

## The Influence of the French Revolution

The French Revolution was a major segment of the large event which is the Transatlantic Revolution, 1760/1815. The French Revolutionary part of the Transatlantic Revolution involved the pre-revolution and its debates, the Revolution of 1789, and the succession of Revolutionary regimes including Napoleon's and the Constitutional Monarchy of the Restorations of 1814 and 1815, and the July Monarchy.

The political radicalism of the English transatlantic republic (England, Ireland and American colonies) was the first phase and contributed to the second French and continental European Phase, as well as both contributing to the third and Latin American phase. (It is noteworthy that the main line of the Portuguese royal family preferred to remain in Brazil where they had sought refuge in exile and reigned until the late nineteenth century as Emperors of Brazil, and allowed a junior branch of the family to be restored as the king of Portugal.)

Thus, the American Revolution and Constitution of 1787 are important for the French and other revolutions, as the French Revolution was important for the formulation of the American party system and the principles of American foreign policy. For the French, the American Revolution fulfilled the prediction for the French foreign minister, Chosieull, that France's overwhelming loss of Canada, and India to England would lead to the revolt of the American colonies.

Indeed, the vast sums expended by England to win the war caused the American revolution, as the vast sums spent by France to support the America- war of independence caused the French Revolution. The

2  
Revolution was caused by the debt of England's wars and attempt<sup>t</sup> to pay the debts by taxes drawn from trade from the mercantilist system. The American revolution led to the temptation to pay for the war by inflation. This fallacy led to the Constitution and the attempt to control government at the national and state levels from inflation, debt and the taxes which seek to solve their consequences. The French Revolution came out of the huge debt caused by a century of warfare, and the attempt to use inflation to solve the problem. The French Revolutionary wars led to trade restrictions. America came out of the age of Transatlantic revolutions with a strong currency and a sound trade policy under the leadership of the Jeffersonians, and England saw the same result. France did achieve a very sound monetary system (having suffered the most inflation) but remained within a mercantilist mindset which reduced France's comparative economic growth during the nineteenth century.

In the second half of the eighteenth century there was a series of revolutions: intellectual revolution of which the publication of Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations (1776) was the central event; the political revolution of the Transatlantic region of which the Declaration of Independence (1776) was the important event; and the industrial revolution of which the application of the steam engine in Edinburgh by James Watt (1776) was the benchmark event.

The era of the Transatlantic Revolutions in the later part of the eighteenth century had a number of paradoxes. Perhaps, the most significant was that the Transatlantic Revolutions were the results of the financial crises caused by modern wars and led to major wars, but had as a consequence created the conditions for long-term peace. The long-term international consequences of the Transatlantic Revolution were peace in Europe, North America and Latin America until the first decades of the twentieth century. America was spared a major foreign war; suffering instead the greatest military casualties in the nineteenth century in the Civil War - a major legacy of the Transatlantic Revolutions.

The wars of the Transatlantic Revolutions were protracted wars as modern wars had become, and the revolutions were the consequence precisely of the protracted nature of the modern wars. The costs of these wars became the burden triggering the revolutions, and the burden of the revolutionary wars caused the logical conclusion that war and change were not worth the financial and social-stability costs of war. These conclusions were caused and reinforced by the emergence of a clear-cut economic science. The zero-sum game concepts of the pre-modern era were replaced by the non-zero-sum game of modern, scientific analysis. The mercantilist tariffs and closed market policies which were the preparation and the goal of the great modern wars of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were replaced with the free trade and international division of labor conclusions of modern economics.

4

The Age of the Transatlantic Revolution was the age of modern economics. It was in reference to the issues of the American and French Revolutions, and England's wars against these revolutions, that Adam Smith, Turgot, Du Pont de Nemours, J. B. Say, Destutt de Tracy, Malthus, Ricardo, Bentham and James Mill wrote. Both the American and French Revolutions raised the two major issues of economics - money and trade. The attempts in practice to deal with the financial problems of the two revolutions' inflation led to the Constitutional Convention and restoration of monetary stability and to the Napoleonic regime's monetary stability. These provided examples to nineteenth century thinkers fascinated by the inflationary crises of the revolutions.

