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The Evolution of the Labor Problem in France during the Eighteenth Century—A Study of Unemployment Relief.
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B. Deductions: Comparison and contrast with present day problem
CHAPTER I

This study has been threefold. First, to indicate how the social problems of the Eighteenth Century are related to the other problems of political, international, cultural, religious, and economic "Controversions," second, to suggest what was being done by the Eighteenth Century in the way of solving the social problems, third, to show more particularly the treatment of the problem of the unemployed, emphasizing chiefly the work of the initial stages of the French Revolution.

The inadequate and, in most cases, scrappy treatment of the social phase of the Eighteenth Century by many historians has left a distorted notion of the true accomplishments of the century. To properly evaluate this problem, the Eighteenth Century must be viewed as a whole. The century has been repeatedly called a century of revolution. In the light of new investigations in the field of Eighteenth Century history, this term is not applicable in its truest sense.

According to a more recent interpretation, it was a 18th century of "Controversions." The task of the Eighteenth Century was the "Controversy" of the Ancient Regime. This task in the international field was the "Breaking" of the direful competitive Power-Balance. The "Controversions" in the political phase resulted in the "Dooming" of despotism by popularism.
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Begun at first by enlightened despotisms, it shifted into gradual regenerations and culminated in the radical, active and retro-active, French Revolution. The "Obscurantism of Academism," coming from the Seventeenth century was "Enlightened" by the "Contraversions" in the cultural field. The "over-turnings" in the religious thought and action of the Eighteenth Century produced an "Awakening" from the stupor of forced uniformity. In the economic aspect of this century, the old statism of the Seventeenth Century was controverted by "Revamping" it on indirect-power lines. In the social field, the conventional class inequities, which were established by the conformations of the Seventeenth Century, experienced an "Upsetting" by "mass equality."

After this perspective survey of the century, one must take a closer look at the social trends of the century. The social "Controversion" comprised the concepts of the meanings of 'society upset' and the control of its functions. The upsetting of society by the controverting age-spirit followed three well-defined eras. The initial era was motivated by piety. The central era was one of philosophy; while the final era was an era of philanthropy. In this upsetting, the controls of its functions were social morality norms (family or general), social pathology problems (hygiene and health, poverty, mendicancy, relief, care of defectives, criminality, etc.), and social utility provisions (educational, civic, travel facilities, etc.).

The century began with a social "Set-Up." This "Set-Up"
embraced an inconsistent complex of nominal medieval "estates" and of actual modern "classes." The first group represented the survival of the privileges of 'status' rather than the 'group services' of the clergy, chivalry, and communality. In the second group, composed of modern "classes," (upper, middle, and lower), we had each class divided hierarchically on lines of personal, selfish advantage. The spirit characterizing this social "Set-Up" was generally one of Seventeenth Century "Conventionism," marked by court-fixed etiquette, class inequities and discriminations.

There were some paternalistic medieval survivals, however, and we usually found more liberal situations in Britain than on the Continent.

The social "Unsettling" of the central era exhibited a merging of those distinct groups found in the social "Set-Up." Class lines were giving way. New aristocracies, especially in Great Britain and France, were coming to the front. Of particular note were the Whig country families and the nabobery, a group who had gained wealth and position from services in India. This era saw the ending of the survivals of serfdom in France (1779), Spain and the Hapsburg realms (1781-82), and in Sardinia and Denmark.

But Russia, in particular, stood out against this tendency towards liberalization. There we found an aggravation of serfdom in favor of the nobles. The motivating forces back of these "Unsettling" were the liberalizing effects of the "Aufklaerung" or cultural "Enlightenment," the religious "Awakening," new economic ideas,
and the progress of American events. The economic "Revampings" produced unsettling effects, especially for the city middle classes (bourgeoisie) and the proletariat of both city and country. There were meagre attempts towards feudal reaction; but these were to no degree successful.

As the social "Set-Up" led to its own "Unsettling" so the social "Unsettling" led to the social "Up-Set." This final era is marked by strata leveling. The first significant step was the French Revolutionary Acts (1789-99) which were, for the most part, equalizing laws and fiscal relief for the poor. To these can be added the spread of equalitarianism from America by returning armies. The Napoleonic Regime and its newly created nobility exerted a social influence upon France and upon Europe. Among other things, we saw an attempt at servile relief in the Germanies, the Italian states, Russia, and the Balkans, followed by the Anti-slave Trade Acts of the United States, Great Britain, France, Denmark, and others.

The spirit of popularism was emerging in "Civism," marked by democratic nationalistic tendencies (i.e. "carrières ouvertes aux talents") and "Humanitarian and Utilitarian" social betterment efforts.

This overview of the century's social trends as a whole affords a sort of interpretative basis for the special phase "Unemployment Problems in Eighteenth Century France," which is our primary concern. To appreciate fully the work accomplished in the
handling of this pathological problem, we must briefly consider the previous status of the problem.

The Church had early assumed, rather spontaneously, and in accordance with the teachings of Christ, a role of guardianship towards the poor and unfortunate. Her canons imposed this upon the official representatives of the religion as a duty. Moreover, the care of the poor and unfortunate was recommended to the faithful as a means of gaining eternal salvation. The Church had sustained numerous hospitals and religious orders of "hospitaliers" for the care of the sick and infirm. The monasteries distributed alms at their gates. The liberalities of the faithful permitted the undertaking of ecclesiastical establishments for relief work.

The gilds, although primarily organized for another purpose, the carrying on of active labor, contributed much in the way of organized relief. These gilds in England, the "gremios" in Spain, and the "confreries" in France were truly societies of mutual relief, distributing their surplus in the parishes and among their members.

On the manors, the problem of relief was a local one belonging to the lord of that manor. He made himself responsible for the welfare of his serfs. As a matter of course he provided work. He regulated their communal labor on the manor roads and in his fields, as well as for themselves.

With the Renaissance period came a revival and a great awakening. To the revival of old ideas, this awakening brought new
ideas with respect to the nation, to literature, to art, science, religion and to the individual. Hand in hand with the splendor of the Renaissance went the wretched condition of the poor. There was a rise in prices due to new imports and food stuffs; but wages remained about the same. There was during the early Middle Ages a system of natural economy. With the developments of the guilds and commerce came a system of money economy. It did not become a dominant factor until the late Fourteenth and early Fifteenth Centuries. This rise of capitalism led to a break-up of the manorial system and altered the guilds. The break-up of the manorial system and the alterations of the guilds tended to complicate the unemployment problem. Yeoman farmers and entrepreneurs began to rise in importance. The beginning of enclosures and the development of "sheep walks" threw many men out of employment.

With the revival of interest in the individual came an interest in the welfare of the masses which found expression in the social literature and activity of the Sixteenth Century. The "Reformation" spirit of the Sixteenth Century attempted to correct the evils found in the social structure. The progress of misery and the increase of mendicancy, together with brigandage helped to force this "re-formation" of assistance. To these can be added such social disturbances of the later Fifteenth and early Sixteenth Centuries as the rebellion led by the Piper of Miklashausen (1476), the Bundschuh outbreaks (1513-15), and the German Peasants' War (1524).

In the face of this degraded social structure the relief
system of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance broke down. The state had to step in to relieve the church. Many writings of a distinctly social trend are to be found in this century. The first to attract attention was "The Utopia" of Sir Thomas More, which appeared in 1516. This brought the people face to face with the social problem. Juan Luis Vives (Lewis Vives) next appeared with his "De subventione pauperum" written in 1524 and first printed in 1532. This famous tract on the relief of the poor was in the form of a letter to the town council of Bruges. Other social writings, although not quite as great as these, were "The Book of Vagabonds" (1510) by Matthew Hutlin, "A Plea for the Right of the Poor to Beg" (ca 1530) by Christian Cellarius, a professor at Louvain, and "Sacred Economy of Caring for the Poor" (ca 1564) by the Spanish monk, Lawrence da Villavicenzio.

The municipalization of relief was started very early in the century by the Netherlands. A severe edict was issued in 1506 against vagabonds. An enterprising group of humanists and lawyers demanded that the government should take over the duty of poor relief from the church. A "common chest" was started at Lille and a secular bureau of charity was started at Antwerp. Vives, in 1525, was called to Ypres and asked to give his advice on handling the problem. The result was that the city government combined all religious and philanthropic endowments into one fund and appointed a committee to administer it, and to collect more gifts.
Although there were occasional examples of municipal poor-relief in Germany prior to the Reformation it was the religious movement that gave the cause its decisive impulse. In his "Address to the German Nobility," Luther had recommended that each city should take care of its own poor and suppress begging. While he was away at the Wartburg, his more radical colleagues took steps to put these ideas into practice at Wittenberg. A fund was started by the application of ecclesiastical endowments. From this fund orphans and students were helped, and money was loaned to needy workmen at a low rate of interest. A severe law against begging was passed. About forty-eight other German cities followed the example of Wittenberg.

The Peasants' War sought to gain reforms in their favor by a complete break with the past. The "Twelve Articles" which they drew up embraced a long list of their grievances. The revolt failed to bring about any improvement in the hard lot of the peasants.

The distinctive characteristics of this later reform in France can be classified under the following heads: (1) transformation of the administration of hospitals; (2) the devolution upon the local magistrate of the duty of poor relief; (3) a census and classification of indigents; (4) interdiction of mendicity and alms-giving; (5) obligation of work for the adults; (6) revision foundations and rational division of the resources for aiding the worthy poor; (7) the establishment of a tax for the benefit of the
The French relief work during this period was increasingly secularised. The laity now began to exert an influence in the administration of the hospitals and other charitable foundations of the church. The idea of relief of the unfortunate by parishes resulted from a police regulation. Thus the Ordinance of Moulins, of February 1566, ordered that the poor be given food and shelter only in their native villages or cities. It was principally Paris, these royal ordinances had in view. At the end of the century there was issued another edict, that of May 1566, which renewed the prescriptions of the Ordinance of Moulins. Another administrative principle was that the duty of relief by parishes was correlative with the duty of furnishing work for the indigents. From this two-fold idea, one concluded that the cause of mendicancy and idleness was voluntary or involuntary stoppage or cessation of work (chômage), and that the quantity of available work was sufficient to provide employment for all who desired it. This obligation to work in order to receive relief was also a means of distinguishing between professional beggars and those who were forced to beg.

There were interesting attempts at Paris for providing work for the idle laborers. An Arret of Parlement, 22 April 1532, provided for employing the sturdy beggars in the works on highways, bridges, and clearing ditches.

In order to give this new system of relief a more solid basis, special administrative organizations were established. In a
very large number of villages there were set up alms-bureaux (bureaux d'aumône). At Paris was the Great Poor Office (le grand Bureau des Pauvres) 1554; at Orleans, the General Almonry (l'Aumône Générale) 1555; a similar one at Troyes (reorganized 1565 and 1585); at Rouen, Bureau for Able-bodied Poor (Bureau des Pauvres Valides); at Chalons-sur-Marne, 1564; at Amiens and Abbeville 1565; at Beauvais 1573, and numerous other places. These organizations were charged with the distribution of aid, the police of the vagabonds and beggars, and the organization of workhouses. The majority of the members of these administrative bodies were elected by municipal organizations. The tax for the benefit of the poor was a parish device, a kind of obligation placed upon the members of the community for the express purpose of regulating alms-giving. The principle of the tax was a regulated and administrative form of alms-giving.

Not only in France was there a re-formation of the principles of poor-relief but in England as well. At the beginning of the Sixteenth Century in England, the relief of the poor was not recognized as a civil duty or as the concern of the government. There had been some legislation under Henry VIII and Edward VI for the relief of the poor and the punishment of vagabonds. In order to deal with the problem of the unemployed several laws were passed for the encouragement of different industries. Thus, a statute of Henry VIII orders "that every person occupying land for tillage shall, for every sixty acres under plough, sow one quarter of an
acre in flax or hemp." The object of this act was undoubtedly to create employment in the linen manufacture, especially for the wives and children of the poor. It seems to have had very little effect in diminishing the number of the unemployed. With the same end in view, the government spent some of the money it got from the suppression of the monasteries on public works, such as the building of roads, harbors, embankments and fortifications. This, no doubt, provided occupation of a useful sort for some of those who had been out of work.

The reign of Queen Elizabeth (1558-1603) was full of social and economic legislation. Here, as before, the problem of unemployment is tied up with the administration of poor relief. The first Elizabethan social legislation of significance was the "Statute of Laborers and Apprentices" (1562-63). This statute was proposed in the hope that the new law would banish idleness, encourage husbandry, and yield unto the hired person both in time of scarcity and of plenty, a convenient wage. Certain persons were confined to the craft in which they were brought up. All persons, not otherwise employed, nor possessing a certain amount of property, were compelled to serve in husbandry. The term of apprenticeship was fixed at seven years. With few exceptions, the craft could be carried on only by those who had served their time. No one over the age of twenty-one years could be apprenticed. To promote permanence of service, it was provided that, in many trades, workers must be hired by the year; and a man from
another parish might not be employed, unless he brought satisfactory testimonials from his last employer. Wages were to be fixed annually for each district by the justices of the peace, and no one might pay more or less than the wages settled on previously by the justices.

The Poor Laws of 1572 inflicted severe penalties on the vagabonds. Vagabonds were defined as including those able-bodied laborers who would not work for "reasonable" wages.

The inclusion of the able-bodied laborers who would not work for reasonable wages throws much light on the purpose of the Statute of Apprenticeship. In 1576 there was an act "for the setting of the poor on works, and for the avoiding of idleness." The relief legislation of 1598 provided further aid for the needy and houses of correction for the vagabonds. The Act of 1601 left the main administration of relief in the hands of parochial authorities appointed annually. It also provided for "setting to work" all children of parents unable to maintain them; also all such persons, married or unmarried, who had no ordinary daily occupation, in order to obtain a living. Under this act, as in previous ones, the justices of the peace were charged with regulating the wages and seeing that able-bodied men were put to work.

Although the charitable legislation of the Sixteenth Century did not result in an overwhelming success, it did leave some fundamental principles, which, though seemingly dormant in the Seventeenth Century, were, in part, reanimated by the Eighteenth
Century. These principles which were passed on to succeeding centuries were the distribution of relief by parishes; the obligation of work for the able-bodied, the prohibition of mendicity; the need of distinguishing between a poor man who merits relief and an unworthy beggar; and the unity or united action of all relief services.

If the legislation of the Sixteenth Century failed, it is not solely because its results were insufficient. Another cause was the awakening of religious zeal which had fallen into a second rate position when legislation was being attempted. That dormant condition took place during the secularization and municipalization of relief. With this awakening there had come a multiplication of charitable and hospitable foundations (hospitalieres). It cannot be doubted that the care of maintaining and propagating the Catholic faith may have contributed a great deal to the renewing of confessional charity. A lasting example of this combining of charitable work and propagation of the faith is that of Vincent de Paul (1576-1660), canonized 16 June 1737 by Pope Clement XII.

