000 francs whilst a primary school teacher with five years experience had a salary of 700 francs a year. Even a Conseiller at the Cour de Cassation, the most prestigious post in the magistrature, earned only 15,000 francs a year in 1853 (the salary was raised from 12,000 francs in that year). Prefects, who earned between 20,000 francs and 40,000 francs, depending on their class of prefecture, had far greater expenses.²

The government did not have a completely free hand in the formation of the Conseil d’Etat; its freedom of choice was limited by two basic factors. On the one hand, it had to guarantee a certain continuity with the old Conseil and to include technically competent men, and on the other, it needed to use membership of the new body as a source of patronage; the doubtful could be lured, the faithful recompensed. It succeeded in attracting a highly talented elite and proceeded to enhance the Conseil’s prestige by extending its constitutional powers and honouring its members. In many respects, however, the new body was far from satisfactory from the government’s point of view. It is true that a certain political docility could be expected of its

² For a discussion of salaries and expenses, Girard et al., op. cit., p. 57.
members and there is a great deal of truth in Pierre de la Gorce’s contention that “vieillis dans le monde officiel et un peu sceptiques, ils avaient froidement calculé les chances propices ou contraires du nouveau régime; l’ayant jugé solide et bon à servir, ils s’y étaient rattachés.”¹ But there were many possible points of conflict between the Conseil and Louis Napoleon. Clearly private interest dictated a prudent acceptance of the new regime, but it could not wipe out a lifetime of opinions, habits and prejudices. It could not, for example, rid the Conseil of that questioning legalism and querulous parliamentarianism nor that inbred suspicion of the unchecked Executive which was so widespread in the new Conseil. “Sois conseiller d’Etat, sois gouvernemental, mais dépouille ta vieille défrisée pourrie d’avocat”, wrote the authoritarian Minister of War, Le Roy de Saint-Arnaud, to his half-brother.² But Forcade la Roquette, like many of his new colleagues, had been contaminated by constant contact with the “defenders of dangerous freedoms”. Admittedly, the hostility of the Conseil to the more arbitrary aspects of the Empire generally remained latent but occasionally it was given expression. It may be illustrated by the Conseil’s attitude to the Loi de Sûreté Générale – the highly repressive law which was enacted after the Orsini Attentat in 1858. The attitude of the Conseil from the very outset was hostile. The first Bill presented by the government had to be withdrawn because of the obstinate and intensely felt opposition of the Conseil. Even the second Bill which met some of their principal objections was subject to many amendments. In the debate in the general assembly of the Conseil (28 January 1858), opposition to the Bill was led by Michel Chevalier who expressed the repugnance felt by the majority of his colleagues. Although the government conceded further modifications, the Conseil very nearly rejected the whole Bill; it was voted by 31 votes to 27. The votes of the Ministers and the conseillers hors sections tipped the scales in favour of the government; amongst the conseillers en service ordinaire there was a big majority against. The Conseil later adopted two important amendments proposed by the parliamentary commission which examined the Bill.³

Members of the Conseil were also generally united in their suspicions of the vague state socialism of Louis Napoleon and later successfully boycotted such schemes as insurance for agricultural workers. They were also extremely sensitive to the sacred rights of private property. This became apparent in their persistent, if not always successful, opposition to the property expropriations which enabled Haussmann (and the Emperor) to rebuild Paris. It was apparent, too, in their opposition to the confiscation of the Orleans family goods. For in May 1852, barely three months after the formation of the Conseil, they had to judge whether the confiscation could be contested in the ordinary courts of law. A number of conseillers rejected the government’s thesis that, as a political matter, the question of confiscation was not within the competence of the courts. The matter was discussed in the assemblée du Conseil délibérant au contentieux (composed of 6 members of the section du contentieux and a total of ten other conseillers chosen by the Emperor from the other five sections). Despite considerable pressure, the government’s case was adopted by only one vote – the casting vote of the chairman, Baroche. The opposition shown by the Conseil cost four men (Maillard, Giraud, Cornudet and Reverchon) their posts.