The serious economists were able to initiate economic science in the context of these crises. They started with a recognition of the complexity of human activities. David Hume exemplified the application of economic analysis in the eighteenth century. He wrote: "But the principles of commerce are much more complicated, and require long experience and deep reflection to be well understood in any state. The real consequence of a law or practice is there often contrary to first appearance." (Hume, History of England, III, 61) Hume continues with numerous examples of the misguided attempts to legislate economic behavior and showed the futility of the legislators resisting the "natural course of improvement." Hume stated the direct conclusion from the success of salutary neglect, and challenged the basis of the new bureaucratic, tax enhancing state. This explains the popularity in Europe of Hume at the time of the French Revolution's centralizing, inflating and confiscating economic terror.

Economics was, perhaps the major discovery of English, French and American Radicals. Thomas Paine, who was active in the radical movements in England, America and France, is an example this process. Paine emigrated from an England which he felt was in the process of abandoning its historic principles of liberty both at home and in the thirteen colonies. As a custom agent he was observant of the great increase in the pressures which had been placed on the English people to contribute more and more taxes, and the threats to liberty which that entailed. The increased demand for taxes, and the consequent threats to liberty, were due to preceding wars <sup>debts</sup>. Radicals saw the weight of war in all respects fell upon the ordinary people. Paine was one of the important founders among the Radicals of all countries of the advocates of international conciliation, which was a major current in the nineteenth century coming from the Revolutions.

Paine, Jefferson, Du Pont de Nemours and many, many others saw the economic burdens and threats to liberty in the increased <sup>war</sup> debt, taxation and tax enforcement caused by earlier wars. The radicals compared the late eighteenth century with English and French regimes which earlier had solved the first war-based financial crises in 1720 - the South Sea Bubble in England which

was solved by the ministry of Sir Robert Walpole, and the Mississippi Bubble in France <sup>1</sup> which was resolved by the ministry of Cardinal

During the succeeding two decades, Fleury./Walpole and Fleury undertook a policy of detente to reduce the possibilities for the wars that had created the financial crises. Taxes were lowered due to reduce military expenditures, savings were invested in industries responding to consumer demands, and there was a non-enforcement of regulations, known as salutary neglect in England and America, and called laissez-faire, laissez-passer by the French Intendant de Commerce, Vincent de Gournay.

Oliver Wendell Brown's Birth of Consumer

6

However, succeeding ministries resumed major warfare with the remergence of heavy national debts to postpone the unpopular costs of the wars to post-war years. Bankers basked in the secure profits from government bonds which had emerged in the Public Finance Revolution of the early eighteenth century whereby the taxpayers directly rather than the king owed the debt to the bankers. The Seven Years' War which ended in 1763 demonstrated to the European radicals the consequences in national debt and the threat to liberty in the collection of taxes of the system of mercantilist tariffs and closed markets which were the preparation and the goal of the wars.

England had concluded peace with France and Spain in 1763 after sweeping to victory in Canada and India, in Havana and Manila, in the West Indies and West Africa. But, at the price of the largest national debt England had accumulated. To pay for these war debts, European countries with England in the lead sought new forms of taxation and better ways to enforce taxation. During the later eighteenth century, European states created a more efficient tax collection system as part of the Public Finance Revolution; the Transatlantic Revolutions were the response to this Public Finance Revolution.

England's salutary neglect was replaced with active enforcement of existing taxes and the introduction of new taxation. To enforce the taxes, individual rights were violated. James Otis and John Hancock became defenders of individual fights against the government's fiscal agents in America; John Wilkes became the focus of defense of individual rights in England.

7

The Society of Supporters of the Bill of Rights in England received strong support from Americans. Americans saw liberty under threat throughout Europe and identified with defenders of liberty in England, France, Poland and Corsica, whose leader, Pasquale Paoli, exiled from Corti, was lionized in London by Burke, Smith and Franklin (Corsica was bought by France from Genoa to replace the forests of Canada for the French navy; the Bonapartes were supporters of France against the Anglophile Paoli).