Vincent de Paul, a priest of peasant origin, had consecrated his life very early to missionary and charitable works. The Daughters of Charity, founded by him some years prior to 1629, were intended to assist at the charitable conference he instituted at Paris in 1629. He enlisted good, young women for this service of the poor. His charity was not restricted to Paris but reached to
all the provinces desolated by misery. When his resources fell very low, he developed and published a charitable newspaper, "Le Magasin Charitable," which he sold in order to obtain money for his benevolent work in the provinces. In these provinces he established what he called "potages économiques" (economic soups). He, himself, drew up the instructions for the preparation of these "potages."

Mendicancy made great strides forward in the Seventeenth Century because of the economic crises and disorders provoked by the internal and external wars. Public security, thus threatened, called for the intervention of royal authority. Louis XIV was not wholly insensible to these things. His charitable policy was perhaps inspired by that of his predecessors. It tended to assure the services of relief as handled by the parishes, and at the same time, it tended to enforce a police of the beggars. The arret of 9 February 1650 ordered the execution of previous arrets and regulations on the police of the poor, and enjoined all to pay the tax. This was followed, in August 1661, by a declaration against able-bodied beggars who did not attempt to find employment. In his declaration of 13 April 1665, concerning the opening and police of workhouses for beggars (Ateliers de mendicite), Louis XIV spoke of the kindness of the State toward those who desired work but could find none. He said these workhouses were planned primarily for them. As for the able-bodied beggars and vagabonds who wished to remain idle, they would be forced to work. The arret of
16 November 1693 concerned itself with the subsistence of the poor as did the arrets of 3 September and 22 October 1709. On 6 August 1709, another regulation appeared which had as its objectives, first, to aid those who desired to work by opening public workshops (Ateliers publics), and second, to make the punishment more severe for those who were able but would not enter these workshops. The supplementary arrets of November 1709 and January 1710 were for the execution of the former arret of 22 October, 1709. All of these arrets were issued by the king and parliament at a time when misery was most general and most acute. It is probable that the sudden bursts of parochial beneficence had died down and needed to be revived. Such a revival took place following this legislation. The parishes set about drawing up new rolls for the tax which it had previously placed upon its inhabitants. One of the most notable works of this century, and one which saw greater development in the next century was the institution of the general hospitals (hopitaux-generaux) whose scope of charitable endeavor was exceeding-ly broad and very inclusive. But the work of these institutions is not included in this study.

In the early part of the Seventeenth Century, England tried, through the justices of the peace, to employ the poor. In eight towns in Hertfordshire such an experiment was tried for two years. The object was to establish the "new drapery" for the employment of the poor, and the requisite capital was supplied from the poor rates; but this scheme failed. Josiah Child (1630-99),
in chapter II of his "Discourse upon Trade" (1668) gives a scheme for the relief and employment of the poor. Andrew Yarranton (1616-85) issued in 1677 a comprehensive plan to set the poor to work by having the State foster flax-growing and iron works.

Sir Matthew Hale (1609-76) presented a more sober plan in his tract "Touching Provision for the Poor" (first published in 1683). As the only radical cure for mendicancy and poverty, he proposed the establishment of workhouses, for which purpose parishes should be grouped in unions. After their erection by means of poor rates, they were to become self-supporting places of industrial education for children and of employment for the poor especially when other work was scarce. This plan of Sir Matthew Hale was quite significant because it presented an idea that was later developed by the Eighteenth Century in the acts of 1722 and 1732. It seems that none of these plans were tried out to any great extent during the latter part of the Seventeenth Century. The condition of the poor was made worse by the "Settlement Acts" of 1662. Since the poor laws threw upon each parish the responsibility of maintaining its own poor, every parish was anxious not to have too many poor residents 'settled' upon its poor rates. This amounted to a real restriction upon the freedom of movement of poor men who could not find employment in their own parishes. With few exceptions, the unemployment relief of the Seventeenth Century was rather static. This was due, in part, to the age-spirit of "Conformation" which produced a rigid "set-up". This "set-up," like many other
"Conformations" of the Seventeenth Century, dictated the task of the Eighteenth Century. These social overulings of the Eighteenth Century were very notable in France. Yet, these upsettings in the social field were not peculiar to France alone, where their development was far in advance, but also were characteristic of other leading European nations.

The laboring classes in Russia, at this time did not present a great problem. Here serfdom was disturbed, but such disturbance did not result in great reforms benefiting the peasant group. About 1766, Catherine II had completed her "Nakaz" or "Instruction" which she would soon place before the "Great Commission" summoned by her to Moscow for drawing up the new law code which 48 she intended to give Russia. This document represented the tendency of enlightened despotism to use to advantage the philosophy and thought of the time. Most of this document was based on ideas gained from Beccaria and Montesquieu. In this document she had planned to free the serfs; but the uprising of Emelian Pugachev in 1773 caused her to dismiss all thought of reform and as a result 49 they were bound more firmly to the soil. Thus the peasants by their own hand averted an unemployment crisis which inevitably would have followed had serfdom been abolished.

What enlightened despotism desired to do for the peasants in Russia was also the motive for attempted reforms in Prussia and Austria. Frederick the Great of Prussia and Joseph II of Austria were benevolent despots who, like Catherine II of Russia,
wished to improve the condition of their peasants. The work of Frederick the Great was not successful because his officials refused to act against the wishes or interests of their own class. He bettered the condition of the peasants on the royal domains, but not elsewhere. Most of the projects of Joseph II were a continuation, in more developed and radical form, of the policies adopted by his mother, Maria Theresa, either before 1765 or during the co-regency. He issued a decree abolishing serfdom in his Slavic provinces. The position of the peasants in his German provinces was improved by general provisions similar to those adopted for the Slavic provinces. His early death in 1790 prevented the firm establishment of these reforms.

Charles III of Spain endeavored to improve peasant conditions in his dominions. In the north, the peasants were better off than in the plateaus of Castille where the feudal system had not quite passed. He attempted to improve the methods of agriculture by encouraging economic or agricultural associations and establishing model farms. He made strenuous efforts to put an end to begging by sending sturdy beggars into the army and caring for the young and feeble in infirmaries. He also sought to assist the poor by the establishment of state pawnshops.

There were a few significant steps taken in the Italian States. Leopold, ruling in Tuscany, freed industry by destroying the guilds. Charles Emmanuel III of Sardinia issued, 19 December 1771, a great decree abolishing the feudal system in the duchy of
Savoy and appointed a delegation or commission to arrange the compensation which should be given to the lords in place of the services hitherto rendered by the peasants.

The conditions of unemployment relief in Eighteenth Century England were not as primitive as those in Russia nor were they turbulent as those in France. The industrial 'Revolution' and economic "Revampings" in England increased the class of the unemployed. The Elizabethan statute of 1601 sought to provide work for the unemployed but had very little success, judging from the conditions of the poorer classes in the later Seventeenth and earlier Eighteenth Centuries. It had been found necessary in 1722 to organize workhouses in each parish in order to give employment to the poor. The Affiliation Act of 1732 permitted adjoining parishes to erect workhouses jointly for the relief of their poor. The problem of dealing with those who were displaced by the dissolution of an old and settled order was already becoming difficult in the first half of the Eighteenth Century. This problem of unemployment was not very serious because the enclosure movement, although already started, was developing slowly during the earlier part of the century. The tremendous changes in the next era made it a very vexing problem and short-sighted attempts at solution led to disastrous and often cruel results. One of the main causes was that the problem of unemployment and poverty was never treated as a national problem on broad lines; but was dealt with by each parish or group of
parishes and the justices of the peace. In this respect England differed widely from France as we shall see later.

Under the Act of 1782 (Gilbert’s Act). ‘Guardians of the Poor’ were charged with finding work for the unemployed. A practice grew up whereby groups of poor (men, women, and children) were hired out to private employers who paid a very low wage.

The Act of 1796 (Spoenhallland Act) provided that when a laborer’s wage was insufficient to provide adequate sustenance for his family, the justices of the peace should add to it out of the poor rates of the parish in proportion to the number in the family. Thus numbers of laborers were thrown on the poor rates. Employers did not pay a living wage when they knew that it would be supplemented by reason of this Act. Wherever fully applied, the Spenhallland system reduced the laboring class to misery and degradation, robbed them of their self-respect and gravely undermined their physical vitality.

In the general opinion of contemporaries, the enclosure movement, which was developing rapidly in the latter part of the Eighteenth Century, was often a contributing cause of increased suffering and misery. They, no doubt, added enormously to the product of agriculture, but Massie, Arthur Young and Eden all agree that they were too often carried out with utter disregard for the interests of the poor. The enclosure of the common fields lessened the number of farms, and the conversion of arable lands into pasture reduced to a great extent the demand for labor.
"The fields being now in pasturage, the farmers had little occasion for laborers, and the poor being thereby thrown out of employment had of course, to be supported by the parish." Here too, the evil was aggravated by the fate of the ejected farmers who sank into the condition of the laborers and swelled the numbers of the unemployed.

The French phase of the Eighteenth Century's development of unemployment relief is of special importance. The present day problem of the unemployed is similar to that which existed in France during the latter half of the Eighteenth Century. The French attempts at solving their problem of unemployment relief throw light on our present day problem. Their attempted solutions were not precipitous; but represent an evolutionary development. Before discussing their solutions one must trace this development which began early in the century.
CHAPTER II

Of the many dates assigned to the Eighteenth Century, we have accepted those of 1715-1815 because they represent definite changes in the political government of Europe, which also caused changes in the other phases of civilization. The first date represents, for France, the end of the long reign of Louis XIV, and at the same time it signalizes the downfall in Europe, of absolutism, of which Louis XIV was most indicative. The second date represents the collapse of the Napoleonic Empire which had completed the revolutionary cycle. As a result of the peace of Utrecht (1713-14), the map of Europe underwent considerable changes. These changes in boundaries afforded as good a starting point for the century as the change in rulers did. As those boundary changes in 1915 closed the Seventeenth Century and started the Eighteenth Century, so, likewise, the changes effected by the Congress of Vienna in 1815 gave us as significant a date for closing the Eighteenth Century. A brief survey has been given already of the "Controversion" of the Ancient Regime with special reference being made to the social "Controversion." The controls of the social functions during this controversion were the morality norms, the pathological problems, and the utility provisions. The problem of unemployment and its relief is distinctly one of pathological nature. The early Eighteenth Century made its contribution
toward solving this problem.

Throughout this first period (1715-1740) the early attitude is one of charity and benevolence based on piety and paternalism. In this respect, there was no sudden break with the past; no definite change in theory. The old "statism" of the Seventeenth Century still had some survivals in this early period. They were soon to feel the influence of a small group of thinkers, primarily in France, who have been very appropriately called 'the precursory physiocrats.'

The social, economic, and financial condition of France at the beginning of the Eighteenth Century was truly pitiable. The costly foreign wars of Louis XIV and his luxurious extravagance at home drained the national treasury. At his death, in 1715, it was estimated that the national debt was 3,460 million francs. Such conditions served as stimuli to provoke the sincere and constructive criticism of the leaders of economic thought. Prominent among these 'precursory physiocrats' were Boisguillebert, Vauban and Cantillon.

Although Pierre le Pesant de Boisguillebert (1646-1714) belonged to the later Seventeenth Century, his work represented the change that was coming in the economic thought of the early Eighteenth Century. He was a state official in Normandy, and as such, he had an excellent opportunity to see the failings and evils of the old financial system. He was well informed, courageous and outspoken. His notable works were "Detail de la France" (1697)
and "Factum de la France" (1707). In these he exposed without fear, the blunders of the administration, and the misery of the people, and in addition, he showed how the two were connected, one with the other. He had urged upon successive ministers, Pontchartrain, Chamillart, and Desmarets, plans of reform.

These plans included the consolidation and reduction of tolls. He warmly attacked Colbert for having shackled the corn trade. He was convinced that agriculture, the all important business of the country, was being stifled. For this reason he pressed his demands for abolishing the fetters which had been placed upon internal and export trade. For this importunity he was disgraced and exiled to Auvergne.

One would not expect a distinguished general to be ranked among the great economists of his time. On the contrary, Sebastian le Prestre, Seigneur de Vauban (1633-1707) produced a scholarly economic work which gained for him this reputation. In 1707, Marshall Vauban printed anonymously, and for private circulation, "La Dixme Royale." It was an economic treatise far in advance of his time. This work was distinguished both for its accuracy of method and breadth of view. The value of his book to present day historians was not due so much to his plans for financial reform, but to the mass of facts, figures, and observations he made upon the economic condition of France. In "La Dixme Royale" he proposed to substitute for a host of other taxes a general tithe upon all classes of men and upon all kinds of revenue. The anger
of the privileged classes was aroused by the proposal to tax them equally with others. Louis XIV considered "La Dixme Royale" as a social danger and the "Factum de la France" of Boisguillebert as seditious. Both of these books were suppressed by arrets on 14 March 1707. Vauban stigmatised luxury, privilege, public debts and the farming of taxes. He extolled labor, agriculture, and equality before the law. In the same year of the publication of his work, Vauban died, chagrined at the king's severe disfavor and the suppression of his book as a social danger.

After Vauban, the intellect of the nation seemed to lie fallow. Despite this, there was some activity. The Abbe Alary founded the "Club de l'Entresol" in 1724. It met in his rooms in the Place Vendome at Paris, to discuss political economy. Among its outstanding members were Bolingbroke, D'Argenson, and the Abbe de Saint-Pierre. It was closed in 1731 because the minister, Cardinal de Fleury, disliked its debating government affairs. Aside from his "Project of Universal Peace," the Abbe de Saint-Pierre produced during this period some writings of economic importance.

Among the precursory physiocrats one cannot very well overlook Richard Cantillon, an English banker of Irish extraction. His birth date is apparently unknown. He died in 1734. His work entitled "Essai sur la nature de commerce en general" was written during this period; but it was not published until 1755 and therefore did not affect the theory of the time. During the entire first half of the Eighteenth Century the government underwent little
public criticism. No doubt this was the calm before the storm which was to come in the next era.

