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INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION

One of the most important problems of social pathology is that of unemployment. A study of the attitude of the state towards the question of responsibility in counteracting unemployment is an interesting one from many angles. This problem has present as well as future pertinence. It is of primary importance now because of similar current problems in England, France, Spain, Germany, Italy, and more immediately in the United States. Not only is it of paramount consideration for the present, but it may throw some light on the techniques which may be used in dealing with the problems of unemployment and readjustment which have followed the recent global war. There is too common a tendency, particularly today, to assume that this is a new problem and one which calls for a new deal. This is a dangerous assumption since it fails to look at the problem, as a whole, historically, and, in addition, it misses all of the valuable lessons taught by past experience. Therefore, the subject needs to be viewed in its historical perspective in order to offset the ordinary notion that our present problem is relatively unique. It is not so relatively new, as we shall see, but has existed from remotest times. We need only to note the words of Christ to His disciples: "For ye have the poor with you always
and whenever ye will ye may do them good." (St. Mark XIV, 7.) We can get this historical perspective by using the chronologica-continuity approach or the historical-unity approach. The chronological approach clearly shows us that the problem has been a continuous one in the history of civilization. By using the historical-unity approach, we can readily see the problem in its relation to the other problems of the special period. By placing the topic in its historical perspective, we shall discover that some of the practices followed in attempted solutions, notably in the Eighteenth Century, are not so unlike those that have been or are now being tried today. The Eighteenth Century is mentioned, moreover, not merely because of its many analogies with the present but because it represents a turning point in the history of the unemployment problem. Therefore, while our study is not limited to the Eighteenth Century, its concentration will be on the late Eighteenth Century in France. France was the leading nation in the Eighteenth Century. Here were found the stresses and strains especially serious and on a big enough scale to merit investigation and consideration. It was a large enough country to be pertinent today. The Germanies of the Eighteenth Century were too small and lacked a strong centralized government. The same was true of the Italies. The English problem has been considered
by some writers. For us, therefore, the French problem is more significant, partly because it is not so well done and partly because of its pertinence.

To start out, it is necessary to define the Eighteenth Century. Of the many dates assigned to the Eighteenth Century, we shall use those of 1715-1815 because they represent definite changes in the political structure 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 coming 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 a revolutionary cycle. As a result of the Peace of Utrecht (1713-1714), the map of Europe underwent considerable changes. These changes in boundaries afforded as good a starting point for the century as did the changes in rulers. As such boundary changes in 1715 closed the Seventeenth Century, so the changes effected by the Treaties of Paris and the Congress of Vienna in 1815 gave us as significant a date for closing the Eighteenth Century.

Many historians, through their inadequate and sometimes scrappy treatment of the social history of the Eighteenth Century, have left a distorted notion of the
true accomplishments of the century along this line. The proper evaluation of this social problem requires that the century be viewed as a whole. For many years the century has been called repeatedly 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 century of "Controversions" or overturnings. The task of the Eighteenth Century was the controversy of the Ancient Regime. Soonest to be affected was the thought of the century. The "Obscurantism of Academism," coming from the Seventeenth Century, was "Enlightened" by the controversies in the cultural field. The "overturnings" in the religious thought and action of the Eighteenth Century produced an "Awakening" from the stupor of forced uniformity. In the social field, the conventional class inequities, which were established by the conformations of the Seventeenth Century, experienced an "upsetting" to bring "mass equality." In the economic aspect of this century, the old "statism" of the Seventeenth Century was controverted by "revamping" it on indirect power lines. The political controversies resulted in the "dooming" of despotism by popularism. Begun at first by enlightened despotism, it shifted into gradual regenerations and culminated in the radical active and retroactive French Revolution. In the international field, the
controversy was the "breaking" of the direful competitive Power-Balance.

After this general perspective survey of the century, one must take a closer look at the social trends of the century. The social controversies 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 in which the stimulus was philosophy; while the final era was an era of philanthropy. In this upsetting, the controls of its functions were social morality norms, social pathology problems (hygiene and health, poverty, mendicancy, relief, care of defectives, criminality, etc.) and social utility provisions.¹

There are two ways of looking at the social organization of the early Eighteenth Century. We may look at it as a medieval survival embracing the three estates (clergy, chivalry, and communality). On the other hand, the social organization may be viewed as one composed of modern classes (upper, middle, and lower). These two views of the early Eighteenth Century social organization reveal a peculiar mix-up with many complications and inconsistencies. The spirit characterizing this social set-up was generally one of Seventeenth Century stereotyped conformations. This
spirit of conventionism was marked by court-fixed etiquette, class inequities, and discriminations.

The social unsettling of the central era exhibited a merging of these two viewpoints. Class lines were giving way. New aristocracies, especially in Great Britain and France, were coming to the forefront. 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 end of the survivals of serfdom in France (1779), Spain and the Hapsburg realms (1781-1782), and in Sardinia and Denmark. But Russia, in particular, stood out against this tendency towards liberalization. Here we found an aggravation of serfdom in favor of the nobles. The motivating forces back of these un unsettlings were the liberalizing effects of the "Aufklaerung" or cultural "Enlightenment," the religious "Awakening," new economic ideas, and the progress of American events. The economic evolution 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 a social up-set. This final era is marked by social strata leveling. This first significant step was the French revolutionary acts
(1789-1799) which were, for the most part, in the nature of equalizing laws and fiscal relief for the poor. To these can be added the spread of equalitarianism by the French expeditionary forces returning from America. The Napoleonic regime and its newly created nobility exerted a social influence upon France in particular, and Europe in general. The rise of popularism, particularly in the post-Revolutionary period, made its social appeal which culminated in the Second Republic (1848-1851) with its program of "national workshops." This spirit of popularism was emerging in "civism," marked by democratic nationalistic tendencies (i.e. "careers open to talents") and "Humanitarian and Utilitarian" social betterment efforts.3

This overview of the century's social trends as a whole affords a sort of interpretative basis for the special phase, "The Development of State Responsibility in Counter-acting Unemployment," which is our primary concern. To appreciate fully the work accomplished in the handling of this problem in social pathology, 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 rule 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 "hospitalers" for the care of the sick and infirm. The monasteries distributed alms at their gates. The generosities 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.

There was, during the early Middle Ages, a system of natural economy. With the development of the gilds and commerce came a system of money economy. It did not become a dominant factor until the late Fourteenth and early Fifteenth Centuries. This growth of capitalism led to a break-up of the manorial system and altered the guilds. Such conditions tended to complicate the unemployment
problem. There arose the industrial entrepreneurs and adventuring merchants. Yeoman farmers began to rise in importance. The beginning of enclosures and the development of "sheep walks" threw many men out of employment. The Renaissance or "The Great Renewing" (as Preserved Smith will call it) came as a period of transition. The three dominant forces of humanism, capitalism, and nationalism were becoming more manifest. This renewal brought new ideas with respect to the nation, to literature, to art, science, religion, and to the individual. It was a period of ease and luxury for those we hear most about, but hand in hand with the splendor of the Renaissance went the wretched condition of the many poor. There was a rise in prices due to new imports and new foodstuffs; but wages remained about the same.6

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 "Re-formation" 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 a "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 Piper of
Niklashausen (1476), the Bundschuh outbreaks (1513-1515), the German Peasants' War (1524) and many other similar uprisings.\textsuperscript{8}

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. There was cultural agitation for this changed social responsibility. Many writings of a distinctly social trend are to be found in this century. The first to attract attention was the \textit{Utopia} of Sir Thomas More, which appeared in 1516.\textsuperscript{9} This brought the people face to face with the social problem. Juan luis Vives (Lewis Vives) next appeared with his \textit{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.\textsuperscript{10} Other social writings, although not quite as great as these, were \textit{The Book of the Vagabonds} (1510) by Matthew Hutlin, \textit{A Plea for the Right of the Poor to Beg} (ca 1530) by Christian Cellarius, a professor at Louvain, and \textit{Sacred Economy of Caring for the Poor} (ca 1564) by the Spanish monk, Lawrence Villavicenzo.\textsuperscript{11}

The municipalization of relief was started very early in the Sixteenth 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.12

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.13

The distinctive characteristics of 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 mendicancy and alms-giving; (5) obligation of work for the adults; (6) revision of foundations and rational division of the resources for aiding the worthy poor; (7) the establishment of a tax for the benefit of the poor. 14

The French relief work during this period was increasingly secularized. 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, February, 1566, ordered that the poor be given shelter and food only in their native villages or cities. 15 These royal ordinances were aimed principally at Paris because of the very large numbers of idle men who left the smaller towns and went to the capital city seeking food, shelter, and work. 16 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, we may conclude that the cause of mendicancy and idleness was voluntary or involuntary work-stoppage (chomage), 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.17

There were interesting attempts in 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.18

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 Generale) 1555; a similar one at Troyes (reorganized 1565 and 1585); at Rouen, Bureau for the Able-bodied Poor (Bureau des Pauvres Valides); at Chalons-sur-Marne, 1564; at Amiens and Abbeville, 1565; at Beauvais, 1573, and at numerous other places.19 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 selected by municipal organizations. The tax for the benefit of the poor was a parish device, a kind of obligation placed upon the members of a community for the express purpose of regulating alms-giving. The principle of the tax was a regulated and administrative form of alms-giving.20
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 civic duty or as the concern of the government. There followed 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.21 Thus, a statute of Henry VIII ordered "that every person occupying land for tillage shall, for every sixty acres under plough, sow one quarter of an acre in flax or hemp."22 The object of this act was undoubtedly to create employment in the textile manufactures, 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 had received 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.23

The reign of Queen Elizabeth (1558-1603) was full of social and economic legislation. Here, as before, the problem of unemployment was tied up with the
administration of poor relief. The first Elizabethan social legislation of significance was the "Statute of Laborers and Apprentices" (1562-1563). This statute was proposed in the hope that the new law would banish idleness, encourage husbandry, and yield a suitable wage to the hired person, both in time of scarcity and of plenty. 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.24

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.25 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 worke, and for the avoyding 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 persons, married or unmarried, who had no ordinary daily occupation for obtaining 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, re-animated 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 mendicancy, the need of distinguishing between a poor man meritig relief and an unworthy beggar, and the united action of all relief services.
If the legislation of the Sixteenth Century failed, it was not solely because its results were insufficient. Another cause was the re-awakening of religious zeal which had fallen from its place of first consideration when social legislation was being attempted during the secularization and municipalization of relief. With this re-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 was that of Vincent de Paul (1576-1660), canonized 16 June, 1737, by Pope Clement XII.