Since historic constitutions and representative institutions resisted the taxes imposed by the Public Finance Revolution, across Europe these were closed or abolished. Having imposed vast war debts, the governments were anxious to find efficient and direct methods of collecting new taxation to repay the current war debts and the expectation of future war debts. Efficiency often was associated with reform in the writings of supporters of the Public Finance Revolution. An efficient and reforming government bureaucracy became a major part of eighteenth century politics. These bureaucrats wrote important works to defend the new taxes and the war debt system for public opinion. An efficient, bureaucratic system of mercantilism, taxation and administration of the war debts became the basis of a new conservative philosophy in Europe. It was the philosophy against which liberals in England, American and France reacted, and it was the philosophy which <sup>was</sup> utilized by the Jacobins and by Napoleon during the French Revolution. It was against this conservative philosophy and the bureaucratic institutions of the Public Finance Revolution against which Edmund Burke, Thomas Jefferson, and Du Pont de Nemours wrote.

8

For all the liberal philosophers opposed to the conservatism of the Public Finance Revolution, the American Revolution was the great test. The American Revolution and nineteenth century American history represented the great defeat for the Public Finance Revolution. America was the practical example of the historic constitutionalism, salutary neglect, and defense of liberty against fiscal agencies against which the Public Finance Revolution was aimed. America fitted into the mind-set of an international society in which war, the foundation of the Public Finance Revolution, was not prominent.



9

The emergence of modern economics' free trade and international division of labor conclusions provided in the century before the first world war a new form of the historic view of the European world as a single community, a Great Republic. Indeed, the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century revolutions had brought North and South America into that Great Republic. At the same time, that nineteenth century Madrid, Paris and London were capitals of this Great Republic, so also were Rio de Janero, Buenos Aires, Caracas, and New York, Philadelphia, New Orleans.

Along side the economic principles, political principles stemming from the Transatlantic Revolutions were a common language within this Great Republic. The political ideas of England's common law, constitutional tradition, political parties and parliamentary government, the protection of individual rights, the federalism, the separation of powers, and balance of powers of the United States, and the Declaration of the Rights of Man,

10.

As the country with the largest war debt, England experienced first the movement toward a more efficient taxing government, and the resistance to this new bureaucratic state, George II, under whom Walpole's salutary neglect, had been accomplished, was succeeded by his young grandson, George III, in October, 1760. The bill for victorious war was enormous, and the new, energetic ministers sought to raise taxes by transforming salutary neglect into a tax state. The Americans were the first to resist, but opposition in England was strong and a new Whig party emerged from the Walpole whigs, the radical supporters of the bill of rights, and the old Tory farmers harassed by new taxes, such as the cider tax - from small apples do great political movements grow. The political philosopher of the new Whiggism in England and America was Edmund Burke. He defended the institutions which had provided the basis for salutary neglect and the economic success for England and America that was its result. Being Irish, Burke had an eye for the historic elements of the English constitution which permitted the flourishing of the most successful constitution and economy.

Burke's role of exponent of the Whig philosophy was made easier by the French admirers of the English political system. Voltaire's Philosophic letters on the English ( ), Montesquieu's The Spirit of the Laws, (1748, 1750), along with Jean Louis DeLelome's Constitution de l'Angleterre (1771, English 1772) and David Hume's History of England (also in French) provided the basis of Enlightenment political philosophy in England, America and France. Burke, who doubled as Whig parliamentary leader and London agent for the colony of New York, was in a strategic position to observe the movement toward augmentation of taxation. The rise of the tax-state meant a threat to the preceding development of representative institutions.

11

Adam Smith was a close friend of Edmund Burke and his analysis in the Wealth of Nations (1776) may be seen as part of the resistance to the tax state's replacement of salutary neglect. Smith's Wealth of Nations was an analysis of the mercantilist system, the closed economy to permit protracted warfare, and the alternatives of international division of labor, international conciliation and low taxation, in a word, the system of salutary neglect.