One of the important consequences of the conflict over the Orleans family goods was the limiting of the independence of the new body. The President, furious at the opposition of the Conseil, insisted that members of the Conseil were government officials, not magistrates, and as such were obliged to submit to his will. For the future Emperor, the Conseil d’Etat was an instrument of the Executive; its members could offer advice but their main function was to implement Government decisions. They were chosen to be “un instrument complet et docile dans la main du Président”. But the President’s conception of the role of the Conseil was not shared by many of its members. Whilst they accepted that they had no right to continually veto government projects, they nevertheless wanted the Conseil to act, on occasions, as a moderating force, a brake if necessary, on the government. In short, they envisaged for the Conseil a quasi-parliamentary role – a role which many of the ex-parliamentarians readily assumed. There was, in truth, a fundamental difference in the points of view of Louis Napoleon and those of his Conseil, although only rarely was this difference manifested. Nevertheless, it was possibly an awareness of

---

1 F. Beslay, Notice sur Léon Cornudet, Paris 1876, p. 7.
this difference which led the government to curtail the powers of the Conseil, and to ensure that its members were kept under the ever-vigilant eye of Baroche their vice-president.¹

The relationship between Louis-Napoleon and his Conseil d'Etat was extremely ambiguous. For the most part, the Conseil was prepared to submit to the will of the future Emperor. It was a submission based on considerations of temperament, indifference or pure self-interest. On a number of occasions when the conseillers decided openly to oppose the government, they were persuaded or bullied back into submission.² Indeed, the Conseil could be accommodating to the point of foolishness. During the discussion in the section de guerre of the 1855 Bill on the army estimates, General Niel who was known to be a friend of the Emperor opposed a particular proposal. The section presumed he was expressing the will of the Emperor and voted unanimously against. When it was later made clear that the Emperor backed the proposal, the same section voted unanimously for.³ Did they lack courage or even honesty? The problem cannot be seen in such terms. Careerism obviously played some part but it is probably fairer to say that they submitted because, in the final analysis, they were fonctionnaires and, as such, it was their duty to do so. But the inability openly to oppose (except on rare occasions such as the Loi de Sûreté Générale) did not prevent the Conseil from occasionally playing the desired role of moderator of the Executive. It simply meant that the tactics of opposition changed. Some of the Emperor's ideas were either pushed aside by the weight of the Conseil's legal objections or quietly buried in some over-worked section. There were occasions when the quiet obstructionism of the Conseil proved a difficult obstacle to surmount.⁴ It is paradoxical that Louis Napoleon in his efforts to strengthen the Executive should choose a body of men many of whose basic ideas were hostile to an over-strong Executive. With one of its institutions riddled with parliamentarianism, it is scarcely surprising that the authoritarian regime should reach its early demise.

APPENDIX

I

Biographical information on the Conseillers d'État or those who became Conseillers was relatively easy to find in the standard biographies of the time. For the Maîtres des Requêtes and auditeurs who were deputies either before or after their stay in the Conseil, basic details could be found in the Dictionnaire des parlementaires of Robert et Cougny. Finding biographical data on those Maîtres des Requêtes and auditeurs who played no part in public life outside the Conseil was extremely difficult and often necessitated an extensive search in the Archives de la Seine or the departmental archives.

This article is based essentially on the following sources:

1) *A large number of biographical dictionaries: particularly useful were:*

   J. Balteau et al., Dictionnaire de Biographie française (A-Duv);
   E. Goepp et Manoury d'Ectot, Les Marins, Paris 1877, 2 vols;
   T. Lamathière, Panthéon de la Légion d'Honneur, Paris 1911, 22 vols;
   H. Lauzac, Galerie Historique et critique du 19e siècle, Paris 1856-1862, 6 vols;
   Robert, Bourloton et Cougny, Dictionnaire des parlementaires français, Paris 1889-1890, 5 vols;
   L. Tisseron, Le Sénat de l'Empire français, Paris 1860-1861, 2 vols;
   Le Tribunal et la Cour de Cassation; Notices sur le personnel, Paris 1879;
   G. Vapereau, Dictionnaire Universel des Contemporains, Paris 1865-1893, 1 vol., 6 editions.