St. Vincent de Paul, a country 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 by him to assist at the charitable conference he instituted at Paris in 1629. He enlisted good, young women for this service to 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 charity newspaper, "Le Magasin Charitable," which he sold in order to obtain money for his benevolent work. In the
provinces he established what he called "potages économiques" (economical stews). He, himself, drew up the instructions for the preparation of these "potages." 

Mendicancy increased greatly in the Seventeenth Century because of the economic crises and disorders provoked by internal and external wars. Public security, thus threatened, called for the intervention of royal authority. In France, Louis XIV was not wholly insensible to these trends. His charitable police, however, 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, 1685, concerning the opening and policing of workhouses for beggars (ateliers de mendicité), Louis XIV spoke of the kindness of the state towards those who desired work but could find none. He said these workhouses were planned primarily for them. As for those beggars who wished to remain idle, they would be forced to work. The arret of November, 1693, concerned itself with the subsistence of the poor as did the arrets
of 3 September and 22 October, 1709. 38 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. 39 The supplementary arrêts of November, 1709, and January, 1710, were for the execution of the previous arrêts of 1709. 40 All of these arrêts were issued by the king and parlement at a time when misery was most general and most acute. It is probable that the sudden bursts of parochial benevolence had died down and needed to be revived. Such a revival took place following these enactments. The parishes set about drawing up new rolls for the tax which it had previously placed upon its inhabitants. 41 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 whose scope of charitable endeavor was very broad and inclusive. But the work of these institutions is not of primary concern in this study. 42

In the early part of the Seventeenth Century, England tried, through the justices of 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. This scheme failed. 43 Josiah Child (1630-1699), in the second chapter of his Discourse upon Trade (1668), gives a plan for the relief and employment of the poor. 44 Andrew Yarranton (1616-1685) issued in 1697 a comprehensive plan for employing the poor by having the state foster flax-growing and iron works. 45 Sir Matthew Hale (1609-1676) 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 the erection of these workhouses 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. 46 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 system of 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 over-turnings of the Eighteenth Century were very notable in France as we shall later see. Yet, these upsets 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 much of a problem. Here, serfdom experienced a slight upsetting 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 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 it she planned to free the serfs; but the uprising led by Emelian Pugachev in 1773 caused her to dismiss all thought of reform; and as a result, the serfs were bound more firmly to the soil. Thus the peasants by their own hand averted social insecurity 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 the 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 domain, 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; but his death in 1790 prevented the firm establishment of these reforms.

Charles III of Spain endeavored to improve peasant conditions in his dominions. He attempted to improve the methods of agriculture by encouraging economic or agricultural associations and by 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 establishing state pawn shops. There were a few significant steps taken in the Italian States. Leopold, ruling in Tuscany, freed industry by destroying the gilds. Charles Emanuel III of Sardinia issued, 19 December, 1771, a great decree abolishing the servile system in the Duchy of Savoy and appointed a delegation to arrange the compensation which should be given the lords in place of the services hitherto rendered by the peasants.

The conditions affecting unemployment relief in Eighteenth Century England were not as primitive as those in Russia nor were they as disturbing as those in France. The industrial "avolution" and economic "revampings" in England increased the class of the unemployed. The Elizabethan statute of 1601 had sought to provide work for the unemployed but had 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 1752 permitted adjoining parishes to erect workhouses jointly for the relief of the 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 shortsighted 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 peace. In this respect, England differed widely from France as we shall later see.

Under the Act of 1782 (Gilbert's Act) "Guardians of the Poor" were charged with finding work for the unemployed.56 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 (The Speenhamland Act) provided that when a laborer's wage was insufficient for providing 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.57 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 Speenhamland 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. Enclosures, 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 interest 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."58 This was true unless they went into the factories. The growth of the factory system, the use of machinery, and the development of factory centers in the cities increased the unemployment problem. 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. Realizing that the problem of unemployment and its relief is distinctly one of a
pathological nature, we shall indicate how the early Eighteenth Century made its contribution towards solving this problem.

Throughout the period 1715-1740 the early attitude was 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 previous century still had some survivals in this period. They were soon to feel the influence of a small group of thinkers, primarily in France, who might be very appropriately called "the precursory physiocrats."

The social, economic, and financial condition of France at the beginning of this 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 the English thinker, 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. In addition, he showed how the two were connected. He had urged plans of reform upon successive ministers, Pontchartrain, Chamillart, and Desmarets. 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 hardly expect a distinguished general to be ranked among the great social economists of his time. Nevertheless, 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 it, 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* a social danger, even as he deemed *Factum de la France* of Boisguillebert seditious. Both books were suppressed by arrêts of 11 March, 1707. Vauban stigmatized 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, chagrinned at the king's severe disfavor and the suppression of his book as a social danger. 62

After Vauban, the independent thinking of the nation seemed to be dormant. Despite this, there was some activity. The Abbe Alary founded the "Club de l'Entresol" in 1724. Among its outstanding members was D'Argenson and the Abbe de Saint-Pierre. Although he will be discussed later, mention must be made here of Richard Cantillon (1680?-1724). His work entitled *Essai sur la nature du commerce en general* was written during this period, but it
was not published until 1755 and therefore did not affect the theory of this early period.

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 caused three insurrections in the provinces at Ruppec, Caen, and 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, furniture, and 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 Eighteenth Century attempts at handling the problem of mendicancy were not very successful. Some beggars were arrested and sent as galley slaves to the colony on the Mississippi.\textsuperscript{65} This practice did not continue long because such transport proved to be a heavy expense for the national government. In a declaration of 18 July, 1724, the royal government announced to the hospitals-general that it would give them more aid.\textsuperscript{66} Having taken this step, the government ordered, 24 July, 1724, the beggars to 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 blunders. 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 unjustly to arrest as vagabonds men who were forced to be idle by the closing down of their workshops. Conditions had become so bad that the Parlement attempted to intervene. By an arret of 30 December, 1740, Parlement resorted to the same measures it had used in 1693 and 1709, i.e., the commanding of the parishes to undertake the responsibility of caring
for the poor, and imposing a tax on each member of the parish for this purpose. 67

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 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 and 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 composed of women) who distributed aid to their respective groups. Other parishes had a bureau of charity headed by the priest, assisted by benevolent women, a treasurer, and a soliciter of charity. Still other parishes had a Mother-Superior and Sisters of Charity handling the relief work. There were brotherhoods (confraries) devoted to this type of work. These parish organizations distributed food, clothing, and medicinal remedies to the needy. They also provided them with working tools. Very seldom was money given. Schools were established
for the teaching of the rudiments of reading, calculation, and religion. 68

The loose organization of these parish institutions was not their chief weakness. Their most striking drawback 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. 69 The poor were questioned as to the mysteries and dogmas 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. 70 Aside from these parish organizations which were private and strictly confessional, there were public institutions centering around the municipality. These institutions were bureaux of general almonry, often called "poor offices" 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. 71

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 contri-
bution of the inhabitants of the city, designated as a poor
tax. To be admitted to relief from this bureau one must be
a sexagenarian; his needy condition must have been investi-
gated 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 to 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 extraordinary
methods. The Parlement of Paris asked inhabitants of the
parish 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.
Before approaching the pre-Revolutionary contributions to the development of ideas of state responsibility in counteracting unemployment relief, it is well to note how the economic "revampings" of the Eighteenth Century aggravated the social system and aided in its controversion. The absolutist "statism," which resulted from the "regulated conformity" of the Seventeenth Century, was controverted by the Eighteenth Century whose task was to controvert the "direct-power" economy of the previous century and to produce an "indirect-power" economy. Instead of "manufacture" (production by hand), we have "mechanufacture" (production by means of mechanical devices). The application of indirect-power, chiefly water, was becoming more general. In these revampings, this industrial overturning was characterized later by the use of steam for the indirect-power (vapo-mechanufacture) and the application of chemistry to industry. Such changes upset the labor situation. The regulated conformity of the Seventeenth Century which permitted little or no improvement was replaced 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 condition rapidly added to the increase of the proletariat.
Significant changes were also being felt as a result of the "agrarian revolution," which was really a "turning-away-from" older methods and viewpoints and not an agrarian revolution in the true sense of the term revolution. This turning-away from the old Seventeenth Century methods of agriculture owed much to the physiocrats and other economists, scientists, and governmental officials, as we shall see later. As a result of the activities of these groups, 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. 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. There was an increase in population and a shift in the centers of population. This being a period of relative peace at home and abroad, population flourished. With the increase in machinery came the development of the factory system and the development of factory centers. Large numbers of the unemployed farm laborers and shiftless beggars flocked to
these centers, some hoping to find work; others in search of charity.

In tracing the development of the theory of state responsibility in counteracting the French problem of unemployment, we shall find the latter half of the Eighteenth Century very significant. It is well to begin with the social ideology which was responsible, in a large measure, for the changes in the social thinking and action of the pre-Revolutionary era. This necessarily leads us into a consideration of the application of this new theory and the resulting practices. Three distinct periods stand out: the early Eighteenth Century (1700-1740), the pre-Revolutionary (1740-1788/89), and the Revolutionary (1789-1814/15). Our attention will center on the Revolutionary period subdivided into the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies, The National Convention, the Directory, and the Napoleonic Period. The Napoleonic period, covering as it does the Consulates (provisional, decennial and life) and the Empire should climax this study. Circumstances preventing this in full, the presentation of detailed research findings will close with the fall of the Directory. However, the whole will be taken account of in the conclusion.
PART I

APPLICATION OF THE "UPSETTING THEORIES"
PART I

CHAPTER I

The Pre-Revolutionary Era, 1740-1789

With the growth of mendicancy and the migration of hordes of idle laborers to the cities, the paternalistic benevolence of the Ancient Regime broke down. The vices that crept into the pious charity of individuals contributed to its collapse. The growing notions of state rather than personal responsibility for the social ills during the Enlightenment period (1740-1789) brought a shift in the attitude towards unemployment relief. This new viewpoint involved a shifting from the older individual attitude of pietistic benevolence (well-wishing) to social beneficence (bienfaisance, i.e. well-doing) based on the current philosophy which provoked discussion of the labor problem as a social question and the relief of the unfortunate as an obligation of society.