Salutary neglect or Laissez-faire was recommended in foreign affairs by France's preeminent economist, Anne Robert Jacques Turgot. Turgot was appointed as a financial reform minister by Louis XVI when he succeeded to the throne in 1774. When France signed the Peace of Paris in 1763 transferring Canada to England, the French foreign minister, the Duc de Choiseul sought to console Louis XV for England's massive success by predicting that the Americans would desire independence from England. With the growth of opposition to English taxation, the French provided unofficial military assistance to the Americans. Turgot recommended the continuation of such a policy without any direct French intervention in the war. He noted that the conflict would be protracted and that whether the colonies succeeded in becoming independent or not, England would be exhausted by the lengthy counter-insurgency. The French foreign minister, Comte de Vergennes, suggested that the young, new king would gain dynastic prestige from a war against England. Louis Martin Sears noted:

12 .  
Vergennes, the diplomat, favored war; Turgot, the economist, beheld in it the final road to bankruptcy and to consequences too horrible to contemplate. The King had some comprehension of diplomacy, almost none of economics. Diplomacy therefore triumphed..... Both counsellors were right. The sun of monarchy set in unexampled splendor. Bankruptcy precipitated revolution.

(p. 10)

Vergennes, one of the greatest foreign secretaries, had the honor of being the father of the French Revolution, ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> we can think of Louis XIV as the grand-father of the French Revolution. (Louis Madelin, French Revolution, p. 184. Turgot's warnings that war debts would destroy the state's finances and that bankruptcy would be the cause of a total political collapse began to be fulfilled in 1787. While the American founding fathers were gathering in Philadelphia, the French government, facing the consequences of Turgot's predictions of disaster from the American war, sought to find a solution to bankruptcy. Finally, the Estates General were called in 1789, one hundred and seventy-five years since the last meeting.

(Voltaire, Montesquieu)  
As French praise of the Whig constitution's salutary neglect had contributed to the formation of American Whig revolutionary principles, the American constitutions formed as states emerged from colonies, and the Articles of Confederation were formulated greatly influenced French political philosophy. Benjamin Franklin, as homespun, 'Quaker' philosopher, gained the attention of the French thinkers. Franklin, later assisted by John Adams, achieved an impressive victory for America in French public opinion.

Adams and Jefferson, when he arrived in France, became increasingly worried that the French philosophes had drawn an unrealistic view of the American constitutions. Indeed, a growing debate occurred in France regarding American constitutionalism. In the face of France's war debt and impending bankruptcy, Turgot

10

leaned in the direction of the advocates of efficient taxation. He differed with Montesquieu and became opposed to the English constitutional concepts of separation and balance of power. Before his death he wrote to Dr. Richard Price, the radical English divine who supported the American Revolution, expressing criticism of the English-based American constitutions. It was in response to Turgot, that John Adams wrote his Defense of the Constitutions of the United States (three volumes). Indeed, over time, Adams strong criticism of the French misunderstandings of American political principles clashed with Jefferson's more moderate, and more sad than angry, criticism of the French. The debate eventually contributed to the break between Adams and Jefferson. The French Revolution became an important part of their correspondance when they had retired from active politics, and resumed what had been, especially in Europe, a deep friendship. In his autobiography, written at the time of the correspondance, Jefferson wrote fifty-three pages on the French Revolution. He recalled the French Revolution in terms of the liberal nobles with whom he associated, and who lost their lives or suffered exile for their liberal opposition to the Terror. Sears says regarding Jefferson's memory of the French Revolution before his return to New York to assume the duties of secretary of state:

The French Revolution at its best was his abiding recollection. It is much as if a beholder of Tsar Nicholas in overthrow and the rise of Alexandred Kerensky and Prince Lvov were to form an impression of the Russian Revolution not to be eradicated by the starvation, oppression and forced labor camps resorted to by their successors. (p. 7)

The legacy of the French Revolution is a matter of seeking to identify what is unique in much of the world's development. In examining the French Revolution's legacy from an American perspective, one looks in a Janus-faced two directions. There is the Anglo-American experience <sup>of the Fr. Rev.</sup> and there is the experience of the rest of the world which did not derive from the English-British Commonwealth or American perspective.

