

[Accueil](#)[Revenir à l'accueil](#)[Collection](#)[Les correspondances de François Guizot : 1806-1874](#)[Collection](#)[178\\_Lettres de John Croker : 1837-1857](#)[Item](#)[Kensington Palace, the 14th July 1857, John Croker à François Guizot](#)

## **Kensington Palace, the 14th July 1857, John Croker à François Guizot**

**Auteurs : Croker, John-Wilson (1780-1857)**

### **Les folios**

En passant la souris sur une vignette, le titre de l'image apparaît.

8 Fichier(s)

### **Les mots clés**

[Conditions matérielles de la correspondance](#), [France \(1830-1848, Monarchie de Juillet\)](#), [France \(1852-1870, Second Empire\)](#), [Histoire \(Angleterre\)](#), [Politique \(Angleterre\)](#), [Politique \(France\)](#), [Santé](#)

### **Relations entre les lettres**

Ce document n'a pas de relation indiquée avec un autre document du projet.□

### **Présentation**

Date1857-07-14

GenreCorrespondance

Editeur de la ficheMarie Dupond & Association François Guizot, projet EMAN (Thalim, CNRS-ENS-Sorbonne nouvelle)

### **Information générales**

LangueAnglais

Cote97, 97 suite, AN : 163 MI 42 AP 178 Papiers Guizot Bobine Opérateur 28

Nature du documentLettre autographe

Supportcopie numérisée de microfilm

Etat général du documentBon

Localisation du documentArchives Nationales (Paris)

### **Citer cette page**

Croker, John-Wilson (1780-1857), Kensington Palace, the 14th July 1857, John Croker à François Guizot, 1857-07-14.

Marie Dupond & Association François Guizot, projet EMAN (Thalim, CNRS-ENS-Sorbonne nouvelle).

Consulté le 10/05/2025 sur la plate-forme EMAN :

<https://eman-archives.org/Guizot-Lieven/items/show/7527>

## Informations éditoriales

Destinataire Guizot, François (1787-1874)

Lieu de destination Val-Richer (France)

Droits Marie Dupond & Association François Guizot, projet EMAN (Thalim, CNRS-ENS-Sorbonne nouvelle). Licence Creative Commons Attribution - Partage à l'Identique 3.0.

Lieu de rédaction Londres (Angleterre)

Notice créée par [Marie Dupond](#) Notice créée le 01/10/2024 Dernière modification le 14/12/2024

---

27

Kensington Palace  
14 July 1897

Mon cher Ami,

I must begin by explaining that I am forced to make use of another hand as my illness makes it inconceivable to use my own for more than a few lines.

I have been suffering constant pain for near six months, but of course in different degrees. I am sometimes comparatively easy but for the last few weeks I have been very ill and cannot venture to confirm the report of the announcement which you have received from Lady Alice and Galignani.

But we need say no more on this subject.

The train of thought in which I was writing my last letter to you was interrupted by the arrival of that foolish speech of Sir Robert Peel's which led me away from what I was really anxious to say to you, and I grew so rapidly and so seriously ill that I have not been able to resume the subject, which, however, deserves your attention.

In the letter to which I was replying, you blamed the Duke of

of Wellington for his indiscreet declaration against all Reform and attributed to it the mischief that followed. I was a witness of the whole game - the devious des cartes as well as what was public. - And I do assure you that that declaration had nothing whatsoever to do with the events that followed. The Reform Clamour had not been for many years so low as it then was, and the defeat of the Duke's Government arose entirely from his & Peel's unhappy defection from their principles & their party by the concession of Catholic emancipation.

I am an impartial judge on that point, for I had been all my life a steady supporter both in the press and in parliament of Catholic emancipation. It was the only point on which I differed from Peel & the Duke and that was the reason why when they resigned

resigned in to go with I had a point. In of politics, grew too. The Anti- should be things should to come in their own when Peel and myself from used to lay hold question or was left for were forced which was state, but nature that was once & exploded surprised alarmed

resigned in 1837 I found it impossible  
to go with them, as Mr. Canning  
& I had always agreed on that  
point. In the natural course  
of politics, when that question  
grew too strong to be resisted  
the Anti-Catholic Ministers  
should have retired, and the  
Whigs should have been allowed  
to come into Office and to carry  
their own great measure; but  
when Peel & the Duke ungraciously  
and unfairly cut that ground  
from under them, they were forced  
to lay hold of the next great  
question on which something  
was left for them to do, and they  
were forced back upon Reform  
which was in a very slumbering  
state, but of so combustible a  
nature that when the match  
was once applied it blazed up  
& exploded with a fury that  
surprised & astonished &  
alarmed those who had introduced  
it

as some leading Men of that Cabinet  
have honestly confessed to me.  
But tho' the Duke of Wellington  
had made the original mistake  
of doing what was right to be done,  
and perhaps inevitable, and  
what I individually approved,  
but which ought to have been  
done by the Whigs, the Duke,  
I say, said that one false step  
should not be followed by another,  
and that another concession  
would have been only followed  
by other demands each growing  
more irresistible by every success  
that was obtained; he was  
therefore in, as nearly as possible,  
the same situation that Louis  
Philippe & you were upon  
your own Subject of reform;  
some portion of the demands  
of your Opposition were  
plausible enough, and you  
would,

97  
would, as abstract propositions, have  
seen no great harm in conceding  
them, but if you had once begun  
to make such concessions, all  
the rest would have followed,  
with the additional mischief of  
discrediting the King & his Ministry.  
You would not have much cared  
as to what rate the Electoral  
franchise should have been fixed  
but you knew that even the most  
moderate concession would, in the  
then temper of men's minds,  
be virtually the abandonment  
of your position. What great  
harm was there in the proposed  
Banquet? None at all as a  
single fact. But it was a defiance  
of the Government which it was  
absolutely necessary to resist,  
and that was so true that we now  
know that the leaders of that movement  
(who only wanted your places and  
not a revolution) were in their  
own

own minds as much alarmed as  
you were, and found themselves  
most reluctantly dragged into  
the vortex. I told all this to  
Louis Philippe himself, as, I believe,  
I also did to you and I  
consolled the King in some of  
our long conversations at Claremont,  
by shewing him that his and  
your resistance to the Bourbons  
had only accelerated a Cata-  
strophe which (accompanied by  
a loss of your character) would  
have equally occurred if you  
had been so pusillanimous  
as to yield, and the wise  
old man actually embraced  
me, avec effusion as you  
say, at the view that I had  
thus opened to him: and it  
was on those principles that  
I, at the time, defended you

in the Revolution  
was an error  
you for his  
by your in-  
it is on the  
now defend  
against the  
which you  
him and  
time, or  
the subject  
that I could  
could be  
almost so  
conduct  
and Mon  
respective  
This  
anxious to  
shall you  
you that  
of the eff  
which you

in



my present condition. I can  
hardly hope that I shall ever  
see you again, but while I  
live I shall never cease to  
pride myself in the title of  
being your friend and by  
thinking that to the best of my  
abilities, I did justice to both  
your personal & political  
character.

Believe me to be, Mon cher Ami  
Most affectionately  
Yours  
Whitaker

The attendance of my Doctor  
has obliged me to change  
my residence to Kensington Palace.