Active forces in the Enlightenment period, owing to which this shift was due, were the schools of the rationalists, the empiricists, and the sentimentalists. Leaders in this social ideology among the rationalists were the encyclopedists, notably, Diderot and D'Alembert; the anti-paternalistic economists, Quesnay (physiocracy), Gournay (laissez-faire), and Adam Smith; and the materialists,
Holbach and Helvetius. Considerable stimulus was given to the process of enlightenment by the encyclopedists, contributors to the Encyclopédie ou Dictionnaire Raisonné, of which Denis Diderot (1713-1784) and Jean D'Alembert (1717-1783) were chief editors. They and their associates stressed the idea that all men have the right to dispose of their person and property as they judge best, subject to natural law alone. The anti-paternalistic economists following Quesnay and Gournay held similar views as we shall see below. Claude Helvetius (1715-1771) and Baron Paul Holbach (1723-1789) were representative of the materialist group who advanced principles of utilitarian ethics. The test of experience was the guiding light of such empiricists as the Italians Giambattista Vico (1663-1744), Cesare Beccaria (1738-1794), jurist and author of Crime and Punishment, and Gaetano Filangieri (1752-1788), jurist and publicist. Others of note in this group were the Frenchman Baron de Montesquieu (1689-1755) with his L'Esprit des Lois (1748), the English political philosopher Edmund Burke (1728-1797), and the Scotch political philosophers Adam Ferguson (1723-1816) and Adam Smith (1723-1790) whose Wealth of Nations appeared in 1776. The social ideology felt the influence of the sentimentalists led by Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1787) with the publication in 1762 of his Contrat Social. Another noted
sentimentalist was Francis Hutcheson (1694-1747), teacher of Adam Smith at Glasgow and originator of the formula "the greatest happiness of the greatest number." Dr. Richard Price (1723-1791) and Joseph Priestly (1733-1804) made their contribution to this ideology as individualists. Morelly, concerning whose life and work few details are known, exerted a profound influence upon the French Revolution through his *Code de la Nature*. Gabriel Mably (1709-1785) developed the ideas of Rousseau and others, and, with Morelly contributed to a communistic type of French socialism.¹

In the development of French economic and social philosophy a turning point was the publication, in 1755, of the *Essai sur la nature du Commerce en général* of Richard Cantillon (1680?-1734), one of the natural law thinkers of Seventeenth Century England. In his "Essay," Cantillon 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 true wealth was extracted; but human labor is the form which produces it; and that wealth in itself was none other than 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 distinguished between the causes which
regulated the difference of wages in the various industries.²

Cantillon's ideas in manuscript had been handed about and even plagiarized before their publication. A French translation of the manuscript had been for some years in the hands of Mirabeau, the Elder. At one time Mirabeau considered publishing it as his own work. Before he could accomplish this, the manuscript was reclaimed from him. He therefore set about writing a commentary upon it, which, after the publication of Cantillon's work in 1755, he expanded and published 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 was "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 encouraged. He felt that the burdens of agriculture should be alleviated. The small cultivator was to be encouraged and held in honor. This doctrine was considered as startling. In July of the next year, 1757, Mirabeau had an interview with Quesnay, court physician of Louis XV and economist, from which event is sometimes dated the origin of the physiocratic school.³ François
Quesnay (1694-1774) had been very active in the field of medicine and surgery, having published treatises on bleeding, suppuration, fevers, and gangrene. He was appointed court physician in 1752, after he had successfully treated the Dauphin for smallpox by using inoculation. This reward and a patent of nobility increased his reputation. About this same time, Quesnay contributed articles on "Fermiers," "Grains," and "Impots" to the Encyclopédie of Diderot and D'Alembert. His position at court and his new ideas on the predominance of agriculture over industry soon attracted a group of fellow-thinkers. Among Dr. Quesnay's chief disciples were such men as the elder Mirabeau, Le Mercier de la Riviere, Abbe Bandeau, Le Trosne, and Frederich-Margrave of Baden. Others included possibly Turgot and Du Pont, although they did not entirely agree with all these tenets.

This new school of economic thought was based on the general idea of natural law. A corollary was that the wealth of a nation lay in its natural resources; that the only true occupations were those which used natural products such as agriculture, mining, and fishing. These physiocrats therefore issued a Journal of Agriculture and published many other similar works, individually and collectively. Ordinarily hostile towards the intervention of the state in the economic relations of individuals, the
physiocrats recognized that certain functions, notably that of assistance, could be fulfilled by society only if society had the support of governmental force.4

Although commonly linked as a physiocrat with Quesnay, whom he probably never met, Jean de Gournay (1712-1759) was actually the center of another school of economists. Gournay had engaged in commerce at Cadiz (1727-1744). During the years 1744-1751 he travelled over Europe. Upon his return to France in 1751, he was made intendant of commerce. He went about France on his visits of official inspection, often taking Turgot with him. He urged his associates to study economics, especially the English thinkers. He made a French translation of the writings of Sir Josiah Child (1630-1699) and Sir Thomas Culpeper (1578-1662). He contributed to the doctrine of "laissez-faire, laissez-passer" and popularized the use of this phrase, which was not original with him. He opposed restrictions on commerce; favored internal free trade and industry. His personal influence stimulated such government officials as Turgot and Trudaine. He attracted a group of followers chief among whom were Herbert, Morellet, l'Abbé Goyer, Trudaine de Montigny, Clicquot-Blervache, also perhaps Turgot and Du Pont. These economists and their associates wanted to remove the restrictions on commerce and labor.5
In addition to the above opinions regarding labor rights there were those of Morelly, Mably, and Baudeau. Morelly, in his *Code de la nature* (1755) says "Every citizen will be a public man, sustained, supported, and employed at the expense of the public." A few years later in his *Doutes proposes aux philosophes economistes*, Mably wrote "One of the principal advantages that I find in living in society is that I have a right to demand that it provide for my subsistence because I consent to work for it." Baudeau also believed assistance to be a debt owed to the poor. This new attitude represents a conclusion that all men who were able to work ought to procure their living by means of work.

Many of the economists previously noted under the physiocratic and "laissez-faire" schools, being among the contributors to the *Encyclopédie*, are sometimes considered as being also encyclopedists.

Diderot and other Encyclopedist show the effects of the change in attitude towards unemployment relief and responsibility for care of the poor; and numerous articles in the *Encyclopédie* were written more or less under this influence. Particularly important examples were the articles of Turgot, famed as a philosopher and government official.

In his book *Reflexions sur la formation et la distribution des richesses* (1776), Turgot 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 as minister, was inspired by his ambition to relieve the poor and to better the conditions of the peasants and 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, the able-bodied men who were forced to be idle must be supplied with work.

The first duty of public assistance, as he saw it, should be a reorganization of relief works. In cases of chomage or work stoppage, crop failures, and famines, this ought to be the best remedy. He firmly believed that relieving the condition of suffering men was the duty and business of all.

Associated with Turgot and largely influenced by him was Pierre Samuel Du Pont de Nemours (1739-1817). He advocated free trade in his Exportation et importation de grains (1764). It is said that Du Pont gave the physiocratic school its name when he published, in 1767, a collection of Quesnay's articles in a manuscript entitled Physiocratie ou Constitution naturelle du Gouvernement le plus avantageux au genre humain. He became a close friend and collaborator of Turgot when Turgot was intendant of Limoges and again when Turgot became controller-general of finances.
Du Pont de Nemours was convinced that it was the duty of society to care for the unfortunates. He suggested that those in need be aided by their relatives and friends and that such help should be supplemented by the state. Above all, Du Pont believed in relief through providing work for the unemployed especially in times of chomage. This theory he regarded as a great step forward and hoped that it would attract as much attention as the scientific progress of that time was doing. He strongly supported the ideas of charity workshops.10 Aside from measures of security, Du Pont admitted the intervention of the government only in matters of assistance, instruction, and public works. As to public works he says: "An unfortunate and too universal experience forces us to agree that, however upright or just an administration is, or might become, public work, done for the benefit of the public, paid for by the public, administered by public officials always risks being more costly and less well done than if it were directed by the action of a particular concern."11

Concerning public assistance, the reservations were still more precise. Although convinced of the utility of state intervention, he resolutely condemned the system of hospitals-general which had been founded under Louis XIV. Du Pont considered these institutions as nothing more than vast prisons destined to receive and care for the infirm
and the sick and to enclose beggars as criminals. His thoughts in this regard are found in these four propositions:

1. The first consideration that we must have for the poor is not to have any poor, and in order not to have any of them, to discard the arbitrary impositions, the constraints, and those prohibitions which prevent production, consumption, and work.

2. When, unfortunately, there are poor, they should be respected as men. We should guard against giving alms when work might be offered instead.

3. For the infirm who are unable to work and to whom aid is purely donated, it is better to give it to them in their homes among their friends than to assemble them in a public institution under a costly and pedantic administration where they would be constrained to live a monastic life.

4. The hospitals which consume, always, a considerable sum of the funds which would be better used in relieving the unfortunate, are one of the means of multiplying the poor. We ought to consider reforming these institutions by degrees.