This different perspective is due first of all to the different historical experiences of the Anglo-American world and the European world before the French Revolution. Obviously, England and America were effected differently than Europe because they were separated from the continent geographically and did not enjoy (suffer) the liberation (Occupation) imposed by the French revolutionary forces. ~~✗~~

During the three hundred years before the French Revolution. from the Tudor accession to the throne and John Cabot's following the vision of Columbus across the Atlantic, the English world happened to develop differently than the continent. This difference was expressed strongly and beautifully by Shakespeare and the Elizabethan and Jacobean writers after only one hundred <sup>years.</sup> Due to Henry VIII self-identification as a great theologian, Luther's dogmas were rejected while his critic of church organization <sup>was</sup> accepted in England. Despite the seventeenth century conflict between Puritans and Absolutists (modeled on French Counter-Reformation), the earlier compromise <sup>of</sup> ~~along~~ pre-Reformation ~~Counter-Reformation~~ Christianity survived in England. For the historians from many perspectives who see the French Revolution as a conflict of religious visions in origins and a conflict over religious organization in its character, the religious differences with the Anglo-American world

The Catholic Reformation or Counter-Reformation of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, stemming from the Council of Trent, had its greatest effect in France. The rulers of France, Castile, Aragon, Two Sicilies, Venice, etc., remained in union with the Papacy because the Papacy had conceded to the rulers control over the appointment of bishops and abbots, and thus, over church revenues. However, many bishops and abbots, if not rulers, were moved to accomplish an internal renewal among Catholics. Richelieu, as a favor to his family, was appointed by the king as bishop of the small diocese of Lucon at twenty-one and worked internal reformation for a number of years before moving on to national politics to represent the clergy at the Estates-General of 1614.

Richelieu and Mazarin created the French system which led to the French Revolution. Richelieu was responsible for the French Estates-General not meeting again after 1614, Richelieu demonstrated the means by which the king's government could raise revenues without the participation of the legislature, the Estates-General. The consequences of this method of public finance was centralized government, revenue enhancing regulations, and large military expenditures leading to the bankruptcy which required the calling the Estates-General in 1789. A crucial part of the French Revolution is the absence of representative national institutions for one hundred and seventy-five years, 1614-1789, from Richelieu to Calonne. The French Revolution was caused firstly by the absence of a national representative institution to provide for the determination of public finance for one hundred and seventy-five years. This was achieved by shifting the burden of taxation from those who would lead the movement for limitation on taxes by exempting the nobility, clergy and civil servants from taxes.

The English kings, Charles I and Charles II, sought to follow the model of Richelieu to seek to raise public finances without calling parliament (1629-40; 1671-85). The English government's attempt to raise taxes without the legislature were the forerunners to the Civil War and execution of Charles I, and the Revolution of 1688 in which Charles I's second son, James II, was expelled. The reliance on parliament for public finances and the limitation on taxes that entailed, was the major contrast between the Anglo-American and French worlds leading to the French Revolution.

The absence of a legislature for one hundred and seventy-five years had a massive impact on French thinking preceding and during the French Revolution. French observers of England, such as Montesquieu, Voltaire and Delehome, were impressed with the role of the parliament in limiting public finances and regulations though separation of powers and balance of powers, as well as the autonomy of civil institutions, whether religion or the stock exchange. A leading political party could remain in power only by creation of coalitions among the differing interests in the society. But, this Gothic model of government began to seem to later French observers to be inefficient and lacking immediacy. The concept of political parties based on coalitions of differing goals seemed formless, directionless, and inconsistent, if not lacking in ethical perfection. In sum, to the modern later eighteenth century French thinker, the English parliament seemed a relic, lacking efficiency to those with a practical caste of mind, lacking morality to those whose mind was focused on elevating humanity.



Thus, the modern eighteenth century Frenchman could imagine a better governmental form than England's, one that by elevating the moral level of humanity could bring material efficiencies. The American Revolution ignited a major debate in France, or rather, merged two parallel debates. Both debates came out of the mid-century wars (1740-1763) between France, and England and England's clients on the continent. France was defeated across the board. The French asked how such a rich country as France could be defeated by a smaller country, as England. Proposals for internal reforms of taxes, regulations, administration and education came forward; it is the period of the popularity of Rousseau's writings on government, education, etc.