2) *On the family backgrounds:*

   Aubert de la Chenaye des Bois, Dictionnaire de la noblesse, 3 ed., Paris 1863-1876, 19 vols;
   Chaix d'Est Ange, Dictionnaires des familles françaises et notables, à la fin du 19e siècle (A-Gau), Evreux 1903-1929, 20 vols;
   A. Delavenne, Receuil Généalogique de la bourgeoisie ancienne, Paris 1954, 2 vols;
   Vicomte A. Révérend, Armorial du Premier Empire etc., Paris 1894-1897;
   Vicomte A. Révérend, Les familles titrées et anoblies au XIX siècle ... Monarchie de Juillet, II Empire et III République, 1830-1908, Paris 1909;
   Vicomte A. Révérend, Les familles titrées et anoblies au XIX siècle ... la Restauration 1814-1830, Paris 1901-1906;
3) A number of individual biographies in the Bibliothèque Nationale:

Allard, Souvenirs, 2 vols, Ln27 25990;
Arrighi de Padoue, by Hug, Ln27 208;
Barrot F., by C. de Royer, Ln27 35237;
Bauchart, by son, 8° Ln27 37851;
Blanche, by Aucoc, 8° Piece Ln27 41657;
Boinvilliers, by Rousse, Ln27 38343;
Boulatignier, by Aucoc, 8° Piece 43328;
Cardon de Sandrans, by Vernis, Ln27 42757; by de Romeuf, Ln27 42828;
Chadenet (anon.), Ln27 45470;
Cornudet, by Beslay, Ln27 29367;
Denjoy, by Boilay, Gr. in 8°, Ln27 5784;
Giraud, by Caro, 4° Piece Ln 27 32918; by Esmein et Rozière, Ln27 34720;
by Cabassol, 8° Ln27 61360; by Glasson, Ln27 39842;
Goupil (notice nécrologique), Ln27 30303;
Grétérin (notice nécrologique), 4° Ln27 9122;
Lacaze (article, Revue des Hautes-Pyrénées, 1913), 8° Lc10 487;
L'Hôpital, by Dubois de Jancigny, 8° Ln27 41833;
Magne, by Durieux, 8° Ln27 63393;
Maillard, by Reverchon, 8° Ln27 13190;
Reverchon, by Richou, 8° Ln27 44702;
Robert, by Trombert, 4° Ln27 64684;
Suin (anon.), Ln27 30673;
Vuitry, by Aucoc, 4° Piece Ln27 35967; by Cucheval-Clarigny, Ln27 37181.

4) Bibliothèque of the Conseil d'Etat:

All the archives of the Conseil d'Etat were burnt at the time of the destruction of the Conseil by the Communards. The Library does have, however, a small collection of biographical works (42(I)-42(V)) and a very useful collection of well catalogued cards, giving details of the careers of the members of the Conseil. These cards were recently discovered in the cellars of the Conseil and were kindly put at my disposal.

5) Archives de la Seine:

I consulted a large number of birth certificates of men who were born in Paris and a collection of “lettres de faire-part”, which gave useful
information on the families. I also consulted a large number of electoral lists (series VD4 and DM) which indicate the place and date of birth; they were particularly useful in tracing some of the younger members of the Conseil.

6) Archives Nationales:
BB30 725-729, Conseil d'Etat: personnel (pièces diverses) 1814-1844;
BB30 733-736, Conseil d'Etat: personnel: divers 1833-1851 (736 particularly useful);
BB30 737, Conseil d'Etat: organisation, fonctionnement, personnel, divers 1852-1869;
BB30 738-742, Conseil d'Etat: dossiers personnels (rather disappointing, occasionally useful for July Monarchy members);
F1b I 230 1-21, some useful information on men who were members of Conseils Généraux;
F70 353-359, dossiers d'anciens fonctionnaires des ministères d'Etat et de la Maison de l'Empereur;
F70 635-636, Conseil d'Etat: divers 1852-1869 (little of real interest);
Série C, Procès-verbaux des séances des collèges électoraux etc. (for the ex-deputies, there is a copy of their birth certificate and, in the case of the deputies of the July Monarchy, an indication of the property tax paid).