Du Pont proposed to aid the poor by means of charity workshops (ateliers de charité) especially in times of calamity. This idea which had been previously expressed in his Journal sur l'utilité des secours a domicile was later developed in an appealing brochure. It is interesting to note the attitude assumed by Du Pont in the Mémoire sur les Municipalités. This brochure was frequently considered
a collaborative work of Turgot and Du Pont but now is
adjudged to be the work of Du Pont alone. Turgot had
discussed in advance, with his friend, the principal points
of this vast program, but the drawing-up of the *Memoire* is
entirely the work of Du Pont. A letter inserted in the
*Journal de Paris*, 2 July, 1787, after the death of Turgot
leaves no doubt as to this.\(^4\) In the *Memoire*, Du Pont
directed the municipalities, the cantons, and the provinces
to settle the problems which were of immediate concern to
them. The municipalities should distribute the taxes among
the inhabitants, proceed with the establishment of public
works and of connecting parish roads, and regulate the
police of the poor and the means of employing them in order
to relieve their unfortunate condition.\(^5\)

The growing notion of state responsibility for
relieving the poor found another advocate in the Marquis
de Condorcet (1743-1794), famous as a philosopher and later
revolutionary leader. After the establishment of the
Provincial Assemblies (1787), Condorcet 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, in his opinion,
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.16

One of the ablest of those in France who believed in the state supplying work as a means of unemployment relief was the Swiss banker Jacques Necker (1732-1804).17 According to him, society owed a moral obligation to the unemployed and should organize a system of protection and aid. Voltaire was instrumental in establishing, at Ferney, a clock and watch factory as well as a silk factory.18

Along with Necker but of still greater significance was the Duc de la Rochefoucauld-Liancourt (1747-1827).19 This nobleman claimed that among the duties of the state was that one 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 its Committee of Mendicancy.20

The regulation and reform of unemployment assistance and work relief during the period 1740-1789 embraced the repression of professional mendicancy and of vagabondage, helping the poor by means of outside relief and work relief, the founding of new welfare organizations, and the pre-Revolutionary agitation for nationalizing the
work of assistance and unemployment relief. For a more adequate treatment, this period (1740-1789) has been divided as follows: Period preceding the activities of Turgot (1740-1761/74), the actual Turgot period (1761/74-1776), the Necker period (1776-1781), the Calonne period (1783-1787), and the initial revolutionary agitation and activity (1787-1789).

The declaration issued against beggars in 1724 had failed. (See page xxx in Introduction). Vagabondage developed more and more. A new declaration (1750) confirming and renewing the traditional measures had also failed. So in 1764 L'Averdy, then controller-general of finances, appointed a commission to draw up a plan of classification of the poor and of the treatments applicable to each class. This commission was composed of four councilors of state together with one reporter taken from among the masters of requests. The councilors of state named were: de Marville, de Boullongne, de Fleury, and de Rosny. The reporter was Taboureau de Bacquencourt. He was later replaced by de Crosne. Berthier de Sauvigny was added as assistant reporter in 1766. After 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 to distinguish between vagabonds and unemployed workmen. The idle laborer was to be given six
months in which to secure work. If, after six months, he was still without work, he was to be considered a vagabond unless he produced acceptable witnesses to testify as to his behavior during that six months' period. Having struck a hard blow at vagabondage, the Commission next proposed, in July, 1765, an edict on mendicancy and a regulation for the alms bureaux. The parlement of Paris refused to deliberate upon this proposed edict and the Commission proceeded to put its wishes into operation as administrative measures. By an arrêt of 21 October, 1767, the Council ordered the opening up of mendicancy depots. Contemporaries considered the creation of these depots as "the reform of reforms." They were established in each généralité under the supervision of the intendants and their agents. These depots were workhouses offered as a measure of relief, not as chastisement. In them, the poor were able to find an asylum. But they soon lost their original purpose when the honest poor were crowded out by the beggars and vagabonds who were arrested and sent there.21

For the history of assistance, especially from the doctrinal point of view, the two years (20 July, 1774-12 May, 1776) during which Turgot was controller-general of finances were very significant. Turgot was the first minister who might have instituted comprehensive theoretic legislation concerning the poor. Time alone prevented him
from putting it completely into practice. He has been generally regarded as the most representative man of his epoch in dealing with the problem of unemployment relief. Yet he was not entirely alone in this. He belonged to a group of outstanding economists some of whom followed in the footsteps of Quesnay and some in the footsteps of Gournay. As a friend of Le Trosne, of Clicquot de Blervache, of the Marquis de Chastelleux, master of the Abbe Baudeau and of Du Pont de Nemours, Turgot had intimate contacts with the writers who were more or less preoccupied with the problem of assistance. He was very much attracted by the social problems which the existence of misery stirred up. This interest resulted from a natural generosity of heart evidenced in several places in his writings. Early in his youth he was filled with the idea of aiding his fellowman. But Turgot did not stop at this stage of individual virtue. He conceived the idea of the rights of humanity, of the natural right of each man to happiness. For him the principal merit of the Christian religion was to inspire in certain men love of the poor and the courage to look after the sick. No doubt this reflects his early life at Saint-Sulpice and the Sorbonne before he, as Abbe Brucourt, surrendered his ecclesiastical habit.22

These admirable traits—devotion to public welfare and facility in administrative work—seemed hereditary.
Among his ancestors were army officials, high church men, and such administrative officials as state councilors, intendants, and a mayor of Paris. Anne-Robert-Jacques Turgot was born 10 May, 1727 at Paris. His parents decided on an ecclesiastical career for him. He spent two years at the Sorbonne. With the consent of his parents, he gave up his religious career in 1751. Almost immediately he entered the administrative service. After filling some minor positions, he was made Director of Requests, 28 March, 1753. This position he held until he was named Intendant of Limoges on 8 August, 1761. The successful organization of Turgot's program of unemployment relief during his ministry as controller-general of finances was due, in a large measure, to his initial efforts while intendant at Limoges (8 August, 1761-20 July, 1774).23

The depressed generalite of Limoges, during this period, showed the practical application of his theories respecting relief. Of all the generalites in France, this one was perhaps the poorest and most backward. The inhabitants were, for the most part, ignorant, greedy, and very distrustful of officials. For agricultural crops the soil was very poor. The cattle were of inferior quality. Crop failures were frequent. There was little industry here and taxes soon wiped out most of it. Turgot quickly learned that in addition to administering the laws,
he had to construct roads, build bridges and barracks, and above all develop a program of assistance to offset these crop failures, the work stoppages and the resulting famine and idleness. He appealed to the nobility, gentry, and clergy and the better-off commoners to undertake some type of large-scale work which might supply employment for these idle laborers. Turgot had addressed a circular letter, 3 May, 1762, to the parish priests of his intendancy asking them to reduce, if at all possible, the "taille" in their parishes because of the suffering occasioned by accidents, contagious diseases, and the loss of cattle. He had hopes of some relief from this quarter. During the succeeding years, Turgot devoted himself strenuously to the other problems which confronted him when he took over this run-down generalité. He adopted and perfected a plan of substituting money payment to the men for the corvee (road service) instead of forced labor without pay. Good roads began to appear as a result of this plan. The very complicated and overburdening tax system was reformed. The militia which had fallen into decay was reorganized by Turgot. He assisted Du Pont and Trudaine de Montigny in drawing up the edict of 1764 which removed some of the grain trade restrictions. The Agricultural Society of Limoges was stimulated by him. He indicated to the society the advisability of using improved farming methods. Also,
there were improvements in agricultural implements, rotation of crops, new crops (especially the potato), new breeds of cattle and the introduction of veterinary science. Manufacturing was encouraged.

In spite of these attempted improvements, misery was still wide-spread in Limoges. This depressed province suffered a terrible siege of crop failures during the years 1769 and 1770. Turgot appealed directly to the king and Terray, controller-general of finances, asking money for setting up a program of public works, rural relief works and direct relief. These appeals were made in a series of seven letters of the following dates: 16 December, 1769; 9 January, 1770; 27 February, 1770; 9 March, 1770; 13 March, 1770; 15 May, 1770; and 25 October, 1770. In these letters, Turgot pointed out the wretched conditions in his généralité. A grant was made, most of which was prescribed for direct relief. Turgot asked for the right to change the proportion of the funds allotted him. He found the sum insufficient for the needs of his intendency. He asked for more money, particularly for work relief.24

Speaking to the Charity Assembly of Limoges (1770) which met to deal with the miserable conditions resulting from the many recent crop failures, Turgot pointed out some of the types of relief work in which the suffering poor might be employed. Such types of public
works ought to be selected as would employ a large number of workers. The simplest and easiest to undertake would be excavations, road building and maintenance, canal digging, etc. Such a program was already underway and more would be started immediately. He suggested that the women should develop the occupations of spinning and weaving under the direction of the Charity Bureaux. In these suggested plans is the practical application of Turgot's theory that the first duty of public assistance should be to organize works for the unemployed. In periods of work-stoppages and famine, this type of aid was considered by him as being the best remedy for the resulting misery.25

Turgot's success in dealing with the complicated administrative problems of the Limoges intendancy was speedily recognized. He was called from Limoges and made Minister of the Marine on 20 July, 1774. With the aid of Du Pont de Nemours as secretary and confidant, he applied himself vigorously to his new duties. This position, which he held for five weeks, was meant only as a stepping-stone to one of the most responsible and influential positions in all France, that of Controller-general of Finances. Among those who felt that Turgot was qualified for this position was Lamoignon de Malesherbes (1721-1794) who accepted the position of Minister of the King's
Household solely in order to aid Turgot in his program of reform. Malesherbes, Maurepas, and others informed the young king Louis XVI of Turgot's genius in organizing and administering the difficult Limoges intendency. They recommended Turgot hoping that his Limoges program would be applied to the entire nation. Upon their advice, the king appointed Turgot Controller-general of Finances, a position which he accepted on 24 August, 1774.

As one of his early acts, Turgot appointed a commission headed by Lomenie de Brienne, to study the measures which had been taken to end mendicancy and to bring in a plan that would achieve that end. In the long, thoughtful memorial that Lomenie de Brienne consequently produced in 1775 was a plan for unified administration of assistance, embodying the idea that the best way to aid indigent workmen was to find work for them.