However, England's victories were bitter-sweet as it emerged with a huge national debt. As a young grand-son of the last king had succeeded, new men and policies were proposed to increase tax collection. In England and Ireland, it led to new political movements in opposition, and a parallel movement in the America colonies. The new taxes and expansion of government investigative powers associated with the taxes were opposed on traditional grounds by the 'new' whig party of the Marquis of Rockingham and Edmund Burke, along with the popular radicalism of John Wilkes and the Society of the Supporters of the Bill of Rights. In America there was tax-avoidance, boycotts, tar-and-feathering tax collectors and the Boston Tea Party, leading to the call to arms of the Minute Men at Lexington and Concord. To those involved, the speeches of Burke, riots for Wilkes and Liberty, tar-and feathering tax collectors, and Liberty-poles were all of the same fabric. They were defenses of the liberty of the individual person against the fiscal and repressive actions of officials, even if they acted under parliamentary legislation aimed at efficiency and public good.

When the Americans undertook armed defense of their liberties against the English parliament and ministry, Burke, Wilkes and the Whigs gave the Americans full support. Instructed by Adam Smith's recent (1776) Wealth of Nations, neither saw the Declaration of Independence (July, 1776) as anything other than a natural progression of political and economic maturity, so long as the scientific truth of international free trade was respected.

The French viewed these developments in the context of the military defeat of 1763, the internal conflicts of an expiring king, and the hopes of a young successor in 1774. But, the young <sup>French</sup> king's desire for reform and popularity found the American Revolution to be a temptation. If England and America engaged in armed conflict, England would come out weakened. It would be a long, protracted conflict - with much opposition inside England - so that whether England won or lost it would be much weakened. Liberal admirers of the Americans advocated that France provide military assistance to the Americans, through private routes such as the Marquis de Lafayette, while remaining neutral - in the end, England was faced with an almost European wide hostile coalition of neutrals. Traditional military advisers pressed a policy of direct French intervention in order to re-assert France's military leadership. The king accepted the argument that it was not glorious for him to gain superiority over England by England's being weakened; he heeded to gain popular glory by bloodying his sword. The debt incurred by France to fight England in the American Revolution broke the back of the French fiscal system, required the calling of the Estate General in 1789, and caused the French Revolution.

However, the American Revolution trigger<sup>ed</sup> a major discussion in French intellectual circles. Each of the thirteen colonies began to form a new constitution, sometimes more than one. in the context of independence, and they formed a constitution for the Continental Congress, the Articles of Confederation. Since not much was known<sup>in France</sup> about the previous colonial governments' institutions the French were imagining the 'natural' woodsman, farmer, and sailor, coming from the state of nature, and creating natural forms of government. Benjamin Franklin, as American minister to Paris, confirmed this, despite the fact that he had come from a stay in Philadelphia after long service as colonial agent in London. Franklin was further lionized because he represented Pennsylvania which had adopted a unicameral legislature - a long step toward the Rousseauian perfection of the general will. Unfortunately for the French philosophes, most of the new state constitutions looked like the despicable, old-fashioned English constitution: - understandable if the colonists were struggling to maintain their traditional liberties against a reforming, intrusive London government. They wanted ~~to~~ independence to keep what they had, which the parliament and ministry were attacking in order to increase taxation.

Having come out of the mid-eighteenth century set of wars and armed truces, England and France both were faced with a major crisis of public finance. Starting at the point of crisis stemming from massive public debts, England and France found each government seeking to gain new sources of taxation by any means possible. Edmund Burke's writings provide us the most complete survey for three to four decades of the late eighteenth century thrashing about for new ways to extract taxation. England and to an extent France had maintained systems of government and

relations to between citizens and government which respected the citizen's rights and limited the powers of the government.

Throughout Europe in the later eighteenth century, parallel problems were arising. The Bourbon monarchies of France, Spain and the Two Sicilies, Portugal, Austria, some German states Sweden,,Poland, and even Russia embarked on a new level of state power of their citizens - Enlightened Despotism. In order to maintain new levels of armed forces and to pay for past expenditures on military activities, governments sought to overcome the resistance to taxes to pay for the military system by setting aside or overriding the various mechanisms by which people in each country had built up fences of protection against unlimited government access to citizen's resources.