The economic condition of France at the beginning of the Eighteenth Century was deplorable. Louis XIV drew heavily on the wealth of the country for his foreign campaigns and his extravagant court life. The heavy burden of taxation did not fall on the nobles, but on the common people. This condition was made worse by the farmers-general who collected the taxes. In 1739 d'Argenson wrote in his Journal that a famine had occasioned three insurrections in the provinces at Ruppec, at Caen, and at Chinon. Massillon, Bishop of Clermont-Ferrand wrote to Cardinal de Fleury in 1740 that the people of the rural districts were living in frightful destitution, without beds, without furniture, and without food other than bread and in a number of cases without that. The poor outnumbered those who were able to live without begging. There was no work to be had. The wealthy seemed to be economizing like the poor. This misery was increased by crop failures. In most of the villages, two-thirds of the land was unplanted due to the lack of seed corn. The daily laborers left the villages and took refuge in small towns. These conditions produced numbers of idle men who became beggars. They travelled in bands, pillaged shops and granaries and incited, to a large degree most of the bread riots.

The early attempts at handling the problem of mendicity were not very successful. Some were arrested and sent as galley
slaves to the colony in Mississippi. This practice did not continue long because the transport of galley slaves to Toulon proved to be a heavy expense for the national treasury. The royal government in a declaration of 18 July 1724, announced to the (hopitaux généraux) hospitals-general that it would give them more aid. Having taken this precaution the government ordered 24 July 1724, that the beggars find work within fifteen days after the promulgation of this law. If, at the end of that time they had found no work, they would be forced to enter these hospitals-general, where provision had been made for them. At first, this law was rigidly enforced; but it occasioned frequent errors. Among those who suffered were many journeymen and laborers who were going from province to province and from city to city in search of work, especially during the harvest season. Supplementary instructions recommended to the constabulary to use prudence and not to unjustly arrest as vagabonds men who were forced to be idle by the closing down of their workshops. Conditions had become so bad that Parlement attempted to intervene with legislation. By an arrêt of 30 December 1740, Parlement resorted to the same measures it had used in 1693 and 1709 the commanding of parishes to undertake the responsibility of caring for their poor; and of imposing a tax on each member of the parish for this purpose.

While the government was placing a restraining hand on the beggars, the church and municipal organizations were trying to
better the condition of the honest poor, (pauvres honteux) by giving them aid in their homes (secours a domicile). This outside relief proved better for the time than the hospitals-general.

Traditionally, the faithful, stimulated by the pious obligation of good works for obtaining eternal salvation, had shared their benefits with the poor in their parishes, with whom they were associated by religious ties. This work was carried on by a variety of parish institutions. In the principal parishes of the larger cities it was handled by two separate organizations (one composed of men and the other of women) who distributed aid to their respective groups. Other parishes had a bureau of charity headed by the priest, (who was assisted by benevolent women), by a treasurer and a solicitor of charity. Still other parishes had a Mother-Superior and Sisters of Charity handling the relief work. There were brotherhoods (confreries) devoted to this type of work. These parish organizations distributed food, clothing, and medical remedies to the needy. They were also provided with tools for working. Very seldom was money given. Schools were established for the teaching of the rudiments of reading, writing, calculation, and religion.

The loose organization of these parish institutions was not their chief weakness. Their striking weakness was the narrowly confessional character of their work. This characteristic was applied in selecting the people to be aided. Their relief work in
aiding the poor was subordinated to their devout practices because they felt that the care of the soul was to be preferred to the care of the body. The poor were questioned as to the dogmas and mysteries of the faith. The result was that a great number of needy people were excluded from the benevolence of these parish organizations. Another restriction was the obligation of having a fixed place of abode in the parish before aid was given.

Aside from these parish organizations which were private and strictly confessional, there were public institutions centering around the municipality. These institutions were bureaus of general almonry, often called poor offices (bureaux des pauvres) destined to relieve misery in general. Their origin was partly motivated by the necessity of extinguishing and repressing mendicancy. Relief was not exclusively their objective but they also proposed to deal with the beggars and vagabonds.

The Great Poor Office (le Grand Bureau des Pauvres) at Paris was a typical example of these public organizations for outside relief. Besides gifts, legacies, and food stuffs, its resources depended chiefly on a regular contribution of the inhabitants of the city, designated under the name of poor tax. To be admitted to relief from the Bureaux one must be a sexagenarian; his needy condition must have been investigated by the commissioners; he must be a Catholic; must have resided in Paris at least three years, if not born there; and must be of social position. Preference was shown towards master workmen or persons of an equal
or higher position. The aid rendered by this organization was
in a large measure as faulty as parochial charity had been, in
spite of the public character of the Bureau. The work of
these 'poor offices' had to be supplemented by extra-ordinary
methods. The Parlement of Paris asked inhabitants of the par-
ish to come to its aid by taxing themselves for the benefit of
the poor.

We have found during the first half of the Eighteenth
Century that outside relief functioned through bureaux of charity
and parish societies; the first having an official character and
the second being essentially private and strictly confessional.
The bureaux rendered great service; but in many of the parishes
of the large cities and especially in the rural sections their
work had not been felt. It remained for the next period to reform
this work and to cast off its evils.
CHAPTER III

With the growth of mendicity and migration of hoards of idle laborers to the cities, the paternalistic character of benevolence broke down. The vices that crept into pietistic charity contributed to its collapse. The growing notions of state responsibility brought about a shift in this period (1740-81) in the attitude towards unemployment relief. This was a shifting from charity and benevolence based on piety and paternalism to benificience (bienfaisance) based on philosophy. It resolved itself into a discussion of the labor problem as a social question and the relief of the unfortunate as an obligation of society.

The event which heralded the era of active and original thought in French economic philosophy was the publication in 1755, of the "Essai sur la nature du commerce en general" of Richard Cantillon. He sounded the keynote of the great school of economic thought which was to follow him. He said land was the source or material from which wealth was extracted; but human labor is the form which produces it; and that wealth in itself was none other than the sustenance, conveniences, and comforts of life. After dwelling upon the growth of human societies he passed on to a discussion of labor and showed why an agricultural laborer could not command as high wages as an artisan. He dis-
tungished between the causes which regulated the difference of wages in the various industries.

The French translation of the manuscript work of Cantillon had been in the hands of Mirabeau, the Elder, for many years. After its publication in 1755, he expanded his commentary on it and published it anonymously under the title of "L'Ami des Hommes," Avignon, 1756. This took the public by storm. The identity of the author was soon revealed. It is said that the book went through forty editions and was translated into several languages. The sub-title of the book was "Traite de la Population" or "Treatise on Population." Its central purpose was to show that population was the source of wealth and that the means of sustenance were the measure of population; therefore agriculture should be alleviated. The small cultivator was to be encouraged and held in honor. This doctrine was considered as startling. The next year (1757) Mirabeau had an interview with Quesney and it is said that from this meeting in July, 1757 dated the school of the Physiocrats.

In his "Reflexions sur la formation et la distribution des Richesses" (1766) Turger discussed the advantages of the division of labor and of the preeminence of the agricultural laborer over the artisan. He spoke of the 'natural' right of each man to happiness in his "Discours en Sorbonne." His whole policy, whether as intendant or minister, was inspired with the ambition to relieve the poor and to better the conditions of the peasants.
and the laborers. He said there was no reason for distributing food and money to strong healthy individuals. They should depend on their ability to work. Therefore, to the able-bodied men who were forced to become indigent, work must be supplied. The first duty of public assistance should be a reorganization of works of relief, (travaux de secours). In cases of chomege and crop failures and famines, this should be the best remedy. He declared that the relief and bettering the condition of suffering men was the duty and business of all. All able-bodied men should procure their sustenance by means of their labor.

Diderot and the Encylopedists showed the effects of this change in attitude towards unemployment relief and responsibility for care of the poor. The numerous articles in the "Encyclopedie" were written more or less under this influence.

Dupont de Nemours firmly believed that it was the duty of society to care for the unfortunate. He suggested that those in need be aided by their relatives and friends and that this be supplemented by the state. Above all, Dupont believed in relief through providing work for the unemployed especially in times of chomege. He regarded this theory of providing work as a great step forward and hoped that it would attract as great attention as the scientific progress of that time was doing. He strongly supported the idea of charitable workshops (ateliers de charite).

The growing notion of state responsibility for relieving the poor found another advocate in Condorcet. After the establishing
of the Provincial Assemblies, he published an "Essai" which placed the work of relief as one of the primary concerns of these assemblies. He pleaded for the use of foresight and precaution. The state should, he said, look after the poor. In order to do this he recommended that the state create and supervise a system of savings banks and teach the poor to use them as a means of preventing misery in the future.

In 1776 appeared Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations." To the physiocratic theory of wealth based on land, he added labor. He condemned restrictions upon labor. He said the patrimony of the poor man lay in the strength and dexterity of his hands and to hinder him from employing this strength and dexterity in what manner he thought proper, and without injury to his neighbor, was a plain violation of this most sacred property.

One of the ablest of those in France who believed in the state supplying work as a means of unemployment relief was Necker. According to him, society owed a moral obligation to the wretched and should organize a system of protection and aid. To whom did this belong? Necker answered very clearly that it was the duty of the state. He believed strongly that sovereign and legislative action would aid in alleviating suffering humanity. He considered the government as the depositary and interpreter of social harmony. Therefore, it belonged to the government to harmonize the diverse elements of society and to correct the inequalities which were contrary to this harmony. He said this would be accomplished by a
better distribution of the taxes, by the establishment of public works, and by the dispensation of charities. Moreover, he strengthened this viewpoint by saying that it was very necessary that the government have a sympathetic attitude towards relief because it was a function or duty of the state.

Along with Necker, but of still greater significance, was La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt. This nobleman claimed that among the duties of the state was that of assisting the poor and unfortunate. He said, if the individual demanded aid of society, society could, in turn, demand work of the individual. The great contributions of this philanthropist will be considered under the discussion of the Constituent Assembly. It was there that he did his notable work as chairman of the Committee on Mendicancy, (Comité de Mendicité).

The absolutist 'Statism,' which resulted from the "Regulated Conformity" of the Seventeenth Century was 'controverted' by the Eighteenth Century. The task of the Eighteenth Century was to controvert the "direct"-power economy of the Seventeenth Century and to produce an "indirect"-power economy. The Statism of the previous century was paternalistic and dominated by "regulated conformity." Nothing new was permitted. Improvements were checked. The gilds were rigid in seeing that a certain type of work was done by a certain gild in order to prevent the overlapping of trades.

The "Revampings" of the Eighteenth Century set aside the "direct-power" economy and put in its place the "indirect-power" economy. This industrial overturning was characterized by the use
of steam (vapo-mechanifacture) and the application of chemistry to industry. These changes upset the labor situation. This century replaced "regulated conformity" by released ingenuity, thus producing many new inventions and machines. More men were thrown out of work due to this new machinery and revamped technique which involved a kind of specialized labor. This rapidly added to the increase of the proletariat. The use of factories led to a demand for favored treatment and also to a demand for government intervention.

Significant changes were also being felt as a result of the "Agrarian Avolution." This turning-away from the old Seventeenth Century methods of agriculture owed much to the physiocrats. François Quesnay (1694-1774) had written the articles on "Fermiers" and "Grains" for the Encyclopédie of Diderot. In 1758 appeared Quesnay's most famous work, "Tableau economique." These physiocrats also produced a Journal of Agriculture and many other works, collectively and individually. Other outstanding members were Mirabeau, the Elder, Turgot, Gournay, and Dupont de Nemours. As a result of the activity of the physiocrats and many scientists who were associated with them, new agricultural ideas began to spread. Chemistry was applied to the soil to increase its production. Rotation of crops was introduced. New crops and new breeds of stock were brought in. Scientific and agricultural organizations, both private and governmental aided in this work. The social overturning which followed these economic upsettings increased the labor problem. The
large farms began to disappear and the owners became leaseholders of smaller farms. Those who were not able to become renters of these farms sank into the class of common laborers, thus increasing the number of unemployed.

Added to these conditions was an increase in population and a shift in the centers of population. This was a period of relative peace at home and abroad; therefore, population flourished. With the increase in machinery came the development of the factory system and the development of factory centers. The unemployed farm laborers flocked to these centers hunting work. The shiftless beggars also went there hoping to find the inhabitants very charitable. These increased the city proletariat and frequently led to riots and strikes. Crop failures and industrial crises helped to produce a demand for a reform of the work of unemployment relief.

The regulation and reform of unemployment relief during the second period (1740-1789) embraced the repression of professional mendicity and of vagabondage, the relief of the poor by means of outside relief (secours a domicile) and assistance through providing work (ateliers de charite), the founding of new beneficent organizations, and the prerevolutionary agitation for rationalizing the work of assistance or unemployment relief. For closer treatment, this period has been divided as follows: Period preceding Turgot (1740-1774); Turgot (1774-76); Necker (1776-81); Calonne (1783-87); and initial revolutionary activity and agitation.
The declaration issued against beggars in 1724 had failed. More and more vagabondage developed. A new declaration confirming and renewing the traditional measures had also failed.

In 1767 L'Averdy, controller-general, appointed a commission to draw up a plan of classification of the poor and treatments applicable to each class. After this preliminary work, the commission drew up a declaration relative to vagabondage. The importance of this declaration of 3 August 1764 lay in the attempt it made at distinguishing between vagabonds and unemployed workmen. The idle laborer was given six months in which to secure work. If, after six months he was still without work, he was considered a vagabond unless he produced acceptable witnesses to testify as to his behavior during the six months of delinquency. Having struck a hard blow at vagabondage, the Commission proposed, in July 1765, an edict on mendicity and a regulation on the alms bureaux. Parliament refused to deliberate upon this proposed edict and the Commission proceeded to put their wishes into operation as administrative measures. By an arret of 21 October 1767, the Council ordered the opening up of "Depots de Mendicité." Contemporaries considered the creation of these depots as "la reform des reformes." They were established in each generalite under the supervision of the intendants and their agents. They were workhouses (maisons de travail) offered as a measure of relief, not as chastisement. In them, the poor were able to find an asylum. They soon lost their original purpose when the honest poor were crowded out by the
beggars and vagabonds who were arrested and sent there.

Turgot has been regarded by many as the most representative man of his epoch in dealing with the question of relief. Early in his youth, he was imbued with the notion of aiding his neighbor. While intendant of Limoges (1761-74), Turgot had become quite interested in the problem of relief of the unemployed. He organized "Bureaux de Charite." These institutions distributed food, money and other necessities. Above all, they were to provide employment for the poor. This was to include work for the women as well as for the men. Steps were also taken to repress mendicity. It was here in Limoges that he established himself as a prudent economist and sincere philanthropist. His views regarding relief have already been discussed. We have seen that he firmly believed in giving aid. His motto was: "The relief of suffering humanity...the duty and business of all..." (Le soulagement des hommes qui souffrent...le devoir de tous et l'affaire de tous...). The first duty of public assistance should be to organize works for the unemployed. In periods of chomage and of famines this kind of aid was considered by him to be the best remedy for the resulting misery.