Turgot next attacked the mendicancy depots. These institutions had been set up as relief agencies but now housed all sorts of men--the unemployed, dangerous vagabonds and brigands, and many infirm. So, after his inquiry concerning the charitable institutions (1774), Turgot sent a circular to the intendants concerning the closing of these badly managed and now discredited institutions. His method was first, to assist, then punish. Most of these institutions had been established by L'Averdy, in 1767, at the cost of 1,000,000 livres a year.
In the autumn of 1775, a committee composed of Turgot, Malesherbes, Trudaine de Montigny, Lomenie de Brienne, and Albert met frequently at Trudaine's house to discuss plans for reform. What these plans were is not known for certain; but it seems that Turgot was acting upon these plans in the orders that he gave to Fontette of Caen. To this official, and probably to others besides, he sent the instruction that all men who were not dangerous to society were to be set free in order to find work, and that those who were too old to work regularly were to receive outside relief to the value of fifty livres annually. Even suspects were to be given a chance. Only those who were proved to be dangerous were to be imprisoned in one of the five depots retained at Saint-Denis, Tours, Bordeaux, Bourgen-Bresse, and Chalons. Those young men who persistently begged and refused to work were to be segregated in a special house of correction at Roule near Paris. They were to be subjected to military discipline in labor-corps and hired out to work, receiving ten "sols" pay each day and also one-fifth of the profits of their labor.

Turgot's most outstanding contributions towards unemployment relief were the Charity Bureaux and the Charity Workshops. The Charity Bureaux were official organizations very methodically distributing aid to the poor whose needs had been more or less exactly ascertained.
Little effort was made by these bureaux to secure work for the indigent. Their chief objective was to give home relief. This type of relief consisted chiefly of food, clothing, and fuel. What these organizations failed to do in providing work was taken care of by the charity workshops.30

The charity workshops were not an entirely new form of relief. Louis XIV and Louis XV had made use of them at various times, but it was during the reign of Louis XVI that they reached their greatest development, thanks to the ingenious organization of Turgot. While intendant at Limoges (1761-1774) he had created a certain number of these "ateliers" and had studied the practical details of their organization and the results which might be achieved through their use.

During the years 1761-1776 he had to struggle against all sorts of difficulties. The political and economical crises were daily becoming worse. The frightful poverty which he, as intendant, had found in Limoges, he now, as controller-general of finances, found widespread throughout France. The problem for him did not consist of determining the objective, which was invariably the same for all enlightened philanthropy. His chief problem was to consider the choice of means which would facilitate the useful employment of all classes of poor.
In May 1775, after having first discussed the matter with Louis XVI, Turgot issued an instruction to all the intendants requesting them to open work projects on the roads and to provide textile jobs in or near the towns. He suggested, in this circular, his earlier program at Limoges, and discussed the subject of classifying the poor and the possible types of relief work to be offered. To begin with, he grouped the poor into two classes. To the first class (the infirm, the aged, and young children) he would give gratuitous aid. He said that the others (the able-bodied poor) needed wages. He began at once to devise some means whereby this could be accomplished. He organized a three-types-of-work program. Women and children were generally used in the easy work projects. In dealing with the more difficult undertakings, other things had to be considered. Thus, in building highways and connecting roads, Turgot realized there were jobs which were more complicated, requiring professional capacity and technical supervision. In order to prevent bad work which, for the new roads, was costly and even dangerous, Turgot decided to have these projects executed under contract. Such contracts were to be given to those persons having technical and professional knowledge. This would make the hiring of numerous workmen easier.
Home work tasks made up the third major classification of relief work projects. While the men usually found work in the charity workshops, the women and children, at first, did not fare as well. Those women and children who did manage to obtain admittance to these workshops seemed ill-suited for such work. Since they were encumbering the projects without being of any evident usefulness, Turgot planned a series of home work jobs. Special funds were appropriated for the purchase of raw materials. Such materials were to be donated to the unemployed women, but in small quantities lest a worker entrusted with a very large amount of raw materials should be tempted to sell these materials for her own profit. Spinning-wheels were lent to those who did not have them. Spinning classes were organized by the directing officials. Once the work was done, it was reported to the director. The raw materials were estimated at the current price and the finished products were estimated a little above the ordinary price, the difference in price being then distributed to the workers. Since the parish priest knew, at first hand, the people, their resources and needs, he was selected to draw up the list of those who would be given home work. These family work projects were set up at once by the officials, and the father was held responsible for their execution. This arrangement permitted a more even division of the task
according to the strength and capacity of each one.\textsuperscript{33}

When, for one reason or another, it was not possible to create such family jobs, the relief work officials organized groups of five to ten workers under a foreman. To this foreman was assigned the project to be undertaken. It was his duty to watch over the project and to assure the officials of the execution of the job and the maintenance of discipline. Wages were settled only at the end of each week, but installments for daily needs were paid. These projects also furnished the daily meals, the price of which was deducted from the weekly wages. Only persons over sixteen years of age were paid wages, younger children being given only their daily meals. The foreman of each group was paid a little more than the other workers because of the responsibility placed upon him. Turgot clearly indicated that the wages paid the workers should remain constantly lower than normal wages in order to prevent large groups of workers from leaving other jobs.\textsuperscript{34}

Turgot called upon the intendants throughout France to follow these instructions and the practices already tested in Limoges. As a result, projects were established in nearly all of the provinces. Some of the principal undertakings were the building and maintenance of roads, the digging of canals, and the draining of marshes.\textsuperscript{35}
In all this work considerable progress was made. Had Turgot remained in office longer, there is no doubt that an adequate organization for relief of the poor would have been worked out, especially since his reform of the corvees would have enabled the road contractors to employ regularly a large supply of casual labor.

Turgot soon learned that the nobles, who feared the loss of privileges and royal favors, were very strongly opposed to his program of financial retrenchment. This factor and that of the court intrigues of jealous ministers ultimately led to his downfall. The king requested his resignation on 12 May, 1776. In his retirement he devoted himself to many of his former interests. Among these were his writings on literature and philology, music, electricity, magnetism, physics, astronomy, and the momentous struggle of the American colonies, as well as political events in Europe. After long suffering from repeated attacks of gout, he died at his home on 18 March, 1781. Yet, all that he had planned and accomplished was not lost. The work which he began for unemployment was continued by Necker who soon succeeded him.

When Necker entered the office of controller-general (1776/77) much attention was being given to the subject of mendicancy and unemployment relief. Conferences were being held under the guidance of literary
and scientific societies and prizes were being given for the best solutions proposed. In 1763 and in 1764 the Agricultural Societies of Orleans and of Caen produced literature on the subject. At Orleans, in 1764, Le Trosne presented a Memorial on Vagabonds and Beggars which 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 distributed 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 mendicancy 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 the levying of a tax on laborers, farmers, and prosperous individuals of the parish. To this conference, according to many contemporaries, was due most of the agitation of relief problems 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. When he became controller-general after the fall of Turgot in 1776, he found a public opinion very well disposed towards sustaining every effort of the government for bettering the relief organizations. It was natural that this new minister, who always had a great respect for public opinion, should attempt to satisfy this strong inclination which was showing itself in matters of beneficence. 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. He felt it was very necessary that the government should have a charitable policy because, as he saw it, assistance was a function of the state. An opinion such as this had not been expressed with greater force than it was expressed now by Necker. He was willing, as was his forerunner Turgot, to intrust the provincial administrations with the direction and control of the charity workshops, the hospitals, and all else concerned with assistance. 39

The Ordinance of 27 July, 1777, concerning mendicancy was in line with, and perhaps an outgrowth of, the letter of Louis XVI, written 8 July, 1777, to his minister Amelot. The king ended his letter by clearly stating the principles of 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." This letter is said to have been inspired by La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt, philanthropist and friend of Louis XVI. This ordinance on mendicancy demanded that the beggars return to their original cities or find work within fifteen days. At the end of this time anyone found begging would be arrested, imprisoned, and sent to the Paris workshops.

Montlinot, a contemporary, considered this a replica of the ordinance of 1764 because the government was unable to find a suitable work in so short a time. There was actually some talk of opening the depots of mendicancy which had been closed. In order to meet criticism, Necker developed a model depot, favored the multiplication of the charity bureaux, and founded the spinning bureaux and the charity-fund pawn shops ("mont-de-piete").

Necker's model depot was located in the généralité of Soissons. There, the factory of Saint-Gobain installed shops for polishing mirrors. The workers—men, women, and children—received wages which were governed by the number of mirrors broken during the process of polishing. Here, also were opened weaving shops for the men.

Another practical consequence of the Ordinance of 1777 was the circular sent by Necker to the intendants favoring the multiplication of the charity bureaux in the
provinces. These organizations besides giving food, clothing, and medicines, organized relief by securing employment in the parishes for the idle workers. The general bureau of Amiens thus opened a spinning school for young girls and an establishment which lent money on pawned articles. The king, in 1787, authorized this bureau to set up a work school for the boys. Of special importance was the bureau at Chateauroux, opened in 1778 and placed under the special protection of Madame Necker as a model for other cities. 45

The spinning bureau was a new creation of Necker along ideas exposed in Turgot's "Instructions" of 1 May, 1775. Such spinning shops were installed in many Parisian parishes as well as in other places. 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 charity workshops for men. At Paris, they were employed at street cleaning; while in the rural sections they were put to work on local roads. 46

To the government of Necker and the administration of Lenoir is due the credit for establishing the charity-fund pawn shops or "monts-de-piete." This type of institution had been considered by some for a long time. These were established in Paris in 1777-1778 and proved very
beneficial not only in encouraging foresight but in adding to the resources of charity.47

After the publication, in 1781, of his famous "Account Rendered to the King of the Financial Condition" ("Compte Rendu"), Necker soon was discredited. The king demanded his resignation which Necker submitted on 19 May, 1781. The next controller-general of importance for our discussion was Charles-Alexander Calonne who entered the office on 10 November, 1783. 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 or pump-priming tactics. Confidence was seemingly restored and loans were made. In 1785 he floated a loan of 80,000 livres. Through Rayneval, assisted by Du Pont de Nemours and others, Calonne, in 1786, concluded with the English representative, Sir William Eden, the famous "Commercial Treaty of 1786," generally referred to as the Eden Treaty.48 A bargain was struck in this treaty. French wines were granted the same terms as were granted Portuguese wines by the 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. This treaty became effective in May, 1787.
On the whole, the treaty was more favorable to England than to France. 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 of finances money to aid the 30,000 unemployed in Troyes. The manufacturers at Sedan, where 9,000 workers were made idle, complained of the introduction of foreign goods and the migration of young workmen to other ports. The inspector of manufactures at Amiens reported 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 also experienced this shutdown of work. The unemployed at Lyons 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, to abolish the corvee, and to remove the restrictions on the grain trade. These reforms were presented to an
Assembly of Notables in February, 1787, but were rejected by them. Calonne resigned 8 April, 1787. When presented by Lomenie de Brienne who became the principal minister 28 August, 1787, only the decrees on the grain trade, the corvees, and the provincial assemblies were registered.