In England and America, the <sup>Tory</sup> British ministry sought to move in a similar direction. It was the English Whigs and the American Whigs who opposed this movement in the direction of increased powers to tax for the military debt and activities. Edmund Burke is generally credited as the person who gave the new Whig party which emerged after 1763, its character, its coherence and its principles. Burke was one of the most well informed persons in England in the eighteenth century (the comparable person in the nineteenth century was Lord Acton) regarding contemporary events, as well as the history, of European countries. Burke prepared the entries regarding each year's events in each country for the Annural Register. He saw the new direction in European state-building, with the crushing of traditional representative and intermediary institutions, to gain tax revenues. He was able to identify the causes, the lineage and the consequences of this development. He was able to note the comparative progress in

continental countries of what the English Tory ministry sought to accomplish in England and America.

, This knowledge gave Burke the factual basis from which to build a defense of traditional rights against the innovation of the new conservatism of the Tories. For the Whigs in England and America, it was not acceptable as normal what had been extraordinary expenditures for war. Such levels of military spending should not be maintained and the national debt incurred for the war should be paid from existing revenues by cutting expenses. Thus, the importance of Burke's consistent emphasis upon economical reform. Burke was a close friend of Adam Smith and incorporated Smith's critiques of mercantilism and tax enhancement into the Whig analysis (quote Smith on prosperity based on peace, justice and low taxes). Burke perceived the potential for further increases in the size of armies and for financing protracted conflicts which was fulfilled in the wars of the French Revolution and Napoleon, with the interference with trade and production, the diversion of resources from consumers and the loss of life.

In England, Scotland, Ireland and America, intellectual opinion tended to adopt and to further elaborate the Whig philosophy which was described by Burke. In all these countries, British intellectuals tended to support the American Revolution. Many of the people who did not support the American Revolution, viewed it as a tragedy and a mistake rather than something diabolical. Burke was able to lead a Whig party in the commons dressed in the buff and blue colors of the American Revolution as an expression of daily opposition across from the Tory ministers. Finally, the Whigs received a majority in the commons and formed a cabinet to negotiate the recognition of American independence.

Since the French Estates-General had not met since 1614, it is understandable that France experienced a different response to the public finance crisis caused by the mid-eighteenth century wars. The north-central core of France around Paris had the Estates-General as its representative institution and the parlement of Paris as its highest judiciary. The provinces added to this core kept their provincial estates and parlements, while gaining the right to send deputies to the national Estates-General. Thus, although the Estates-General did not meet from 1614, the provincial estates and parlements, as well as the parlement of Paris continued to function. But, to avoid calling the Estates-General to provide taxes, the French governments had quieted those who would have insisted on calling<sup>ing</sup> the Estates-General (to limit taxation) by granting them tax-exemptions.

Having entered the conflict of the American Revolution, France added a vast increase to its national debt and reached the point where tax income would not service the interest on the debt. The calling of the Estates-General in 1789 to again balance taxation with representative participation in fiscal decisions ment facing the buildup of one hundred and seventy-five years of not having representation. Calling par<sup>12</sup>lement in 1640 to deal with war costs after a decade of no representation led to the English Revolution of the Long Parliament (1640-1660), while the absence of representation in the English parliament led to the American Revolution. But, whereas the English and American Revolutions were to restore the traditional institutions of the parliament or the colonial assemblies, without long hiatus'. the French not only experienced a one hundred and seventy-five years hiatus, but swept away the traditional institutions of estates and parlements.

Some sense of the differences in attitude between the French and English intellectuals in the era of the French Revolution may be seen in a letter written to Talleyrand by Napoleon Bonaparte on the 3rd Complementary Day, Year V of the new French Revolutionary calendar (September 19, 1797) concerning new constitutions for Italy. Bonaparte wrote:

In spite of our pride, our thousand and one pamphlets, and our random and prating speeches, we are extremely ignorant of the science of political conduct. We have not yet defined what is meant by executive, legislative, and judicial power.

Montesquieu gave us false definitions.... His eyes were fixed on the government of England; he defined the executive, the legislature, and the judiciary in general.