In 1774, Turgot appointed a commission headed by his friend Lomenie de Brienne, to study the measures that had been taken to extinguish mendicancy and to bring in a plan that would attain that end. In the long, but carefully thought out, memorial that he produced in 1775 was a plan for a unified financial administration
of assistance. Lomenie de Brienne pointed out that the best way to aid workmen who had fallen into indigence was to find employment for them.

After his inquiry concerning the establishments of charity (1774), Turgot sent a circular to the intendants concerning the closing of the badly managed and now disgraceful "depots de mendicité." His method was first, to assist, then punish. At the end of the year 1775, after the publication of his instructions on the "bureaux" and "ateliers de charité," the "depots" were finally closed. The "Bureau de Charité" was an official organization distributing, very methodically, aid to the poor whose needs had been ascertained exactly. Little effort was made by them to secure work. Their chief objective was to give "secours a domicile." This relief consisted chiefly of food, clothing, and fuel. What these institutions failed to do in providing work was taken care of by the "ateliers de charité." The duty of these organizations was to furnish work to the indigent. They were to aid a man without resources and at the same time to respect his dignity by giving him a salary. One thing that characterized these "ateliers de charité" was that the work they offered was not prescribed. It was freely accepted as an aid in time of chomage, not as forced work. This idea was not new, but it reached untold success under Turgot. Its success prevented a great number of disorders which usually accompanied a large group of unemployed. It saved them from famine and at times prevented them from falling into mendicancy.
The work which Turgot began was continued by Necker.

When Necker entered the office of controller-general, a great deal of discussion was being given to the subject of mendicancy and unemployment relief. Conferences were being held under the guidance of literary and scientific societies for considering the subject and prizes were given for the best remedies proposed. In 1763 and 1764 the Agricultural Societies of Orleans and of Caen produced literature on the subject. At Orleans, Le Troene, in 1764, presented a Memorial on Vagabonds and Beggars (Memoire sur les vagabonds et sur les mendicants." It received a first prize and was sent by the Agricultural Society of Orleans to the controller-general, who thought so much of it that he sent it to his intendants. A similar conference was held at the Academy of the Immaculate Conception at Rouen in 1779. The most important of these conferences was the one held at Chalons.

In 1777 the Academy of Sciences, Literature, and Arts of Chalons opened a conference on "the means of destroying mendicity in France by rendering the beggars useful to the state without making them miserable. The treatises presented there recommended the centralization of the charitable resources into one large common fund; the creation of new manufactures for employing the idle workmen, and a tax to be levied on laborers, farmers and other prosperous individuals of the parish. Many contemporaries attributed to this conference the activity and agitation concerning the problem of relief during the last years of the Ancient Regime.
As we have already seen, Necker believed the state to be responsible for protecting and succoring the unfortunate. He claimed that the administration would accomplish this by a better distribution of the taxes; by establishing public works for the unemployed; and by the dispensing of charities.

The Ordinance of 27 July 1777 concerning mendicity was in line with, and perhaps an outgrowth of, the letter of Louis XVI written 8 June 1777 to his minister Amelot. He ended his letter by clearly stating the principles for the organization of public aid. "Work for the able bodied, hospitals for the invalids, houses of correction for all who resist the benefits of the law." (Aux valides le travail, aux invalides les hopitaux, et les maisons de force a tous ceux qui resistent aux bienfaits de la loi). This letter is said to have been inspired by La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt, philanthropist and friend of Louis XVI. This ordinance on mendicity ordered the mendicants to return to their original duties or find work within fifteen days. At the end of this time anyone found begging would be arrested, imprisoned and sent to the "ateliers de charite" in Paris.

Montlinot, a contemporary considered this a replica of the ordinance of 1764 because the government was unable to find suitable work in so short a time. There was some talk of opening the "depots de mendicite" which had been closed. In order to meet this criticism Necker developed a "Model" depot, favored the multiplication of the bureaux de charite, founded the "bureaux de filature,"
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and the "Mont-de-Pieta."

This model depot was located in the generalité of Soissons. Here the mendicants were given work. The factory of Saint-Gobain installed there shops for polishing mirrors. These workers, consisting of men, women, and children received wages, which were governed by the number of mirrors broken during the process of polishing. Here, they also opened up weaving shops for the men where apprentices earned as high as eighteen sous a week.

Another practical consequence of the ordinance of 1777 was the circular sent by Necker to the intendants favoring the multiplication of the bureaus of charity in the provinces. This organization besides giving food, clothing and medicines, organized relief by securing employment in the parishes for the idle workers. Of special importance was the bureau of Chateauroux, opened in 1778 and placed under the special protection of Madame Necker as a model for other cities.

The "Bureau de Filature" was a new creation of Necker, instigated by the ideas of Turgot which he exposed in his instructions of 2 May 1775. These spinning shops were installed in many Parisian parishes and other places where there was an overproduction. This work was furnished primarily to women. If the sale of their products left a deficit the government supported it. Besides this assistance for women, Necker opened more "ateliers de charite" for men. At Paris they were given employment in sweeping
and cleaning the streets; while in the rural sections they were put to work on local roads.

To the government of Necker and the administration of Lenoir is due the credit for establishing the "Monts-de-Piete." This type of institution had been considered by some for a long time. They consisted of charitable funds for granting loans on securities, that is pawned articles. These were established in Paris in 1777-78 and proved very beneficial not only in encouraging foresight but in adding to the resources of charity.

With Necker's retirement the office of controller-general was given to Charles-Alexandre de Calonne. He was acquainted with the grave condition of the treasury but won the favor of the court by gifts and pensions. He sought to restore confidence by his lavish expenditures. Confidence was restored and loans were made. In 1785 he floated a loan of 80,000 livres. In 1786, he, through Dupont de Nemours, concluded with William Eden, the famous Commercial Treaty of 1786, generally referred to as the Eden Treaty. A bargain was struck in this treaty. French wines were given the same terms as were granted Portuguese wines by the famous Methuen Treaty. English cutlery and hardware were to be admitted at ten per cent, and cottons at twelve per cent. The same duties were applied to French goods. On the whole, the treaty was more favorable to England than to France.

This treaty became effective in May 1787. In the wine districts it was very popular, but in the manufacturing centers
it was universally denounced. Many manufacturing establishments had to close down. Thousands of men were thrown out of work. The Archbishop of Reims demanded of the Controller-general money to aid 30,000 unemployed in Troyes. The manufacturers at Sedan complained of the introduction of foreign goods and the migration of young workmen to other ports. Here, there were 9,000 idle workmen. The inspector of manufactures at Amiens that with winter approaching there were approximately 46,000 idle workmen. The inspector of Chalons-sur-Marne reported 14,000 unemployed. At Carcassonne there were about 30,000 out of work. Lyons and Paris experienced this chagrin. At Lyons the unemployed numbered about 25,000, while in Paris they were "almost without number." This closing of the manufacturing centers produced untold suffering and appalling misery. On all sides were demands for the abrogation or modification of the Eden treaty.

To deal with this situation, Calonne suggested more taxation. He wanted to resume the projects of Turgot; to levy a new land tax, to inaugurate provincial assemblies, abolish the corvee, and to remove restrictions on the grain trade. These were presented to the Assembly of Notables in February 1787, but were rejected by them. Only the decrees on the grain trade, corvees, and provincial assemblies were registered when presented by Lomenie de Brienne, Calonne's successor.

The turbulent condition of state finances and the wretched condition of the poor made the matter of responsibility for relief
a very urgent one. During the winter of 1788-89 Necker had distributed 1,500,000 francs to the unemployed. The 'depots de mendicité' were reopened and reformed. Hospices were organized in each parish. Many nobles, during this time, devoted themselves to beneficent work. The most notable was the Duke de La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt. He established on his domain at Liancourt an agricultural school, a trades school, a factory for making carding machines, and a factory for spinning cotton. There was a model farm for the use of the farm school. At Bantiguy he founded tile and brick works. The Prince de Crouy founded a factory for the manufacture of silks and muslins. This employed a number of the idle workmen. There were founded during this period new organizations based upon a love of humanity, rather than prompted by religious motives. The chief among these societies were "La Maison Philanthropique," La Societe de Charite Maternelle," and "L'Association de bienfaisance judiciare." These tended to help those who were overlooked by the other relief institutions.

With all that private relief organizations had done, and with all that public legislation and organization had done, the problem of unemployment relief continued to become more acute every day. This led to an enormous amount of agitation for definite government action. This began in the provincial assemblies.

The provincial assemblies proclaimed unanimously that the right of the indigent to aid was a duty to society. The pro-
vinctial assemblies of Soissons and of the Ile-de-France claimed that work was the test or criterion by which one could distinguish between beggars and worthy indigents. They all recommended gratuitous aid and sustenance to the infirm or invalids and aid and sustenance to the able-bodied poor, but in exchange for work. These ideas were recast and strengthened in anticipation of the meeting of the Estates-General.

The Assembly of Notables, called by the kind in 1787 to aid with advice on the taxing of the privileged and the unprivileged, demanded the dismissal of the minister, Calonne, and advised that the question of taxation be referred to the Estates-General. The new minister, de Brienne, dismissed the notables and proceeded to raise further loans and recommend new taxes. Parlement refused to sanction additional loans or to vote new taxes. They said that subsidies could constitutionally be granted only by the representatives of the nation—the Estates-General. This seemed to be the only means of solving the problem. The king, Louis XVI yielded in August 1788. After consulting with the learned men, he issued a summons for elections to be held for the Estates-General which was to meet in May of the following year. The electors were asked to prepare reports on the condition of the locality with which they were familiar, to indicate the abuses, if there were any, and to suggest possible remedies.

These reports and lists of grievances that had been drawn up throughout the nation were noteworthy. In some cases they
adopted models which had been prepared by ambitious politicians, in others they debated fiercely what articles should be included and in still other cases, they recorded simply the views of individual members. These reports or cahiers were not essentially revolutionary. They expressed loyalty to the monarchy and fidelity to the king. They were agreed in demanding a constitution embodying the liberties which Necker had promised in the name of the king. Those of the Third Estate were particularly insistent upon correcting the social inequalities and abuses associated with the Ancient Regime. In their cahiers, as in some of the cahiers of the nobility and of the clergy, the question of unemployment relief was considered.

There were demands which had as their objective the destruction of mendicancy and idleness among the indigent. The provincial assemblies had already made a classification of the indigents which divided the mendicants into professional beggars, vagabonds, and idle workers, (those forced to beg because of lack of employment). This first class of demands advised means of preventing mendicancy and idleness. The second class of requests concerning relief of the unemployed recommended the establishment of houses or places of aid (Maisons de secours), "Ateliers de Charité," and public works (travaux publics). All of these were to be under the supervision of the government. The Cahier of the Nobility of Amiens asked that the Estates-General consider "means of destroying mendicity by a good police system, by charitable funds
and by initiating public works." The Cahier of the Third Estate of Chartres demanded the establishing of public works for the relief of the unemployed indigents. The three orders of the town of Bayonne united in drawing up their cahier. In this cahier, the three orders demanded the setting aside of a fund to be devoted to the creation of works to relieve the idle workers (i.e., ateliers de charite). From the clergy at Troyes came a plea for charitable work for the relief of the mendients.

The third class of demands of the cahiers considered it the duty of each parish and community to look after its poor and its beggars. Others demanded that all beggars be prevented from leaving their parish upon pain of severe punishment. There were still other cahiers that asked that the regular orders be prohibited from begging. There were various other demands including a tax for the benefit of the poor; suppression of the "depots de mendicite." Some proposed suppression of abbeys and appropriating clerical property for the benefit of the poor.

These and many others from which these have been selected, warned the delegates to the Estates-General, and above all, the Third Estate, that this most pressing question of unemployment relief should not be overlooked. As a result of this agitation the Constituent Assembly created a Committee of Mendicity, whose work we shall next consider.
CHAPTER IV

The Ancient Regime with its "insincerities," its "insecurities," its "inefficiencies," and its "inequities," finally succumbed to the criticisms and attacks which had been directed against it. This fall can be summarized in terms of the Great Active and Retro-active French Revolution. This revolutionary cycle started with Enlightened Despotism (ca 1760-1789). Louis XV was aided by such able men as Choiseul and Maupesou. The early years of the reign of Louis XVI saw this enlightenment functioning. His most noteworthy ministers of that period were Turgot (1774-1776) and Necker (1776-1781). The financial schemes of Calonne ended with the calling of the Assembly of Notables in 1787. These men saw through the schemes of Brienne and recommended that the king convokve the Estates-General.

This Enlightened Despotism was dominated by aristocratic tendencies. The Limited Monarchy of the second period covered the years 1789-92. This Limited Monarchy was dominated by "Mesorocr ony" or middle class, Bourgeoisie, tendencies. On 17 June 1789, the Third Estate solemnly declared itself the National Assembly of France. Three days later the deputies of the Third Estate came to their meeting and found the door locked. Led by Mirabeau and Abbe Sieyes, they proceeded to a building which had been used as a tennis court. Here they took an oath as members of the National Assembly
that they would not separate until France had been given a Constitution. This famous "Tennis Court Oath" of 20 June 1789 sounded the death warning of absolutism and ushered in a Limited Monarchy.

During the next month, insurrections broke out all over France. On 14 July a mob of proletariats, bourgeois and peasants stormed the Bastille. To them, this fortress symbolized royalist absolutism. Its destruction, though savage and bloody, was everywhere regarded, in France and abroad, as a triumph of liberty. This day was declared a national holiday, and a new flag, the tricolor, red, white and blue replaced the Bourbon standard of white studded with the fleur-de-lis. This revolutionary act was followed by the "August Days" (4-5 August 1789). After hearing a long report made by a special investigating committee, the members of the Assembly attached the privileges of the upper classes. A frenzy of generosity seized the Assembly. Noble vied with noble, and clergyman with clergyman in renouncing their privileges. Manorial courts were suppressed, serfdom was abolished. Equality of taxation was decreed. Feudal and servile dues were suppressed. These "August Decrees" were consolidated into an impressive decree abolishing the feudal system. The Assembly had accomplished, at least in theory, a notable social revolution. The events of the "October Days" (5-6 October 1789) helped to show to what extent the people were suffering. On 5 October a mob of women, including some men dressed as women,
armed with sticks and clubs, marched from Paris to Versailles and there demanded bread of the king and insisted on his return to Paris which took place on 6 October. The next step of the Assembly was to draw up a Declaration of the Rights of Man. In this document they enunciated a doctrine of natural rights. Man had a right to liberty, property, security and resistance to oppression. This declaration was adopted by the Assembly on 26 August and sanctioned by the king on 5 October. The absolutist monarchy was replaced by a limited monarchy. Many reforms of great significance were enacted. Through these they hoped to establish civil liberty and civil equality, to reform the administrative, financial, religious and economic conditions.