Thus we have seen in the pre-revolutionary period (1740-1789) the development of a type of social ideology which led writers to consider how this great social problem—relief of the unfortunate—might be eased, if not solved. Books, pamphlets, treatises, and articles in scientific, economic, and philosophical publications dealing with the problem appeared during this time. These writings came from financial experts and other public officials, scientists, economists, philosophers, and writers on social problems of this century. The tendency of the century towards controversy was being felt in the social phase of French civilization, as well as in the political, economic, cultural, and other phases. One has only to consider the work of such outstanding groups and individuals as the physiocrats, the philosophers, the encyclopédistes, the Academy of Chalons, Cantillon, Mirabeau, Quesnay, Du Pont de Nemours, Turgot, and Necker. Instead of bringing some relief for this overwhelming problem, the Eden Treaty only served, for the most part, to aggravate the condition of the poor. Cessation of work in
a large number of manufacturing centers and wine-producing districts threatened society with increased vagabondage, beggary, and true unemployment. Crop failures caused by unusual floods and hail storms resulted in great famines. Local interests and controls in handling the problem of relief began to shift towards provincial responsibility and administration. This in turn led to a growing attitude of national responsibility. The period directly preceding the call of the Estates-General for May, 1789, saw a great deal of agitation and activity for constitutional action and government responsibility in carrying out a program aimed at relieving the condition of the unemployed.
CHAPTER II

Manifest Interest Directly Preceding the Constituent Assembly

We have seen in the preceding chapter how, on the eve of the French Revolution, disasters were piling up. Calamities continued to accumulate.

After the disasters caused by the floods of 1787 and that of 13 July, 1788, new troubles broke out. The winter of 1788 was unusually hard. There was an acute scarcity of grain. The industrial crisis which followed the Eden Treaty continued to strike hard. Picardie, Normandie, Lyons, Bourges, Tours, Orléans, Sedan, Champagne, and the Ile-de-France were hardest hit and consequently became the chief centers of chomage. In the bailliage of Orléans, work stoppage struck hard the rural sections as well as the towns. The flour mills were destroyed by the terrible storms and accompanying fires, thus throwing men out of work and creating a famine. Causes which more or less produced this famine and chomage were: (1) the weakness of the French mercantile system, (2) the poor method of transportation and the equally poor system of communication, (3) the lack of progressive methods and planning ahead in the field of agriculture, (4) the low standard of living in France as compared with that of England and elsewhere, and (5) the
wide-spread hoarding and speculation in grain.¹

The very disordered condition of state finances and the wretched circumstances of the poor made the matter of responsibility for relief a very urgent one. During the winter of 1788-1789, Necker, who had been re-instated as Minister of Finances, had distributed 1,500,000 francs to the unemployed.² The "Depots de Mendicité" were re-opened and reformed. Hospices were organized in each parish.³ Many nobles, during this time, devoted themselves to beneficent works. The most notable was the Duke de la Rochefoucauld-Liancourt. On his domain at Liancourt, he established an agricultural school, a trades school, and a cotton factory. There was also a model farm for the use of the farm school. He also built tile and brick works at Rantiguy. In 1787, Arthur Young, visiting the industrial plants set up by Liancourt for the express purpose of furnishing work for the unemployed, praised the humanitarian principles of this benefactor of the poor.⁴ The Prince de Grouy set up, at Condé, a factory for the manufacture of silks and muslins. In these were employed a considerable number of idle workmen.⁵ Also there were founded during this period new relief organizations based upon love of humanity, rather than prompted by purely religious motives. The prominent ones were "La Société de Charité Maternelle," and "L'Association de Bienfaisance Judiciaire." "La
Mais on l'Opini, chi., the doctors Girard and Jeanroy. Among its members were found such prominent men as the Count de Choiseul-Gouffier, ambassador to Constantinople; the Dukes of La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt, of Montmartre, of Nivernais, of Brissac, of Montmorency, of Coigny; Talleyrand-Perigord, Bishop of Autun; the Baron de Steal-Holstein, ambassador from Sweden; Necker, and a large group of high-ranking officials, priests, bankers, notaries, and financiers. In 1788, King Louis XVI declared himself the head and patron of this worthy organization. The "Maison" received the whole-hearted support of the king's brother, the Duke of Chartres; the Marquis de La Fayette, Bailly, and Benjamin Franklin, minister plenipotentiary of the United States at the French court. This popular organization increased from 500 members in 1785 to 633 in 1787. These new societies aimed at helping those who were generally overlooked by the other relief organizations and institutions.

Despite all that private relief organizations had done, the problem of unemployment continued to grow worse. Large centers like Paris were becoming overcrowded daily by the numbers of idle workers, beggars, and other
unfortunates who migrated to the capital from outlying rural sections and provincial districts. These unfortunates were an additional charge upon the already overburdened charity of the city. Moreover, they became a nuisance and a most disturbing factor to the policy, as well as to the peace and security of the city.

The Commune of Paris decided to do something practical in dealing with its own unemployment situation and at the same time to make further tests of the theories that were being advocated as possible solutions for this harassing problem. Pursuant to instructions from Louis XVI, Jacques Necker, Director-general of Finances, had ordered the setting-up of a work relief program. Under this plan, the town council of Paris was entrusted with the selection of types of work that would be useful to the city and which would also employ a large number of the idle laborers. The municipal bureau (Bureau de Ville), on 2 December, 1788, took measures to put this program into operation. This council selected the architect, Poyet, and the building inspectors, Madin and Fournier, to supervise the organization and the functioning of this program. The type of work suggested was navvy work, i.e., the building of embankments, repairing of streets, building of roads, and similar heavy outdoor jobs. This type of work was naturally more suitable for this vast body of unemployed
who represented a variety of crafts and capacities. These jobs were open to any unemployed in Paris, regardless of age or sex. Such a program, as we shall later see, would provide useful and even permanent improvements for the city itself.

Among the early projects was work on the Quai d'Orsay from the portal of Saint-Nicolas to the Quai le Pelletier, from thence by the portal of Saint-Paul to the Quai de Tournelle below the quais of Marmionnes, thence to the outlet of the Rue Hauteville, finally ending in the isles of Charenton. Wages were eighteen sols (maximum), per day for men and five to ten sols per day for women and children. These temporary relief measures lasted until 1 April, 1789. About 3,000 men had been employed and that at a cost of 1,860,000 livres.

But the crisis which necessitated the above relief program had grown worse. The incessant flow of men from the provinces to Paris steadily aggravated the already miserable conditions existing in the capital city. Finding neither work nor sufficient food at home, the idle laborers flocked to Paris hoping to find work or at least a charitable living. Work projects were started. These multiplied rapidly. They consisted chiefly of repairs to public highways, above all, the construction of a new road-way up Montmartre. This last was called the Montmartre
project. The construction work began on 29 May, 1789, with 76 laborers. The territory covered by this undertaking was the site between the boulevard Rochechouart, the Rue de Clignancourt and the Rue Houdon (formerly Rue Nationale under the Revolution) which terminated at the Rue Royale (today, Rue Pigalle). The highway had to be large enough to permit carriages to reach the top of the hill. This project, with time, took on such an importance that contemporaries in referring to the Montmartre project, generally included the lesser construction jobs of the gateway of Saint Louis, that of de Reuilly, de Vaugirard, of the École Militaire, of the Bastille and of the highway de la Vertu. This Montmartre project was typical of the recent work relief program put into operation in May, 1789. Through the Montmartre workshops, the Commune of Paris showed a more practical side of dealing with this social menace. They employed thousands of idle laborers and at the same time did something constructive for the community. As this project developed in extent of territory and number of employed, latent abuses became apparent. These abuses and other features which ultimately led to the closure of this project will appear later in our discussion, specifically, after the events of July and August, 1789.

Owing to the successful beginning of the Montmartre and other Parisian undertakings, they had a
significant influence upon other parts of France. This soon led to much agitation for definite government action. This agitation began in the provincial assemblies. Each assembly was divided into commissions or bureaus which had the responsibility of making investigations and preparing reports on the problems assigned to them. Each provincial assembly had a "bureau du bien public" (public welfare bureau) which, in most cases, was also the bureau of agriculture and commerce. These bureaus were composed of members of the three orders. There were prelates and priests, designated as members primarily because their profession implied a spirit of charity and welfare work, both parochial and diocesan. Some clerical members were made reporters, as evidenced by the appointment of La Bintinaye, canon of a large Parisian church, whose reports presaged those of the Committee of Mendicity of the Constituent Assembly. An influential member of the public welfare bureau of Orleans was the Abbé Siéyès whose later work had its beginnings in this period. La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt, who later became outstanding as president of the famous Committee of Mendicity, began his work as a member of the public welfare committee of the provincial assembly of Soissonnais. His attitude and work were clearly indicative of the interest shown by the local nobility.
Among the representatives of the Third Estate were found municipal administrators, rural proprietors, and doctors. This last group included the name of Lavoisier, chemist and agronomist, member of the provincial assembly of Orleans, who was not content with writing on agronomy, economics and chemistry, but also produced an interesting report on agriculture and another on mendicity. These assemblies proclaimed, almost unanimously, that the right of the indigent to get aid was a duty of society. The assemblies of Soissons and of the Ile-de-France claimed that work was the criterion by which one could distinguish between beggars and worthy indigents. These local groups all recommended gratuitous aid and sustenance for the infirm, but for the able-bodied poor, aid and sustenance were to be given only in exchange for work. Members of these provincial assemblies believed in the efficiency of the "ateliers de charité" (charity workshops). The assembly of Champagne declared that the charity workshops created by them would be devoted exclusively to really useful projects, such as construction and repair of highways leading into the villages and projects of rural sanitation. Those of Rouen and Soissons fostered similar ideas and projects. The Alençon assembly adopted a ruling that their workshops would be placed preferably in the parishes where the need
for work and relief was greatest, without taking into consideration a contribution on the part of those parishes for the support of such projects. This assembly urged its municipalities to send to the assembly any and all propositions for workshops designed to aid the unemployed. Assistance given at home (assistance à domicile), relief works in time of chomage (le secours de travail), and poorhouses (depots de mendients) were the principal objects of the deliberations of these assemblies regarding unemployment relief. They contributed largely to the development of a philosophy that embraced the right of the truly and sincere poor to relief, the correlative duty of providing work for the able-bodied poor and the prevention of professional mendicancy. These ideas were recast and strengthened in anticipation of the meeting of the Estates-General.

