

dangerous  
 a course  
 and, cynical  
 stands on  
 not merely  
 ary epoch,  
 to the plea  
 was doing  
 not concern  
 of corrup-  
 ter and an  
 the Spanish  
 as he had  
 s fortunes.  
 policy with  
 Talleyrand  
 that both  
 his intimate  
 d, and had  
 Bourbon was  
 and it was  
 tolerated."  
 proceedings.  
 and inspired  
 s. Possibly  
 regard to  
 at we have  
 For we are  
 retain and  
 have taken  
 and Fouché,  
 rows an in-  
 aracter. He  
 more than

## THE END

one occasion, outrages in essence and style so intolerable that no man could forgive them. Yet Napoleon in his troubles sent for Talleyrand, and began talking to him confidentially about politics. In the midst of their conversation, Talleyrand calmly remarks, "But, by the bye, I thought we had quarrelled." Napoleon dismisses the remark with a "Bah!" Talleyrand, however, had then been long in close relations with Russia, and was not to be won back. Fouché, too, was dismissed with disgrace. He openly hated Napoleon, and passed his exile in intriguing against him. Napoleon was ignorant neither of the hatred nor the intrigues. But, in 1815, as we have seen, he whistles him back, and entrusts him with one of the most delicate and important offices at his disposal, the one which gives the best opportunity for betrayal.

Many other causes for his overthrow have been alleged, but, in our judgment, they are ancillary to those that we have cited. And, as a rule, they are, strictly considered, rather effects than causes; it was the causes of his overthrow which produced these disastrous errors. His faults of policy were, no doubt, in his later reign, numerous and obvious enough. But they were not, as is often popularly stated, the causes which effected his ruin, but rather the effects and outcome of the causes which produced his ruin. And this much more must be said in fairness for them, that, viewing them from their political aspect, and putting aside all moral tests, they were grand and not wholly extravagant errors. Life was too short for his plans. The sense of this made him impatient and violent in his proceedings. And so his methods were often petty—not so his policy. His gigantic commercial struggle with England was an impossible effort, but it was one which distinguished economists have, on a smaller scale, often since