As there were notable changes in these fields, so were there notable changes in the social field. In the middle era, piety and paternalism gave way to philosophy. This final era does not discard philosophy entirely, but adds to it a new impulse, that of humanitarian civism. There were changes in the concepts of the nature of meanings of society, the controls of its functions, and its practices. The "cults" were dominated by two theoretical groups: the Utilitists and the Perfectibilists. The philanthropism of the Utilitists and the theophantropism of the Perfectibilists sought voluntary progressive social regeneration; while Civism demanded "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, that is, civic justice and a chance for happiness for all men. They expected to achieve these immediate and arbitrary social reparations through
civic action. The changing conditions in the constitution of society have already been noted. Class lines continued to give way as the various groups merged. The controls of the functions of society were controverted by the age-spirit. Among the pathological problems so affected was that of unemployment relief. As has been seen, the cahiers practically dictated a program of social reform to the National Constituent Assembly.

During the period preceding the Estates-General the idea of state responsibility for unemployment relief had received the sincere attention of the leaders of political and economic thought. This theory was pressed still further by numerous proposals, petitions and memorials sent to the National Constituent Assembly by individuals and organized groups.

M. Fromont, master of surgery, presented to the National Assembly, on 3 October 1789 a memorial and project for a decree which would provide free medical and surgical aid to the poor in all the provinces. Du Tremblay de Rubelle sent to the National Assembly a "Memorial on the destruction of Mendicity." This petition of 28 November 1789 urged the increase and perfection of the offices for supplying charity and work (bureaux et ateliers de charité). In a letter of 20 January 1790 to the Constituent Assembly, Bailly, mayor of Paris and a leader of the Constituent, spoke of the extreme misery existing in Paris, of honest men who, lacking work, were reduced to begging. The king had opened some workshops for the men. Bailly, himself, proposed to take the
charitable funds at his disposal as mayor and create spinning shops in order to employ the women. In this letter he begged the Assembly to consider very earnestly the condition of the poor. The Assembly was touched by these sentiments of Bailly but took no immediate action.

The great genius back of all the philanthropic work of the Constituent Assembly was Francois-Alexandre-Frederic, Duke of La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt. He was born at Roche-Guyon, 11 January 1747, of illustrious and wealthy parents. During his early years he had spent much time between la Roche-Guyon and Liancourt. He had studied physical sciences in preference to other subjects. He had travelled in England and throughout France. He was well acquainted not only with great statesmen but scientists and economists as well. He was counted among the founders of the Royal Agricultural Society. In 1785 he presented a memorial on the cultivation of the turnip and on the proper care of stock. The year 1786 saw him emerge as a philanthropist. Hygiene, assistance, and instruction of the people were ideas that directed the remainder of his life. About 1780 he founded the first technical school in France. This school was both technical and military, being open to the children of poor soldiers as well as other poor orphans. Instead of indigent and ignorant soldiers La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt wished to produce for the nation, citizens who were schooled and laborious. He further used his property and wealth, as has been seen in farms
and hospitals. His firm belief in assistance through providing work was the guiding spirit of his work as chairman of the Committee of Mendicity of the Constituent Assembly.

France was still suffering from the bad effects of the Eden treaty. Conditions grew worse. The severe winter of 1788-89 brought with it increased suffering. Numerous recent crop failures had led to a scarcity of grain. Mendicity and vagabondage increased. This soon developed into serious outlaws and brigandage. The relief problem became very acute and the memorials and petitions to the National Assembly increased. These finally stirred it to action.

The creation of the Committee of Mendicity was, in a great measure due to the representatives of the Commune of Paris. On 2 December 1789, a deputation from the district of Saint-Etienne-du-Mont demanded that the Commune provoke from the National Assembly a decree on the subject of the poor, workmen, and mendicants.

On 4 December, the Assembly received communication of a work on the necessity and means of employing advantageously all the able-bodied workers. This was the work of Boncerf, a member of the Royal Society of Agriculture, and known for his previous pamphlets on the drainage of marshes. In another memorial, Lambert demanded the formation of a committee charged with "applying in a special manner to the protection and conservation of the non-proprietary class the great principles of justice decreed in the Declaration of the Rights of Man. In the name of religion, of humanity, and of the Father-
land, to encourage useful works, to prevent emigrations and to bring about a union of the charitable foundations, and establish-
ments.

On 18 December 1789, the Commune of Paris sent six depu-
ties to the National Assembly to ask that it consider the peti-
tions of Boncerf and Lambert. Virieu proposed a committee of seven members to examine the documents sent in by Boncerf and Lambert.

Petion de Villeneuve held "that the foundation of this committee would be dangerous, that being deprived of active means for succor-
ing the poor in a useful manner, the Assembly ought not to meddle in projects foreign to it." Gillet de la Jacqueminiere suggest-
ed that the care of the poor be left to the municipalities. In the end the petition of the Commune was sent to the Committee on Agriculture.

There appeared, in the National Spectator of Paris, on 21 December 1789, an anonymous letter from a citizen of the district of the Mathurins. The anonymous author suggested to the mayor of Paris the opening of a subscription for the poor and the appointing of a committee to receive and dispense these subscriptions. This suggestion was followed on 16 January 1790, by another from Boutteville-Dumetz, who proposed to the National Assembly the nomin-
ation of a committee whose duty would be to apply to the indigent class the principles of the Declaration of Rights and to determine the proper means of assuring succor to this class and the establish-
ment of workshops for aid (ateliers de charite). On 21 January
when Bailly’s letter of 20 January was read, Barnave proposed a decree to the effect that the Assembly was not in a position to deliberate in the manner suggested by the letter but would appoint four commissioners to receive whatever gifts the individual members proposed to contribute. La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt moved as an amendment that these four commissioners be required to present views on means of destroying mendicity.

By the end of January 1790, the National Assembly had appointed La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt, Francois-Simonnet de Coulmiers, the Abbe d’Abbecourt, Massieu, Cure of Cergy (Oise), and Frieur, deputy of the Third Estate from Chalons-sur-Marne as the four commissioners provided for in the decree of 21 January. From time to time other members were added until the Committee numbered nineteen with La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt as its president. Some of these had been elected by the Assembly while others had been chosen by the Committee, because of their particular competence, to collaborate with it. Among its members were M. de Montlinot, inspector of the depot of Soissons; Thouret, inspector-general of civil hospitals; M. de la Milliere, intendant of bridges and public highways; the Bishop of Oloron; Lambert; Boncercf; the Bishop of Rodez; Du Tremblay de Rubelles, de Cretot; Bonnefoy, and Lucien David.

This Committee on Mendicity was active from its first session, 2 February 1790, until its last session, 25 September 1791. There were exactly seventy sessions. Its work embraced relief
for the poor in the cities and in the rural districts, succor for foundlings, and for the infirm and sick, employment for the able-bodied, and repression of mendicacy. Later it brought within its scope houses of correction and prisons. Liancourt was its productive genius. He worked very assiduously, drawing up the questionnaires, directing the researches and visits, and writing the scientific and doctrinaire reports.

In order to fulfill such an extensive program the committee was divided into sections and the work was distributed among these sections. The first and second distributions made on 26 April and 2 June 1790 were followed by a third and more workable one on 3 September. This general distribution of work among the members was as follows:

1. Relief of the poor in large cities:
   The Bishop of Rodez, Guillotin, Perisse du Luc, and Thouret.

2. Relief of the poor in the rural sections:
   Guillotin, the Bishop of Rodez, de Virieu, and Thouret.

3. Aid for the foundlings:
   Prieur, Guillotin, and Montlinot.

4. On funds:
   Liancourt, de Tremblay de Rubelles, and Thouret.

5. On employment for the able-bodied:
   Bonnefoy, de Cretot, Perisse de Luc, and Bonceur.

6. Aid for the infirm:
The Bishop of Rodez, Guillotin, and Thouret.

7. On the repression of mendicants:
   Liancourt, Montlinot and Thouret.

8. On transportation:
   Liancourt and Montlinot.

9. On adoption of foundlings:
   Liancourt.

Aside from this general distribution of work each member was charged with the examination of specific projects which he reported to the committee. Here they were discussed before being presented to the Assembly.

Definite relationships were established with the other committees of the National Assembly. In this connection Liancourt very jealously guarded the domain of the Committee's operation and permitted no encroachments. This was clearly seen in his opposition to the Assembly giving part of his work to the newly created Committee on Health (Comité de Sante or Comité de Salubrite). This Committee on Health had taken over the relief of the sick among the poor. He reproached Guillotin, a member of this recently organized committee, for having forgotten the deliberations, in which he took part, of the Committee on Mendicity on this subject. Liancourt, assisted by Malouet, succeeded in having the National Assembly declare that it did not intend by its decree of 12 September to give to the Committee on Health any functions previously attributed to the Committee on Mendicity. Aside from this, these two
Committees worked together very harmoniously.

The proposed legislation for the repression and extinction of mendicity was referred by Liancourt to the Constitutional Committee and the Committee on Jurisprudence. (33) The Committee on Finance was consulted on the subject of the Canal projects and on funds for the relief of the beggars and hospitals as well as other matters involving funds. A decree of the Constituent Assembly commanded the Committees on Agriculture, Domains, Finance, and Mendicity to meet jointly and prepare a report on aid and work to be distributed throughout the departments. (35) The committee on Researches was consulted concerning measures to be taken against mendicity and on the subject of a decree relative to charitable workshops (ateliers de charité). (36) The Ecclesiastical Committee was called in to give its advice on hospitals, on the administration and sale of hospital and national property, and above all, the suppression of fetes. (37) The suggestions and advice of the Committee on Domains and the Committee on Alienation were also solicited by the committee on Mendicity. (38)

The genius of La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt sought to enlist the services of various scientific groups. The Royal Medical Society was consulted with respect to the projects of the Committee on aid for the indigent sick (pauvres malades) in both urban and suburban centers, on establishing surgeons in the rural sections, and on the hospitals of Paris. (39) The Royal Society
of Agriculture collaborated with Liencourt's committee in studying means to combat mendicity. (40)

The Committee of Mendicity did not cease to be in direct communication with the political and administrative authorities. There was a constant exchange of correspondence. Letters were sent to the controller-general, to the ministers of finance, of justice, of public contributions of marine, of war, and of foreign affairs. Besides these, the Committee on Mendicity sent out circulars to the intendants, to the departments, to the districts and to the municipalities. (42)

La Rochefoucauld-Liencourt did not content himself with correspondence alone. He received and heard individual and group deputations who brought to his committee their suggestions and remedies. On May 31, 1790, a deputation from the Agricultural Society presented their views on mendicity. On the same day Bailly, Mayor of Paris, headed a group which presented a project for the construction of a canal that would provide work for hundreds of unemployed. (43) More than thirty of such deputations were received by the Committee.

France attempted to profit by the examples other nations were able to offer in matters of beneficence. Liencourt had previously sojourned in England and was quite impressed with what he saw. The English poor tax and the operation of the poor houses he did not like. He studied the workhouse system in the county
of Suffolk. He corresponded with Dr. Alexander Hunter and Dr. Richard Price who were interested in medicine, agriculture and philanthropy.

The members of the Committee of Mendicity utilized a number of contemporary works of a philanthropic and humanitarian character. These included the pamphlets of Montlinot, du Tremblay de Rubelles, Lambert, Boncoeur, Regnier, Dupre, Volland, the proceedings of the provincial assemblies, and the Annals of Agriculture of Arthur Young, the book of John Howard on prisons and hospitals, and the work of Beccaria on Crimes and Punishments.

The Committee on Mendicity would not be satisfied with the correspondence with administrative officials, nor the receiving of deputations, nor using of specially prepared monograms. They sent out questionnaires and circulars to the intendants and other officials requesting information as to the conditions and maximum number of poor to be aided. They followed these inquiries by visits to the great hospital establishments in Paris and there obtained information at first hand which was later used in their reports.

The wonderful organization of the work of the Committee on Mendicity by Liancourt, its relations with the other committees of the Constituent Assembly, its procedure, and the untiring efforts of its members were summarized in seven monumental reports
with recommendations for remedial legislation. Although there were numerous other reports, these seven stand out as being the most general and comprehensive and are therefore more suitable for our study. (48)

The first of these reports was made by Liancourt to the Constituent Assembly on 12 June 1790. The First Report was an exposition of the general principles which had directed its work. It considered assistance of the poor a social duty, but only in exchange for a payment in work. (49) Assistance ought to be provided for by the Constitution since it was not included in the Declaration of the Rights of Man. (50) Whatever legislation might be enacted should have as its primary aim the destruction of the causes of poverty. In this report Liancourt outlined a plan of the Committee's work. They proposed to submit to the Assembly a series of reports and suggestions as to the best methods for handling the problem of unemployment relief. (51)

The Second Report dealt with the actual status of the legislation of the government relative to hospitals and mendicity. This report contained a historical survey of the administration and royal legislation concerning hospitals in France from their origin up to the time of this report (1790). Similar work was done relative to the legislation on mendicity and on foundlings. Its most important feature from the standpoint
of unemployment relief was its criticism of the way in which the Ancient Regime handled the problems of assistance. The Ancient Regime interested itself in preventing misery rather than relieving suffering. Very little was done by it to support industry. This report further stated that this legislation on assistance was imperfect and dangerous because it was not founded on the common basis of politics and justice. In conclusion, the reporter, La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt, said that the task before the Assembly was difficult without doubt; but the grandeur and beauty of the motive would make the Assembly triumph when it saw that in a useful and equitable assistance of the unfortunate was to be found its most precious duty.

The subject matter and proposed legislation of the Third Report were centered on the constitutional bases of the general system of legislation and administration of relief. It stressed the necessity of collecting all the hospital funds and other funds devoted to charity and poor relief into a common fund placed at the disposal of the national government. It criticized the idea of a municipal poor tax. Provision for relief of the unfortunate was considered an essential feature of the Constitution and as such should be administered like all other national legislation. Liancourt, in the name of the Committee of Mendicity presented a project for a decree which consisted of twenty-nine articles. The first article asserted that the National Assembly
should place in the rank of its most sacred duties the relief of
the poor in all ages and circumstances. This relief, as well as
the expenses to be incurred in the extinction of mendicity,
should be supported by public revenue.