When the Parlement of Paris refused to sanction additional loans and vote new taxes, Louis XVI, in August, 1783, yielded to their suggestions for calling the representatives of the nation together. 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. These deputies were asked to prepare reports (cahiers) on their localities, pointing out abuses and suggesting remedies.

These reports and lists of grievances, drawn up throughout the nation, were noteworthy. In some cases they
debated fiercely what articles should be included; and in
still other cases, they simply recorded 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. The cahiers
on the Third Estate were particularly insistent upon
correcting the social inequalities and abuses associated
with the Ancien Regime.14 In their cahiers, as in some of
the cahiers of the nobility and of the clergy, the question
of unemployment relief was duly considered.

These demands are found scattered throughout the
cahiers of the three estates. Such complaints and
suggestions respecting relief of the terrible suffering of
the poor, particularly the able-bodied poor who were without
work and whose begging disturbed the public welfare, may be
grouped into four classes. The first class included
demands which had as their objective advising the consider-
ation of proper means of preventing beggary and idleness
among the indigent. In the second class were pleas for the
wiping out of mendicancy by establishing workhouses of aid
(maisons de secours), charity workshops (ateliers de
charité), and public works (travaux publics).15 The third
class of such complaints asked that each community and
parish be obliged to provide for the subsistence of its own poor and beggars. The fourth class of these cahiers demanded legislation to prevent the able-bodied beggars and idle workers (i.e., those forced to beg because of lack of employment) from leaving their home parishes and overcrowding other parishes. Aside from these four distinct classes of complaints, there were numerous miscellaneous demands. Those deputies whose cahiers contained demands of the first class felt that the Estates-General ought to consider proper means for preventing unemployment. Numerous examples of this type of request may be found in the cahiers of all the three orders. All of these means of combating the unemployment situation were to be under the supervision of the government.

We shall consider a few notable examples drawn from hundreds of such complaints found in the cahiers of all the orders. The bailliage of Dourdan asked that a bureau of charity be set up for the infirm and that publicly owned workshops be opened for the able-bodied unemployed. These workshops were to be supervised by provincial administration. This bailliage also demanded that the "costly, useless, and destructive Depots de Mendicité be destroyed and replaced by public works which can offer employment to the needy and also serve a public good." The cahier of the nobility of Amiens asked that the
Estates-General consider "means of destroying mendicancy by a good police system, by charitable funds, and by initiating public works." The nobles of the sénéchaussée of Boulonnais suggested that the poor be given a small plot of ground for purpose of cultivation. Those who refused this were not to be aided from the parochial charities.

Of particular note was the attitude expressed in the cahier of Paris, intra-muros: "The nobles, citizens of Paris desire that all the provincial estates seek to wipe out mendicancy and prevent it by providing work... that the number of work days be increased by reducing the number of fêtes." Among the names of the deputies who drew up this cahier were the Duke de la Rochefoucauld-Liancourt; the Marquis de Condorcet; Stanislas, Count de Clermont-Tonnerre; the Count de Lally-Tollendal; all of whom were men directly interested in the problem of unemployment and its relief. The deputies of the bailliage of Verdun demanded that the Estates-General seek means to establish public works, all under the direction of the provincial estates, that will always be open to the poor who are able to work. It was clearly indicated that in these public works there shall be proportionate wages. Similar demands for charity workshops and public works projects are to be found in the cahiers of the nobility of the bailliages of Orleans, Auxois, Aval, Crépy; and the
sénéchaussées of Candon, Boulonnais, Perigord, and many others.

This pressing social problem of the late Eighteenth Century did not pass unnoticed by the clergy. The clergy of the sénéchaussée of Sisteron called on the king and the Estates-General to do something for the poor, especially since the rural districts were losing so many of their population and much of their culture. They closed their cahier by saying that the above request "... is the most sacred duty of the king and the representatives of the nation." The clerical deputies of the bailliage of Amiens demanded the building and improvement of highways and such practical works as would give employment to the indigents. The bailliage of Aval asked that the bureaus of charity be sufficiently multiplied. This increase of bureaus would provide work for the able-bodied indigents and resources for the needy infirm. "Suppression of mendicancy..." said the electors of the sénéchaussée of Boulonnais, "is one of the most useful operations that the government might undertake, for it would provide work for a large number of able-bodied men whose children would soon contract the habit of idleness and all its attendant vices." The clergy of the bailliage of Chateauneuf in Thimerais sought to have bureaus of charity and charity workshops set up in the
chief centers of each bailliage. These charity workshops were to be under government supervision and supplied with raw materials such as cotton and linen. The situation of the poor was discussed at length in the cahier drawn up by the clergy of the bailliage of Nemours. They expressed the opinion that each parish ought to care for its own poor; that the government ought to consider means of employing the poor usefully. Similar opinions and requests for the creation of more bureaus of charity and, especially charity workshops came from the clergy of sénéchaussée of Agenois and the bailliages of Dourdan, Melun, Moret, Paris (hors les murs), Troyes, and Vermandois.

By far the most numerous and most insistent demands for work as a means of unemployment relief came from the Third Estate. The Third Estate of the bailliage of Amien said that begging was a scourge to society. "A good administration will advise means of ending it." Proceeding on this principle, these deputies are charged to ask that the poor be aided by procuring work for them either on public works or otherwise. Deputies from the bailliage of Exmes asked that the king employ beggars in public works. The sénéchaussée of Angoumois addressed their cahier to the Minister of Finances asking that work on the roads be used as useful employment for the able-
bodied. Charity workshops in each department for supplying work to the poor were demanded by those from the bailiwick of Étampes. The bailiwick of Mantes and Meulan demanded that the deputies to the Estates-General provide charity workshops for those who were willing to work and at the same time provide moderate wages in order not to draw workmen from other necessary jobs because of better wages. Also very determined in their attitude towards this problem were the bailiwick of Melun and Moret whose Third Estate demanded the suppression of the mendicant depots as contrary to humanity. They were of the opinion that the Estates-General ought to be advised as to means of employing the beggars as well as the other idle men in useful works supervised by the magistrates.

The deputies of the Third Estate of the royal bailiwick of Meudon, just outside the walls of Paris, drew up an interesting statement. "Since a civilized state ought not to admit excuses for misery, and since humanity and religion have taught us that the poor are our brothers, it is the duty of the French nation to provide for their needs and to prevent their indigence from troubling the public welfare. In consequence, the Third Estate of the bailiwick considers that it is necessary to establish in each parish hospices and charity workshops sufficiently endowed to supply the needs of all the citizens who seek
refuge therein." ... "The Estates-General will be invited to consider the establishment of another class of poor citizens, who, little familiarized with the mechanical arts, and finding themselves without work in the country, are constrained to come and settle in the cities, and offer to their fellow citizens, who are not able to employ them, the afflicting but sterile picture of their misery." 36 The Third Estate of this bailliage thought that it would be possible to give them some lands in the less densely populated parts of the kingdom which their industry would make capable of production. 37 The cahier of the Third Estate of Paris (intra muros) proposed an entire constitution for the French nation. Of particular interest are their views concerning unemployment relief. They recommended the abolishing of the mendicancy depots and the opening of public workshops in which all the poor, regardless of age, sex, or physical condition (able-bodied and infirm alike) might be able to find work all the time and above all during the winter; such work to be suitable to their condition. As for those who were already living at home, the director of the public workshop would supply them with work that could be carried on in the home. All of this was to be done under the supervision of the provincial and municipal assemblies. 38 The deputies of the bailliage of Nemours went even further in their demands.
They began by insisting upon a declaration of rights of men and of citizens and inserted such in their cahier. Among the thirty articles comprising the declaration was one that said "All men have a right to aid (secours)." These deputies were of the opinion that misfortune, poverty, and indigence should not be considered as crimes. The victims of these social ills ought to be employed usefully and particularly in all types of public works. Programs and projects for relief should be so arranged that the poor would know to whom they could go when seeking work. The wages should be slightly lower than normal in order not to attract men who are already employed. The infirm poor ought to receive aid as set forth in Article 4 of the proposed declaration of rights included in this cahier. For the able-bodied who need work, public workshops and road work ought to be offered to them. Such public works should be provided by the government expressly for employing the poor. Such an application of public funds, they felt, would be not only a great help to commerce but would also stimulate agricultural production.

In this cahier of the Third Estate of Nemours can be clearly seen the hand of the physiocrat, "Pierre Samuel Du Pont, cultivateur et propriétaire dans la paroisse de Chevannes" in the bailliage of Nemours, who, in all probability, drew up this document. The parish of
Bourget suggested that the Estates-General ought to see
that each parish care for its own problem either through
supplying work or by means of direct relief. The
sénéchaussée of Guyenne asked that each parish establish
charity workshops for all those who were able and willing
to work. Similar suggestions for dealing with the
problem of the unemployed poor can be found in the cahiers
of the Third Estate of Bourgla-Reine, Chartres, Forcalquier,
Rochefort-sur-Mer, Treguier, Lannion, St. Eustache, Jugerie
de Riviere-Verdun, Trevoux, and Varines. 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 a work program
to relieve the idle workers. There were various other
demands in these Third Estate cahiers including demands for
a tax for the benefit of the poor; suppression of the
begging religious orders; and suppression of the abbeys
and appropriating clerical property for the benefit of the
poor. These cases which have been cited and many others
from which these have been selected warned the delegates
to the Estates-General that this most pressing question of
unemployment relief should not be overlooked.