A number of personal dossiers which are listed below:

7) Archives de la Marine:
A number of dossiers listed below.

8) Archives de la Guerre at Vincennes:
A number of dossiers listed below.

9) Archives Départementales of a number of departments (copies of birth certificates sent by a number of Archivists).

10) Archives de la Chancellerie de la Légion d'Honneur:
A small number of dossiers listed below.

II

MEMBERS OF THE CONSEIL D'ETAT, 25, 26 JANUARY 1852
(WITH INDICATION OF DOSSIERS CONSULTED)

Conseillers

Allard (Guerre, GD 1351/2)
Barbaroux (AN, BB6 II 16)

Conseillers hors sections

Brénier de Renaudière
Darricau (Guerre, GD 50488/2 série)
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Barrot F.
Bauchart
Boinவilliers (AN, BB6 II 47)
Bonjean (AN, BB30 419)
Boudet
Boulatisni (AN, papiers Tranchant 4 A 55)
Boulay de la Meurthe J.
Carlier (AN, F1b I 157(7))
Charlemagne (AN, F1b I 157(17) and BB6 II 83)
Chevalier
Conti (AN, BB6 II 97)
Cornudet
Cuvier
Dariste
Delange (AN, BB6 II 116)
Denjoy (AN, F1b I 158(15))
Flandin (AN, BB6 II 159)
Fremy (AN, F1b I 160(14))
Giraud (AN, F17 22886)
Godelle
Herman (AN, F1b I 268(1) and 162(5))
Janvier
Lacaze
Leblanc (Marine, 1421)
Lefebvre
Le Roy de Saint-Arnaud
Magne (AN, F1b I 167(1))
Maillard (AN, F1b I 167(2))
Marchand
Parieu
Rouher
Stourm
Suin
Thorigny (AN, BB6 II 408)
Vaisse (AN, F1b I 176(1))
Villemain (Guerre, personnel civil 43474/2 série)
Vuillefroy
Vuillery

Mattres des Requêtes 1st Class

Arrighi de Padoue (AN, F1b I 153(17))
Blanche (AN, F1b I 156(26))
Brehier (AN, F1b I 156(39))
Camus du Martroy (AN, F1b I 157(3))
Chadenet (AN, F1b I 157(13))
Chassaigne-Goyon (AN, F1b I 157(18))
Chassériau (Marine, 1029/461)
Dabeaux (AN, F1b I 158(1))
Forcade la Roquette

Mattres des Requêtes 2nd Class

Argout
Aubernon
Bataille
Batailler du Berthier
Bernon
Daverne
Dubois (AN, F80 211)
François
Gavini (AN, F 1b I 161 (7))
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Gasc
Gaslonde (AN, F17 20800)
Gomel
Lestiboudois (AN, F17 21171)
Loyer (AN, F1b I 166(13))
Maigne
Montaud (dossier Légion d'Honneur)
Pascalis (dossier Légion d'Honneur)
Renouard de Bussière
Reverchon
Thierry

*Auditeurs 1st Class*

Belbeuf
Bordet
Bosredon du Pont
Cardon de Sandrans
Casabianca
Chamblain (AN, F1b I 157(14))
Fare (dossier Légion d'Honneur)
Fouquier
Hudault
Huvé de Garel
Le Hon
Le Marié
Leviez
L'Hôpital (dossier Légion d'Honneur)
Marbeau
Mesnard
Mouton-Duvernet
Robert

Goupil
Jahan
Lavenay
Louyer-Villermay
Martin de Chassiron
Maupas
Pagès
Portalis
Redon de Beaufreau
Richaud
Ségur (AN, F1b I 173(12))

*Auditeurs 2nd Class*

Aucoc
Bartholoni
Boinvilliers (fils)
Cottin
Des Michels
Dufau
Guernon-Ranville
Le Chanteur
LeFebvre-Pontalis
Le Roy
Pandin de Narcillac
Pons-Renepon
Vieyra-Molina