The proposition as stated in Article I of the proposed
decree was further elaborated and presented to the Assembly as
the Fourth Report of this series. The Committee, in this report
recommended relief for the sick, both in the city and rural sec-
tions, aid for foundlings, aid for the aged and infirm, relief
for the able-bodied, and the establishment of savings banks to
teach thrift and caution to the poor. In dealing with the
unemployed, the committee felt that it was impossible for the
government to procure, individually, work for those who lacked
it. At the same time it felt that the government owed this
duty to the group as a whole and could best attain this end by
cautious, provident legislation and encouraging the multiplica-
tion of those means which provide work. It should encourage
agriculture, commerce and industry, but its intervention should
be indirect. The Committee of Mendicity, supported by the
Ecclesiastic Committee and the Committee of Agriculture, strongly
advocated diminishing the number of festival holidays be-
cause they cut down the number of working days and created unnec-
essary expense and idleness. The projected decree requested
that a fund be set aside for work aids (ateliers de secours) which
fund was to be augmented 25% by the departments. The departments, in case of a shortage of work, were to facilitate work by means of temporary advances to industries which were more or less permanent.

The Fifth Report represented the first budget on matters of relief. The remedial legislation recommended an expenditure distributed as follows:

- For care of sick (urban and suburban).....12,000,000 livres.
- For securing employment............. 5,000,000 "
- For repression of mendicity............ 3,000,000 "
- For aged, infirm and foundlings.........27,000,000 "
- For expenses of administration.......... 4,000,000 "

The total expenses as estimated were 51,500,000 livres.

The Committee reduced the sum to fifty millions and asked that this amount be appropriated every two years. This project was not acted on by the Assembly and suffered the fate of the other projected decrees.

The Sixth Report dealt with the repression of mendicity and the creation of houses of correction and other means of dealing with those arrested. In this report, Liancourt recognized the humanitarian work of Beccaria on Crimes and Punishment.

This Sixth Report struck at the causes of mendicity and suggested humanitarian methods of dealing with this class of offenders.
The Seventh Report was a summary report covering the research and recommendations in the preceding six reports. The Assembly failed to act upon these recommendations. After accepting the report of its Constitutional Committee it dissolved itself and left this notable work to the Legislative Assembly.

The failure of the Constituent Assembly to consider favorably the reports and recommendations of its Committee of Mendicity did not mean that this body entirely ignored the subject of relief. Among its first works were the shops created for employing those without work (the "Ateliers de charite"). After reading the report of the researches of the Committee of Mendicity on the situation of the poor and of mendicity in Paris, La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt on 30 May 1790, drew up a decree. He proposed to establish workshops (ateliers) in Paris, independently of those already in operation. These workshops might provide spinning for the women and children and ("travaux de terre") for the men. The able-bodied beggars were to find employment within eight days or be forced to leave the city and return to their original homes. Each department was to be granted a sum of 30,000 livres to be employed in useful works which might be established to relieve the situation. He added that among the means of furnishing work was one which combined all the advantages of giving employment and at the same time insuring employment that
was useful. This project was a canal which would connect the Marne at Meaux to the Seine at Paris and the Seine at l'Oise. Such a canal would prove most useful to the provinces through which it passed. This was suggested as a prompt means of furnishing employment. After a second reading the entire decree was adopted on 30 May 1790.

La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt read to the National Assembly on 31 August 1790, the Fourth Report of the Committee of Mendicity. The proposed decree which accompanied this report was discussed but not adopted. A decree relating to charitable workshops (ateliers de charité) for Paris was adopted on 31 August 1790. This decree presented by Liancourt was opposed by Galissoniere who did not favor making a special provision for Paris. Massieu, cure of Sergy, a member of the Committee on Mendicity, answered him that the needs of Paris were pressing and that the miserable conditions there were the same as those in all the departments. He further added that the motive of the Committee was to further a uniform legislation on relief since such legislation had not as yet been adopted. The project was voted upon and resulted in the adoption of five articles. The workshops for providing employment (ateliers de secours) existing in Paris were to be suppressed and new ones were to be opened immediately in Paris and in the different departments in which
such works should have been judged necessary by their directories. Thus article I of this decree made a definite step toward uniform relief legislation. Article II provided for heavy tasks for the strong and lighter ones for the weak. The stronger men were to be paid by the job while those who were feeble or unaccustomed to such work were to be paid by the day. The wage for such work, whether by job or by day, was always to be lower than current wages for such work and was to be determined by the administrative bodies where these works were opened.

On 4 December 1790, Vernier, in the name of the Committee of Finance, introduced a proposition for according 125,000 livres to the department of Seine-et-Oise. One-fourth of this sum was to be distributed in pure charity to those out of work, and the remaining three-fourths were to be used in support of public works which were to be advanced by the public treasury. Martineau, Barnave and Prieur felt it would be dangerous to make special appropriations for one department. Barnave substituted his proposal in place of that of Vernier. This project as decreed by the Assembly provided that the public treasury would make an advance of 50,000 livres in four equal installments to the department of Seine-et-Oise to be used in ateliers de charité and the construction and repair of the most useful highways. The committees of mendicity, finance, agriculture, commerce, and domains were asked to report continually on the mode of relief that ought to be furnished to each department. It also decreed that in the month of the publication of the decree each department
would be required to indicate what it might be able to do in the way of draining marshes, clearing forests, and road construction as a means of employing the idle workmen.

In accordance with this decree, La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt, representing the committees of mendicity, finance, agriculture, commerce, and domains, presented on 16 December, a project for a decree. This decree, adopted the same day it was presented, received the royal sanction three days later.

Through it, the government provided from the public treasury a sum of 15,000,000 livres to be distributed to the departments for the creation and support of works for relief (travaux de secours). Of this sum 6,640,000 livres were to be divided equally among the eighty-three departments. Thus each department received 80,000 livres. This sum was to be paid in three installments: 40,000 livres on 10 January 1791; 20,000 livres on 10 February 1791; and 20,000 livres on 10 March 1791.

The departmental directories were to decide without delay on the means of opening within their territory works appropriated to the needs of the laborious indigents. Their objective should be to create and undertake works of general utility to both the department and the nation. These were to be started immediately. Information as to the kind of work undertaken, its aim, extent, advantages, and expense were to be sent as soon as possible to the
minister of finances who in turn was to report it to the National Assembly. These works were placed under the direction of the departmental directories through the districts and municipalities, following the order established by the Constitution. If a project spread over more than one municipality, the departmental directory should give exclusive jurisdiction to the directory of the district in which this project lay. This decree made a notable start towards relieving the unemployed by useful labor which benefited both.

In his instructions of 26 December, to the departmental directories on the execution of the decree of 16 December, De Lesseps, minister of the interior, made many recommendations. He emphasized the necessity of a useful choice of works, of wise cautious direction, of severe economy, and, above all, of exactness in keeping the accounts. Among the different works to be undertaken he suggested the clearing of certain lands, the draining of marshes, construction of canals, the replanting of domainal forests and the repair of local roads. Wages, he said, were to be kept lower than the local wages for the same kind of work. He concluded by saying that the king had a great deal of confidence in the wisdom and zeal of the administrative assemblies of the departments and of their exactitude in conforming to these instructions.

From time to time there had been proposals for draining
the marshes on the public lands. M. Heurtault, Vicomte de Lamer-ville, had presented such plans to the Committees of Agriculture and of Commerce on 30 December 1789. There it was decided to send to the Assembly a report and project for a decree on the draining of the marshes. On four occasions, 7 February, 22 April, 1 May, and 24 August 1790, he had presented his project, but each time with little success. On 24 December of the same year he again presented his project in the name of the Committees of Agriculture, commerce, feudality, domains, and mendicity. This project would not only give work to needy laborers, but would recover vast tracts of land and improve the sanitary conditions in the departments. He held that these reclaimed lands would form a basis for great agricultural projects which would be able to employ numbers of workers in times of industrial crises. The Assembly after much discussion adopted his project on 26 December 1790.

The minister of the interior, on 22 May 1791, sent a letter to the Assembly proposing a partial distribution of the 8,360,000 livres remaining after the first distribution of 6,040,000 livres out of the 15,000,000 livres decreed on 16 December 1790. In response to this letter, La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt brought in a project for a decree which was adopted on 16 June, 1791. This decree set aside 2,600,000 livres of the 8,360,000 livres which was left from the original sum of 15,000,000 voted on 16-19 December 1790. This sum was to be used in forwarding the most useful public
works. Twelve departments were to be aided. The amounts to be given and the works for which they were to be used were stated in the decree. These works consisted chiefly of canals, river improvements, construction of dikes, and repairing of quais. An interesting feature of this decree was the division of the workers into two classes, the bachelors and the married men. Preference in employment was to be given the men with families. Provision was made for aiding workmen in returning to their original homes to be employed in the public works there.

The success of the first and second distributions inspired the Assembly to make a third and final distribution of the money remaining from the fifteen millions voted on 16 December 1790. The Committees of Mendicity, of Agriculture, of Commerce, of Finance and of Domains sent to the Constituent Assembly a project for using the remaining 5,760,000 livres for supporting various undertakings for public improvement and providing work for the unemployed. Their reporter, La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt, reviewed the progress of the government unemployment projects and found them very beneficial to both the public and the individual.

This decree of 25 September 1791, provided for the distribution of 5,760,000 livres among seventy-four departments for works of general public utility. Each department to be aided was named in the decree as well as the amount to be given and the purpose for which it was to be used. No departments were to be given funds for such work until they had satisfactorily accounted for
the funds given them in May and December 1790. The minister of the interior was to report on progress of these works every three months. Among the public works enumerated in the decree were the drainage of marshes, the building and repair of dikes and the repair of ports, the clearing of land, the construction of bridges, and the improvement of rivers.

On 27 September 1791, Liancourt made a last attempt to have the Constituent Assembly enact legislation which would make unemployment relief a duty of the state, to be supported by public funds. Perhaps he felt a greater urge to do this since the Constitution which was accepted on 3 September had only mentioned relief work in its fundamental guaranties. Having been associated with this humanitarian work for such a long time he was anxious to see definite legislation concerning it.

This proposed decree, presented by him in the name of the Committee on Mendicity, covered in general the recommendations and decrees that had accompanied its seven great reports. This proposal suggested that the state declare, through the National Assembly, that it would place in the rank of its most sacred duties the assistance of the poor in all ages and circumstances. This national charge, coupled with that of the extinction of mendicity was to be carried on with state funds. Each department was to be supplied with the funds necessary for this work. These funds were to be used in aiding the poor, the aged, the foundlings, the sick
and infirm, the erection of work for the unemployed and in the extin"ction of mendicity. Liancourt proposed to do this at public expense; hence, the decree provided for an appropriation of 50,000,000 livres. This sum was to embrace the revenue which belonged to the hospitals and other charitable foundations. This decree was very long and complicated and brought forth little comment. Mr. Andrieus moved to postpone the discussion. Liancourt in response to this said if the Assembly believed it did not have time to consider this project he would favor postponement. He proposed that the National Assembly, since the immensity of its work would not permit it to deal with the organization of relief work, should leave to the following legislature the honorable care of fulfilling this important duty. This proposal was adopted on 27 September 1791.

On 5 August 1791, the Constituent Assembly took up the discussion of the Constitutional Act as presented by its committee on Constitution. The discussion followed the divisions of the Constitution. The "Declaration of Rights" was placed at the head of the Constitution. Dupont de Nemours suggested an addition to the Declaration of Rights relative to relief owed to the poor and infirm. M. d'Andre, deputy of the nobility of Aix replied saying that as this matter was cared for by the Constitution there would be no need of Amending the "Declaration of Rights". Dupont de Nemours acknowledged having read the constitutional provision but insisted on its being in the Declaration. The Assembly voted to
to support the contention of M. D'Andre.

M. Thouret, deputy of the Third Estate from Rouen and reporter for the Constitutional Committee, read to the Assembly, on 9 August, that section of the Constitution which dealt with the fundamental guaranties of the Constitution. The section dealing with relief read as follows:

"There will be created and organized a general establishment of public aid for the relief of the infirm poor and the able-bodied poor who lack work."

M. Rabaud-Saint-Etienne, deputy of the Third Estate from Nimes, demanded that the article be given more morality and solemnity by the following revision:

"The Nation regards as a debt the relief of the infirm poor and the able-bodied poor lacking work. In consequence thereof there will be created and organized to this effect a general establishment of public relief."

Barere de Vieuzac, deputy of the Third Estate from Bigorre requested that foundlings be included in this revision. He was warmly supported by Garet, the Elder. Dupont de Nemours felt that Barere had sounded a new principle. He referred to Barere as another Saint Vincent-de-Paul. In support of this suggestion, Deu- pont produced his revision of the amendment.

"There will be created and organized a general establishment of public relief to rear the foundlings, to aid the infirm
poor, and to procure work for the able-bodied poor." La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt recommended that they add "and to procure work for the able-bodied poor who would not be able to find it." This, he felt, would not encourage laziness and idleness but would tend to place the men more on their own resources. Thouret drew up the revised amendment which embodied the suggestions of Barere, Dupont de Nemours and La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt. This was voted upon and immediately adopted.

The work of organizing this relief as provided for by the Constitution was not undertaken by the Constituent Assembly as we have seen from its rejection of the projected decree of Liancourt on 27 September. By its decree which postponed the work of organizing relief, it dictated the task to the national Legislative Assembly.

The Constituent Assembly not having time to carry out the constitutional provision respecting the organization of relief work, had left it to the Legislative Assembly. This Assembly, on 1 October 1791, began its great work of organization of the government under the Constitution of 3 September 1791.

The Constitution provided for the creation of a general foundation of Public Assistance for aiding the infirm poor, and foundlings, and for furnishing work to those who were unable to secure it. In accordance with this provision, the Legislative Assembly, on 14 October took under consideration a committee for that purpose. M. Tenon, deputy from Seine-et-Oise, advocated that
the Committees of Mendicity and of Public Health, of the Constituent Assembly be combined for this purpose. This was not well received. M. Broussonnet, deputy from Paris, recommended a Committee of Public Welfare. The Assembly did not accept this but did accept the plan of Garran-de-Coulon, deputy from Paris, for a Committee of Public Aid (Comité de Secours Publics).

On 27 October, the President of the Assembly read a list of the members elected to the Committee of Public Aid. There were twenty-four active members and ten alternates. Among its members were: Tenon, Beauvais, Maignet, Tartanac, Bo, Siblot, Deperet, Desbois, Castellier and Bernard de l'Yonne. M. Tenon, deputy from Seine-et-Oise was elected president; Desbois, Bishop of Amiens and deputy from la Somme, was elected vice-president; while Beauvais, deputy from Paris, and Castellier, deputy from Loiret, were made secretaries. Later six other secretaries were appointed, four of whom had previously served the Committee on Mendicity.