Why, indeed, should the right of declaring war and peace, the right of determining the amount and character of taxes be regarded as an attribute of the legislative power? . .

Since the House of Commons is the only body which, for better or worse, represents the nation, it alone ought to have the right to impose taxes; it is the only bulwark they have been able to find to moderate the despotism and insolence of courtiers. But in a government where all authority emanates from the nation, where the sovereign is the people, why classify among the attributes of the legislative power matters that are alien to it? -

I see only one thing that we have really defined during the last fifty years, that is the sovereignty of the people: but we have been no happier in the determination of what is constitutional, than in the assignment of the different powers. ...

It is divided, it seems to me, between two quite distinct authorities. One of these supervises and does not act; to this body the power that we nowadays call the Executive would be obliged to submit important measures:...

The legislative power would enact all the organic laws in the first instance, ~~and~~.... This legislative power, without rank in the Republic, impassible, hearing and seeing nothing of what goes on around it, would have no ambition, and would no longer inundate us with a thousand circumstantial laws which nullify themselves by their very absurdity, and which make us a nation with three hundred folios and not a single law.

If you see Sieyes, please show him this lwtter. ...

(John Hall Stewart, A Documentary Survey of the French Revolution, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1951, pp. 700-702.)

In the circumstances of the calling of the Estates-General and its transformation into a national assembly when a majority of the first estate - the clergy - crossed over to join the third estate, an early method of paying the national debt was sought. It was decided to confiscate the property of the Catholic Church to use to pay the debts of the government (Decree of November 2, 1789). The Church was to be reorganized: the Decree of October 28, 1789 had suspended the taking of monastic vows (vows were prohibited by the Decree of February 13, 1790); The Civil Constitution of the Clergy (Decree of July 12, 1790) abolished historic bishoprics and established one bishop for each of the eighty-three departments with election of bishops and priests by the voters and fixing salaries paid by the government; and finally, the Decree of November 27, 1790 requiring the clerical oath.



Meanwhile, the former property of the Church were to be sold, and the income used to repay the national debt. In the meantime the confiscated church lands were to be security for a bond. the assignats (Decree of Decmeber 19, 1789). The bonds were redeemable in the confiscated lands, and after redemption were to be destroyed. The assignats were made legal tender by the Decree of April 17, 1790. During the course of the French Revolution, more and more assignats were issued which caused a great and destructive inflation by credit expansion. The inflation led to the passage of the decrees of the Economic Terror: the assignats were declared permanent bonds paying interest relieving the government of repaying the principal; a compulsory loan to the government was decreed, and a series of price controls were introduced. The death penalty was imposed on those convicted of exporting grain (Decree of December 5, 1792); the death penalty was included in the first law of the maximum (price controls) in the Decree of May 4, 1793, and in the second in the Decree of September 29. 1793 in the extension of the Economic Terror.

The confiscation of church property and the re-organization of the church on a political election principle, the issuing of assignats, and the use of the Economic Terror by death penalties for violation of price controls, introduced disorder into many parts of France. Most of the major cities of France were besèiged and conquered by armies sent by the Committee on Public Safety in Paris. A continuing irregular warefare developed among the devout peasants of the Vendee (Brittany) creating the occasion for a mass extermination of the population.

Thus, a very sad consequence of the French Revolution was not only more extreme measures of government intervention, culminating in executions in the Economic Terror, attempting to solve earlier measures of government intervention, but also the introduction of political genocide. The shock of these consequences had a lasting impression in Europe and beyond for the whole of the nineteenth century. But the first deviation/learned by European society from the terrible wars of the French Revolution and Napoleon that war has unimaginable consequences which must avoided witnessed the re-emergence of economic terror and genocide in the first world war. The Armenian Massacres by the Ottoman Turks, the genocide of the Ukrainians by the Soviet Politburo, and of the Jews by the Nazi Party may be seen as a legacy of the French Revolution. It may be said that the policies of the Communists in China, Vietnam and Cambodia are similar legacies. Pol Pot in Cambodia claimed that his economic policies and the accompanying massacres were derived from his studies of Jean Jacques Rousseau and the French Revolution.