The Committee of Public Aid was at first divided into three sections: public aid, mendicity and health. Four sections were later proposed consisting of hospitals, foundlings, schools of medicine, and unemployed men; but the Commission retained its first plan. They held one hundred six sessions beginning with that on 29 October 1791 and closing with that on 19 September 1792.
Among the first acts of the Committee of Public Aid was the demand it made upon the minister of the interior for the material on mendicity which had been filed with him by Liancourt, president of the Committee on Mendicity of the Constituent Assembly.

Before proceeding with its work the Committee waited to hear the report of the minister of the interior on the state of the country which was given on 1 November 1791. In this report, the minister of the interior, Delessart, reviewed the work of the Constituent Assembly relative to the relief and the support of the hospitals, foundlings, "dépots de mendicité," and funds for employing the able-bodied poor (fond des travaux de secours). He emphasized the fact that these funds which had been appropriated by the Constituent Assembly would soon be exhausted and asked that the Legislative Assembly do its utmost to continue such needful and productive expenditures of public money. After having heard the report, M. Barris suggested that the Committee of Public Aid be requested to bring in a report and project for a decree concerning this matter. Beauvais, a member of the Committee replied that the Committee had such a project under consideration and would report on it early in December.

In accordance with the request of the Legislative Assembly of 23 November, Deperet, deputy from la Haut-Vienne, made a report in the name of the Committee of Public Aid on the relief funds to be given to the departments for aiding the sick and
unemployed. This report, which summarized the relief work of the Constituent Assembly and pointed out the necessity of continuing such work, was followed with a project for a decree. This project provided for an appropriation of fifteen million livres. Of this sum, 5,300,000 livres were to be used in opening up communications (roads) in the departments for employing the workmen in need. Such workmen must present certificates from their municipalities in order to be employed. The remaining sum of 9,700,000 was to be distributed to the depots of mendicity (1,300,000), to the foundlings (2,400,000), and to the hospitals (6,000,000). This project which was presented on 26 December 1791, was ordered printed and discussion on it postponed. On 2 January 1792, this project was again taken up and again it was postponed. In the meantime the Legislative Assembly voted a subsidy of 600,000 livres for the continuation of the canal of Bourgogne which was employing many men.

The proposal of Deperet, which had been sent to the committees, ordinary and extraordinary, of finances, was again reported by him on 6 January, to the Assembly. The Committees on Finances had cut the requested appropriation to 4,100,000 livres. No definite action was taken on it during this session. When it was presented again on 17 January it was adopted. It provided for a distribution of 4,100,000 livres to the various departments. Of this sum 100,000 livres went to the foundling institutions. The
major portion of the amount voted, (2,500,000 livres) was to be used in facilitating the work of unemployment relief throughout the departments. The minister of the interior was to watch carefully over these funds in order to prevent wasteful expenditure and duplication of work. The remaining 1,500,000 livres were devoted to hospital aid. Thus was completed the first step of the Legislative Assembly towards relief under national patronage.

The problem of unemployment relief, as has already been seen, was closely linked with that of mendicity. To wipe out mendicity would be solving, to a great degree, the problem of unemployment. In recognition of this fact, Laureau, deputy from l'Yonne, proposed, on 21 January, a plan for the general destruction of mendicity. He recommended that the government appropriate a sum of 12,000,000 livres every year for a period of five years. Such sums were to be used by the minister of the interior for the execution of all kinds of public works. This, he said would solve the problem of dealing with the able-bodied poor who wanted work. The invalids, aged, and incurables were to be sent to institutions which he proposed to create in each department.

The Assembly failed to deliberate on this project but referred it to the Committee on Public Aid. He was accorded the honors of the Assembly which he refused saying he had only done his duty.

This spirit exhibited by Laureau exerted an influence upon such members of the Committee of Public Aid as Tartanac, Siblot, and Bernard de l'Yonne. Tartanac felt that encouragement
of public works would greatly relieve the situation. The decree, which he presented on 9 March 1792, for creating and supporting public works was not adopted until 4 April. The first article of this decree authorized the minister of the interior to distribute 5,760,000 livres among the departments as provided for by the decree of 9 October 1791. Of the sum of 2,500,000 livres voted on 17 January last, 150,000 livres were to go to Paris to aid the indigent laborers of that department. The remaining 2,350,000 livres were to be divided among the other departments according to the law of 17 January mentioned above.

The distribution of this sum of 2,350,000 livres was made the objective of a decree presented to the Assembly by Siblot on three occasions, 30 May, 28 June and 5 July 1792. He proposed to distribute the money according to the needs of each department rather than make an equal distribution. In order to do this he divided the departments into four classes. The first class consisted of those departments which had suffered great disasters and which were in greatest need. In the second class were to be found those departments which had consumed all the funds given them by the government. The third class embraced those departments which had undertaken works of great utility both locally and nationally which ought to be continued. In the fourth class he placed those departments whose needs were not great. This classification was adopted by the Legislative Assembly on 5 July. It designated
a sum of 1,180,000 livres to be distributed among the thirty-nine
departments in the first class. Those ten departments in the sec-
ond class were given 315,000 livres to be divided among them. The
third class which embraced eight departments was given 480,000
livres. To the fourth class which consisted of twenty-six depart-
ments was given a sum of 375,000 livres. There was to be a propor-
tionate distribution, according to need, in all the classes except
the fourth in which there was to be an equal distribution of 15,000
livres. It was felt that this would aid each department in
dealing with its problem of aiding the worthy poor.

The doctrine of the Legislative Assembly was clearly
sounded by Bernard, deputy from l'Yonne, in a long and diffuse
report read to the Assembly on 15 June 1792. It repeated and
confirmed the doctrines of the Constituent Assembly. This report
took the ground that every man had a right to subsistence; by work
if he were able-bodied; or by gratuitous aid if he were unable to
work. Assistance was considered a national duty. In order to
carry this out the government must provide work for those who were
unable to find it. In support of these ideas he introduced a pro-
ject for a decree. This project provided for an annual appropria-
tion to each of the eighty-three departments to be used for poor
relief. The bases for determining such amounts were to be the
population of the department paying a certain amount of taxes, and
the average price of a day's work in that department. Since the
relief of the poor was a national charge, the property and revenues of the hospitals were to be placed in a common fund. He recommended that each canton establish an agency charged with distribution of work and aid to the unemployed and the infirm residing in that canton and whose names had been placed in the register to be opened for that purpose. These agencies were to be under the supervision of the administrative and executive bodies of the canton. The organization of public aid for all the kingdom was as follows:

(a). Relief works (travaux de secours) for the unemployed in the time of shortage or work of calamities.

(b). Home relief (secours a domicile) for the aged, the infirm, and the sick in urban and suburban centers.

(c). Hospitals in each department.

(d). Foundling institutions in each department.

(e). Relief for unavoidable accidents such as fires and floods.

These relief works (travaux de secours) were to be open every day except Sunday.

In presenting this project, Bernard de l'Yonne hoped to establish a national organization of public aid. Assistance was not to be gratuitous for those who could work. Work, he considered to be the surest means of destroying indigence. If a man was
poor it did not mean that he had nothing, but that he had no work. The nation should seek to better itself by providing work for those who lacked it.

This report and projected decree was again presented on 28 July but did not receive the consideration it merited.

The last act of the Legislative Assembly towards unemployment relief through public works was initiated by M. Gregoire. His project was presented and adopted on 16 September 1792. It placed at the disposal of the minister of the interior a sum of 6,000,000 livres for the support of public works. These works were to consist chiefly of the construction and repair of highways and bridges.

The third great Revolutionary Assembly was ushered in on 21 September 1792, as the Legislative Assembly withdrew. This body, known as the National Convention, controlled the third stage of the "Active" phase of the revolutionary cycle, the "Democratic" Unlimited Republic (1792-95). Until a new Constitution could be framed, the government was administered by the National Convention. Two major parties, the Mountainists and the Girondists struggled to control the Convention and to direct the Revolution. The Convention resorted to a rule of force in order to preserve the nation from the civil strife and revolts within the departments and the foreign invasions of their victorious enemies. This rule was carried out under the direction of the Committee of Public Safety (Comite du Salut Public). Its course was marked by the rise of
the "Terror," its "Reign" and its "Reaction." The Girondin rule (September 1792-June 1793) saw Valmy, the first victory of the Revolutionary government under the 'tricolor.' This was followed by the decree of revolutionary propaganda of 21 September and the decree of 22 September abolishing the monarchy and proclaiming the Republic. The Leaders of this party included Brissot, Vergniaud, Condorcet and Thomas Paine.

The Montagnards held sway from June 1793 to July 1794 under such men as St. Just, Hebert, Carnot, Danton and Robespierre. Their rule, which saw the "Terror" at its height was followed by the Thermidorean Reaction of July 1794-October 1795.

During the course of these years, 1792-95, the French Republic through its military successes had extended its boundaries to the natural frontiers of the Rhine, the Alps, and the Pyrenees. The Convention also sought to promote greater social equality. It abolished all scignorial dues which had been retained, divided confiscated land into smaller tracts and limited prices on food stuffs. These enabled many peasants to purchase small farms. The work of the Convention on assistance resulted in making it national. The impetus back of this was shown by the members of the Convention when discussing the Declaration of Rights and the Constitution which were finally adopted on 9 August 1793.

The Constituent and Legislative Assemblies had paved the way for nationalizing assistance. Although they produced a
large amount of material on the subject, neither of them accomplished the desired end.

In the discussion on the Declaration of Rights, Carnot held that society ought to provide for the needs of those from whom society claimed services. (138)

Daunou, in his "Vues Rapides sur l'organisation de la Republique Francaise" recommended the reopening of public works and supporting them at the expense of the government. This, he thought, would aid in solving the problem of idle workers. (139)

In his "Projet de Constitution Populaire," Poultier, deputy du Nord, developed a plan of relief. The right to existence was a right of all citizens, therefore indigent citizens should receive aid, and that in proportion to his needs and services. He wished to establish in each department a hospice for the aged and for orphans, hospices for the invalids and the sick, and workshops in each section where the poor would be able to find work. (140)

Condorcet, as we have already seen, believed in assistance through providing work. Society, he argued, was obliged to provide for the subsistence of all its members whether it was in procuring work for them or in assuring them other means if they were unable to work. He was supported in this viewpoint by Robespierre and La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt. Robespierre believed in aid, first, by means of work then by gratuitous aid. (141)
After much discussion the Convention finally adopted the Girondin "Declaration of Rights." Article 21 of this document declared "relief" a sacred debt of society. Society, it held, owed subsistence to the unfortunate citizens whether it was in securing work for them or in assuring them the means of existence if they were unable to work. It was in accordance with this principle that the Convention proceeded to organize its Committee of Public Aid.

On 2 October 1792, Gossuin, deputy du Nord, proposed the formation of a Committee of Public Aid (Comité de secours publics) to consist of twenty-four members. The Convention set about to create such a committee. The twenty-four members placed on this committee on 18 October, included Beauvais, Bo, Maignet, Masséna, Vadier, Siblot, and Lacoste. Other members were added on 3 November. The Committee of Public Aid worked under the supervision of the Committee of Public Safety.

During the remainder of the year 1792, this committee fostered many projects for relief of the unfortunate. It succeeded in getting an appropriation of 5,000,000 livres on 8 October. This sum was given to Roland, minister of the interior, to be used in various ways for relieving suffering. These included providing work.

Jean Debry, deputy from Aisne, was interested in procuring work for the able-bodied poor in order to aid in wiping out
mendicity. His plan was to place at the disposal of the minister of the interior a sum of 5,000,000 livres to be used in opening charitable workshops (ateliers de charité) for the benefit of the unemployed. The opening of these "ateliers", or the repair of roads by the departments, he felt, would employ many of the indigent. This project was ordered printed and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Fayau, deputy from the Vendee, presented in the name of the Committees of Public Aid and of Finance, a plan for aiding the unemployed. In his plan, introduced on 6 February 1793, he asked for 3,000,000 livres to be distributed among the eighty-five departments to be used in carrying on public works. Barbarou proposed 8,000,000 instead of 3,000,000. Lesage amended the proposal of Fayau, substituting 6,000,000 in place of the original 3,000,000. The Convention adopted Fayau's plan as amended by Lesage. Public works were to be inaugurated throughout the eighty-five departments. These should be of the most useful sort and should employ as many indigents as possible.

One of the most significant laws enacted by the National Convention relative to unemployment relief was that of 19 March 1793. Jean Baptiste Bo, deputy from the department of Aveyron, read, on 19 March 1793, a report and project for a decree on a general organization of public aid. Previously it had met the approval of the Committee of Public Aid and now the National Convention accepted it as one of its basic laws for the nationalization
of assistance. Much of the doctrine of the National Convention can be found in the preface to this law. It considered that the organization of relief should be founded upon justice and morality. Society owed work to its members. This decree repeated the basic principles stated in article "21" of the Declaration of Rights of 1793. These fundamental principles were: (1) every man had a right to subsistence by means of work if he were able-bodied; if not, by means of gratuitous aid; (2) this duty of providing for the subsistence of the poor was a national charge.

This law of 19 March provided for a sum to be assigned annually to each department to be used in aiding the indigent. The elementary bases for this division of aid throughout the Republic were to be based upon the taxable and non-taxable members, and the average daily wage in each department. These same bases were to be used by the departments when dividing their sums among the districts, and by the districts when dividing their sums among the cantons. There was to be formed in each canton an agency under the supervision of the administrative and executive officers, charged with the distribution of work and aid to the poor, able-bodied or invalid.

The funds for relief, which the Republic was to appropriate, were to be divided in the following manner:

(1) Aid for the able-bodied by means of employment in times of a shortage of work or disaster (travaux de secours
pour les pauvres valides, dans les temps morts au travail ou de calamités).

(2) Outside relief (Secours a domicile).

(3) Asylums for the sick without homes.

(4) Hospices for the homeless, the aged, the infirm and the foundlings.

These "travaux de secours" were to be open every day in the week, Sunday excepted. There were to be maternity asylums and health officers for the poor. A national savings bank was to be organized and the poor were to be taught the benefits of thrift. Since work was to be provided, mendicity was to be dealt with very rigorously. No food or money was to be distributed in public buildings, but this method of relief was to be replaced by voluntary subscriptions to the relief agencies. The enactment of the foregoing legislation was the second great step made by the Convention towards nationalizing assistance. In this project, unemployment relief received direct consideration.

This was further developed by the laws of 26-28 June 1793, and of 12-15 October 1793. The first law which provided for aiding the foundlings, the aged, and the indigent, contained a provision for aiding the unemployed by means of providing work.

The second law, that of 21-24 vendémiaire an II (12-15 October 1793), dealt with the problem of mendicity. Again, the problem of the unemployed has been linked with that of destroying mendicity. The leaders argued that if mendicity were wiped out or
even sufficiently repressed, they would be able to determine who were the true unemployed who earnestly desired to work. This fact alone is responsible for many petitions and projects for healing society of this ill. On 24 February 1793 the Young Republican Club of Besancon presented a project which was sent to the Committee (152) on Public Aid, for consideration.

The Committee worked at great length on a project which would attain the desired results. This report and project it sent to the Convention by Jean Baptiste Bo in 21 vendemaire an II (12 October 1793). The report divided the mendicants into three classes. In the first class were those mendicants who begged during certain seasons of the year, especially when work was scarce and many factories were closed. These mendicants did not leave their cantons and did not disturb public order. The second and third classes included those mendicants who would not work and those habitual and lawless vagabonds who disturbed public peace. These last classes were to be dealt with very severely, while the first class was to receive ample consideration. In the definitive decree, adopted on 27 vendemaire an II (15 October 1793), houses of repression were to be established for those who would not work and for the lawless vagabonds; while relief works (travaux de secours) were to be created for those who wished to be employed. Each municipality was to make a study of their unemployment problem. This study was to contain the name, sex, and age of the unemployed person, his type
of work, the periods when such work was lacking, and useful
means of replacing it. The municipalities were to send these re-
ports to the relief agency in their canton. There the cantons
were to make such observations and recommendations as they might
think necessary and then send these to the districts. The direct-
ory of the district was to add its advice and sent it to the direct-
ory of the department who would present it to the administrative
council. The administrative council was to send a duplicate of
this information, together with a request for the necessary funds
to the executive council. This executive council was to present
this information and request for sums to the legislative body which
was to take definite action on the matter. The Committees of Agri-
culture and of Commerce were asked to suggest what public works
might be undertaken which would bring prosperity to agriculture and
commerce, as well as general public welfare. The price to be paid
for labor in the "travaux de secours" was to be three-fourths of
the average price paid in the cantons.

In conformity with the law of 19 March 1793, all distribu-
tion of food and money was to cease in the cantons with the open-
ing of these relief works. Any person caught giving such aid to beg-
gars was to be fined the price of two days' work. If caught a sec-
ond time the fine was to be doubled and such fines were to be paid
to the fund which took care of the outside relief work. France
was thus given one of the best plans of the period which did much
to solve the problem of unemployment as well as that of mendicity.

Since a great deal of money had been appropriated from
time to time for public works some leaders felt that the Convention might do something that would insure the proper handling of these sums and at the same time make them productive of the most good.

To crystallize these notions, Barere de Vieuzac, deputy from Bigorre, on 21 ventose an II (11 March 1794) read to the National Convention a long report on public works and what had been done to encourage them. He emphasized the fact that the Constituent and the Legislative Assemblies had tried to wipe out mendicity. He recommended the creation of a Commission of Public Works to centralize the control and financing of such works. This system of public works, he said, would solve the problem of mendicity. Repression and severe penal codes were to be laid aside and work was to be given to the masses of the unemployed. He said individual work should be associated with national prosperity. His project for a Commission of Public Works (Commission des travaux publics) was adopted the same day it was presented, 21 ventose an II (11 March 1794). The law which established the Commission of Public Works also provided for a Central School of Public Works. This was established by the law enacted on 7 vendémiaire an III (28 September 1794).

The "Livre de Bienfaisance Nationale" created by the law of 22 floreal an II (11 May 1794) further nationalized assistance but did very little for direct relief of the unemployed through means of work. The work of assistance after 9 thermidor an II (25 July 1794) was administered by the National Aid Commission
(Commission nationale de secours) which worked in conjunction with the Committee of Public Aid. This National Commission created on 12 germinal an II (1 April 1794) received by a law of 26 thermidor an II (13 August 1794) a sum of 20,000,000 livres to be used in support of the various charitable establishments under its supervision. Among these establishments were the "travaux de secours."

The National Convention attempted to go forward with the work of assistance begun by the Committee of Public Aid of the Legislative Assembly. In its program which resulted in the nationalization of assistance, the problem of the unemployed received much attention. Assistance ceased to be a duty of the rich and became an obligation of society. In fulfilling this obligation, society recognized the right of every man to subsistence. This involved the right of every man to labor. In recognizing the right of every man to labor, the Convention did its utmost by encouraging plans which provided work for the unemployed. These attempts suggested others to the legislative body which soon replaced the National Convention.
CHAPTER V

The later Eighteenth Century saw the first stage of the "Reactive Revolution." It began with the Directory, an "Oligarchic, Limited Republic" (1795-99). The Constitution of the Year III (1795) provided for a bicameral legislature and an executive body of five directors chosen by the legislature. These directors raised armies and carried the war into the enemy's territories. It was not as successful in dealing with internal affairs. By the "coup d'etat" of 18-19 brumaire (9-10 November 1799) the Directory was overthrown by Napoleon. The government was placed in the hands of three consuls and two legislative bodies. Under the new Constitution the three consuls were to be appointed for a term of ten years. Napoleon, who was appointed first consul, made the other two merely his advisers. He proceeded to organize the government thoroughly. He enacted many wise and far reaching measures. In recognition of his skill in subduing the enemies of France, and pacifying Europe, he was elected consul for life (1802). The final stage in the French Revolution was reached when the Senate conferred upon Napoleon in May 1804, the title of emperor. Between 1804 and 1807-8 the French Empire rose, reached its height in 1810, and declined from 1811 to 1814. The Coalition Wars, begun in 1792, culminated in the "War of Liberation" (1813-1814/15). Thus the French Revolution completed its reactionary cycle.

(1)
The numerous changes experienced in the international, political, cultural, economic, and religious fields were also felt in the social field. Financial conditions had grown worse. Unsettled conditions caused manufacturers to reduce or stop production. This threw many men out of work. The unemployment problem again became very acute.

The Directory made an appeal to the managers of theaters and playhouses to give a charity performance monthly for the benefit of the poor. The minister of the interior, Benezech, sent a circular to these managers explaining the motive of this request and assuring them of his cooperation in distributing such a gift. In his circular to the departments Benezech called their attention to the need of providing work for the able-bodied poor. He recommended indemnities to be given to agriculture and encouragement of the arts hoping thereby to stimulate employment.

By a law of 7 frimaire an V (27 November 1796) the executive Directory placed a tax on all play houses and theaters and places of amusement. The profits from such a tax were to be used in aiding the indigent in accordance with the law of 19 March 1793.

Much of the work of assistance under the Directory was private in nature. Much aid was distributed individually. It lacked internal organization, hence it was not able to carry on as strong a program of relief as was carried on by the Convention.

The Napoleonic regime which embraced the Consulate (1799-1804) and the Empire (1804-1814/15) saw a better organization of
internal administration.

On 8 frimaire an VIII (29 November 1799) La Place, minister of the interior, made a report on the condition of the country and called attention to the numbers of men who were out of work in the face of an approaching hard winter. As a result of this the Consulate adopted a decree, on 18 nivose an VIII (8 January 1800), relative to the unemployed. This provided that the minister of the interior was to employ during the months of pluviose and ventose (February and March) 30,000 men on the public works. At the end of each week 72,000 francs were to be set aside to care for this. (7) Work was immediately given to the unemployed. On 8 floreal an VIII (28 April 1800) this work was extended for another month. (8)

Fouche, minister of police felt that such aid rendered to the unemployed was worthy of continuation. He advocated that the city of Paris employ 800 workers daily. Because of his agitation the Consulate adopted on 27 nivose an X (17 January 1802) an arrêt embodying this principle. Besides providing for the employment of 800 workmen, it appropriated 3,000 francs each month to be used for this purpose. (9)

Napoleon undertook a system of public works which not only added to the beauty of Paris but also gave employment to many of the idle workers there. In 1803 he wrote to his minister of the interior that work should be opened up in Paris because of the approaching rigorous winter. (10)

In 1800, ten general councils had demanded the opening of
"ateliers de charité" and "dépots de mendicité." These demands were followed by those of twenty-six general councils in 1801. This agitation for relief resulted in the decree of 5 July 1808. The Emperor felt that before repressing mendicity, provision should be made replacing it with work. This decree which, by means of severe repressive measures, struck a hard blow at mendicity, also provided for the establishing of charitable workshops and depots of mendicity.

During the stagnation of commerce Napoleon opened "bureaux de bienfaisance," These administered in many ways to the needs of the poor. He was interested in the freedom of labor and opposed the organization of groups of laborers.

With the commercial crisis of 1811-12 came the closing of many of the ateliers supported by him. It has been estimated that there were nearly 100,000 idle workmen in Paris alone. Thence, the discontent was very great. Many placards bearing statements against the Emperor were posted on the city walls. Shops were raided. There were cries demanding work or bread. These futile attempts at rioting were speedily suppressed. To meet these demands workhouses were instituted. To these workhouses, and the "bureaux de bienfaisance" which had been established previously, were added new "dépots de mendicité." These efforts during the Napoleonic regime succeeded in freeing labor and in providing temporary relief for those who were thrown out of work during this crisis which led to its final dissolution.
SUMMATIONS

This study has tended to show the relationship existing between the Social problems of the Eighteenth Century and the other problems of the Eighteenth Century and the other problems of political, international, cultural, religious, and economic controversies. It has been a review of the Eighteenth Century's attempts at solving its social problems, and more particularly its treatment of the problem of unemployment.

In tracing the development of unemployment relief in the Eighteenth Century it was found that the attempts at solving the problem were not precipitate in their development, but evolutionary.

Relief work, like most humanitarian efforts, was found to be motivated by Christianity. The Middle Ages saw charity as one of the dominant factors in the propagation of the Faith. The giving of alms, the hospitalization and care of the sick, the establishing of foundling institutions were significant examples of Christian piety and charity.

With the Renaissance came the interest of the laity in the work of relief. There we found a significant rise of capitalism. This rise of capitalism and increase in commerce broke up the manorial regime and altered the guilds. This breaking down of labor barriers increased the group of unemployed.

The "Re-formation" of relief work in the Sixteenth Century brought new methods and organizations to the front. The secu-
larization of relief work in France, the Elizabethan legislation in England, and the work of Lewis Vives in the Netherlands were notable examples of the changes wrought by the Reformation.

The Seventeenth Century with its "Conformations" proved to be rather static. In relief, no new developments of great significance were to be found. All seemed to be waiting for a change. This change eventually came with the Eighteenth Century.

With the passing of absolutism and the coming in of enlightened despotism we saw the work of relief take on a new attitude. The Industrial "evolution" contributed to this change in attitude. The Eighteenth Century saw a great development in industry. "Indirect-power" economy replaced "direct-power" economy. Many new industries developed. Individual ingenuity was released and labor restrictions were moved. In some cases it made possible the employment of more men while in other cases the use of machinery threw many out of work. Except for Russia, the economic and social controversies tended to complicate the labor problem. The attempts to free the peasants in Prussia, Austria, Spain, and the Italian states were, to some extent, successful. The enclosure movement in England and the development of small farms threw numbers of men out of work thereby flooding the labor market. They attempted to solve that problem by means of workhouses and poor laws.

The unemployment situation in France was equally as complex. The spirit of "charity and benevolence" of previous times still carried on. New theories were being formulated by the early
physicocrats, Boisguillebert, Vauban and Cantillon. This early period of the Eighteenth Century (1715-1740) saw the royal government, the church and the municipalities dealing with relief and its allied problem, the extinction of mendicancy. The parish organizations, which were narrow and almost strictly confessional, were superseded by municipal organizations which were much broader. Not only were food, fuel, clothing and shelter given, but work as well. Most of the large cities had a Poor Office which provided these things.

The Middle Period (1740-89) saw the beginnings of controversy and the rise of many practical humanitarian efforts for social betterment. The motif of "piety and paternalism" of the earlier period gave way to that of "philosophy." New political, social and economic theories were advanced. In the latter part of the period appeared the great works of Rousseau, Voltaire, Montesquieu, Diderot, Adam Smith, Turgot, Quesnay and others. There was a cry for social justice. Men began to define society and its obligations. They were not deaf to the clamor of the unemployed. Turgot removed labor restrictions by suppressing the guilds. Dupont de Nemours and Condorcet spoke of the freedom of labor and the right of every man to work. Great conferences were held on the problems of mendicity and the unemployed. The situation was further complicated by the Eden treaty of 1786. As a result of this treaty many French factories and industries were ruined. Thousands were thrown upon the labor market which was
already flooded. The agitation for relief, begun by individuals and provincial assemblies, and crystallized in the demands of the cahiers, culminated in the appointment of a Committee on Mendicity by the Constituent Assembly.

The late period of the Eighteenth Century (1789-1815) was an era of "philanthropy." Philosophy was not entirely disregarded. To it was added humanitarian civicism. Here the practical humanitarianism which started in the previous period was continued with a new zeal. The Committee of Mendicity of the Constituent Assembly was created to study the problems of mendicity, its causes and extinction, and relief work in general. Their investigations, reports, and recommendations were taken as a basis for subsequent legislation. La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt, president of the Committee of Mendicity was an ardent advocate and supporter of assistance through providing employment for the unemployed. He sounded the doctrine of state responsibility for practical relief which was later incorporated in the Constitution of 1791. The work of nationalizing assistance, begun by the National Constituent Assembly and continued by the Legislative Assembly, was achieved by the National Convention through its enactments of 19 March, 28 June 1793 and 15 October 1793, and of 11 May 1794. Unemployment relief was aided by the creation of a Commission of Public Works.

The chief remedy, among the many that were suggested and tried, was a program of public works covering the draining of marshes, the filling of ditches, the clearing of wastelands, the re-
planting of forests, the building of bridges, the improvement of waterways, and the construction and repair of local and national roads. Next to these, in importance, was the suggestion of government encouragement to industries. These efforts made by the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies and by the Convention were continued under the Directory. The Napoleonic period, embracing the Consulate and Empire, made its contributions towards solving this problem. Under his guidance a program of public work was inaugurated. New public buildings were put up while others were repaired. In the work of renovating and beautifying Paris, Napoleon was able to aid many of the unemployed.

Although most of the French attempts at solution did not prove feasible, nevertheless, they were a definite expression of a widespread belief in the responsibility of society and of the state for unemployment relief.

Thus, through the Social Controversies of the Eighteenth Century and through the great French Revolution, France has made a significant contribution to European and, eventually, to world civilization in solving this problem of society.

These attempts at solving one of the great pathological problems of Eighteenth Century France were very significant because of the light they throw upon our present day problem. Our current crisis with its unemployment problem is very similar to the industrial crisis of the latter half of the Eighteenth Century.
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