These selections from the cahiers indicate very
clearly that enlightened Frenchmen were well aware of the
unemployment situation. Something had been done, but in
too small measure, by the king, the controllers-general, and a few of the other higher officials. By far, the majority of such attempts at relief came from the intendants in their restricted areas. The theory of national responsibility in counteracting this problem was beginning to take form. Although the cahiers let the nobility, the clergy, and the Third Estate speak out against this evil yet practically nothing of national scope was done to crystallize these scattered opinions. This was a task for publicists. Many pamphlets, petitions, proposals, plans and memorials relative to this problem were sent to administrative officials and groups as well as to the provincial assemblies.

Some idea of the number and types of publications appearing about 1789-1790 can be had by noting the following list:

Boncerf, Paul-Francois; Ancient administrator of public establishments, member of Royal Society of Agriculture, treasurer of the district of Saint-Etienne-du-Mont.

"De la necessite et des moyens d'occuper avantageusement tous les gros ouvriers."
20 August, 1789. This was ordered printed by the District of Saint-Etienne-du-Mont in 1789, by the National Assembly in 1790, and by the Municipality of Paris. By 1791 it had gone through eight editions.

"La plus importante et la plus presente affaire, ou la necessite et les moyens de restaurer l'agriculture et le commerce."
1789.


"Memoire sur un moyen de mettre en culture les terres arides de la Champagne."

"Aperçu des effets qui resulteront des dessechements, defrichements, plantations."

"Memoire... sur l'enlevement des immondices au bord de la Seine pour procurer du travail aux ouvriers." 45

Poulletier, Claude-Francois; Citizen of the District of Saint-Megloire.

"Memoire sur les moyens d'occuper les ouvriers et les autres gens oisifs qui sont dans Paris." August, 1789. 46

Grisard

"L'Exemption de la classe pauvre, suivi de l'allègement de l'ouvrier." 47

Houard, B.A.; Citizen of Paris.

"Moyen et necessite absolues d'occuper les ouvriers oisifs et ceux des ateliers de charite a des travaux utiles a l'Etat et a eux-memes." 48

Bosco

"Essai sur les moyens de detruire la mendicite en employant les pauvres a des travaux utiles." 49

Dufourny de Villiers, Louis-Pierre; Artist, engineer, future member and president of the Directory of the Department of Paris.

"Invitation aux districts a former des comites fraternels... Observations sur les causes de la misere..." 25 April, 1789.

"Cahiers du quatrième ordre, celui des pauvres journaliers, des infirmes, des indigents, etc., l'ordre sacre des infortunes; ou correspondance philanthropique entre les infortunes, les hommes sensibles et les Etats generaux..." 25 April, 1789. 50

Poyet, Bernard; King's architect and architect of the city of Paris.

"Memoire sur la necessite d'entreprendre de grands travaux publics pour prevenir la ruine totale des arts en France et pour occuper d'une maniere utile les artistes et les ouvriers de la capitale."
"Projet proposé par le sieur Poyet, architecte du Roi et de la ville de Paris, pour employer quarante mille personnes tant artistes qu'ouvriers à la construction d'une place dédiée à la nation." 1791. 51

D'Offemont, LaSalle, Marquis de Piedefer.
"Mémorie pour employer utilement les bras des indigents, leur procurer la subsistance et leur accorder une propriete territoriale." 1790. 52

"Precis de vues generales en faveur de ceux qui n'ont rien." 53

"Moyens de detruire entierement la mendicite." 54

"Cahier des Pauvres." 1789.

"Au Roi et aux Etats-Generaux. Supplique presentee d'abord à l'Assemblee des electeurs du Tiers Etat de Paris, qui n'a pu y etre prise en consideration pour sauver le droit du pauvre et pour l'interet commun de tous les ordres."

"Adresse a l'Assemblee nationale a l'effet d'en obtenir la formation d'un Comite dans son sein, pour appliquer, d'une maniere speciale a la protection et a la conservation de la classe non proprietaire, les grands principes de justice, decretes dans la declaration des droits de l'homme et dans la Constitution." (printed by order of the Assembly of the Commune of Paris.)

"Adresse a l'Assemblee nationale pour sauver le droit du pauvre et pour stabilir le calme et la tranquillite publique." 55

Telles-Dacosta; Honorary grand master of the Waters and Forests of Champagne, Lord of Etang and of the Parish of Marne.
"Plan general d'hospice royaux." 1789. 54
Moulens, L'Abbe Larat de; "Le cri de l'humanite."
Addressed to the National Assembly in 1789. 55

Bohet
"Moyens de destruire entierement la
mendicite. ... en rendant la charite plus
profitable aux pauvres." 1789. 56

Dutemblay de Rubelle; Future member of the Directory of
Paris and Commissioner of the National Treasury.
Maitre des comptes.
"Memoire sur la destruction de la
mendicite." 1789. 57

Mittie
"Plan d'administration generale pour les
charities publique et moyens d'assurer la
subsistance des pauvres. Adresse a l'auguste
assemblee des Etats generaux par M. Mittie,
ancien controleur et releveur ambulant des
domaines du Roi de la generalite de Paris."
1789.

"Aux Etats-generaux, Plan de travaux publics
pour occuper separement les pauvres et les
mauvais sujets." 1789. 58

Charton, Jean-Baptiste.
"Plan d'un etablissement patriotique en
faveur des enfants et des ouvriers des deux
sexes, indigents, faute d'ouvrage." ca 19
Sept., 1789. 59

De Reynier
"Idees sur la mendicite et les moyens de
l'eteindre." Read to the Society of
Agriculture on 17 May, 1790. 60

Comte de Sainte-Foy
"Invitation a ma Patrie en faveur de
l'humanite souffrant." This brochure was
dedicated to the city of Montauban. 1788. 61

Gerdret; Justice of Peace of the section of Oratoire.
"Reflections sur la mendicite: moyens pour la
faire tourner au profit de la nation, et
parvenir a son extinction." 62

Paulmier; Officer and Gentleman-Farmer from Nemours.
"Essai sur les bois, les friches, les chemins
et les mendients." Presented at Paris in
1790 to the Royal Society of Agriculture. 63
Desbois de Rochefort; Curate of Saint-Andre-des-Arcs. "Mémoire sur les calamites de l'hiver 1788-89." 64

Many of these documents, along with others of slightly later date, found their way to the National Assembly as we shall later see. Of particular interest are the works of Boncerf, Du Tremblay de Rubelles, and Lambert. Because of their foresight in recognizing the future implications of this pressing social problem, they were later made members of the Assembly's Committee on Mendicancy. Their influence and work with this Committee will be discussed in the succeeding chapter.

Furthermore, an accounting will be made of the effect contemporary social and socio-economic writings had upon the National Assembly and the formation of its Committee on Mendicancy.

Thus far, we have seen a growing interest in the problem of dealing with the unemployed. Solutions have been noted and their application discussed. The Montmartre project gave us a good idea how relief through work operated. It has its abuses, as well as its good points, which we shall later see. But, on the whole, this experiment proved, to some extent, to have been of practical value. This type of relief, as we shall also later see, was not completely discarded. The provincial assemblies became interested. Administrative officials and groups
began to suggest remedies. Numerous higher administrative officials, as well as engineers, architects, and hospital officials issued briefs, memorials, and other types of literature concerning mendicancy and unemployment. The cahiers provided a wealth of material concerning the problems of mendicancy, chomage, and resulting unemployment. All tended toward pointing out the responsibility of the state in this matter. It remained for the National Constituent Assembly to take the first effective steps towards crystallizing and making national these sentiments and opinions relative to state responsibility in counteracting unemployment.
PART II

REVOLUTIONARY ERA AND STATE CONTROL
PART II

CHAPTER I

National Constituent Assembly:

Evolution of Principles of State-Controlled Relief

The growing unrest in the pre-Revolutionary period (1740-1789) was not felt solely in the social and economic fields. The religious and cultural aspects of the Eighteenth Century also experienced the dominant trend of "controversion." This controversy was particularly active in the political life of the century and especially in France. Here, it was clearly indicated that the Ancient Regime was out-moded. A change in the political set-up was inevitable.

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. The course of its fall can be summarized best in terms of the great "Active-Retroactive" French Revolution. This revolutionary cycle started with "Enlightened Despotism" (ca 1760-1789). It actually had its very first start under Louis XV who was aided by such able men as Choiseul and Maupeou. The early years of the reign of Louis XVI saw these despotic reform plans functioning. His most noteworthy ministers of that period were Turgot (1774-1780) with Malesherbes, then Necker.
(1776-1781). The financial schemes of Calonne ended with the calling of the Assembly of Notables in 1787. In the midst of the controversy that followed, Calonne resigned. Louis XVI then appointed Lomenie de Brienne, archbishop of Toulouse and a distinguished member of the Assembly of Notables, to the position vacated by Calonne. Brienne, although previously opposing Calonne, now adopted Calonne's plan, adding to it a stamp tax. The Assembly of Notables did not accept his proposals and recommended that the king convolve the Estates-General.

This Enlightened Despotism was dominated by aristocratic tendencies. The Council of State, held 27 December, 1788, at Versailles, resulted in the king's decision to call the representatives of the three orders to meet as of old. On 24 January, 1789, Louis XVI issued a letter to all the provincial governors calling upon them to hold elections for qualified deputies of each order to assemble on Monday, 27 April, 1789, at Versailles. It had been nearly 200 years since the Estates-General had met. In this letter he asked that the deputies consider the financial chaos facing the nation and that they deliberate upon means of solving it and other pressing problems concerning the welfare and prosperity of the nation. These delegates were to present all petition for redress of grievances in "cahiers." It was through these "cahiers" that the king hoped he would become acquainted with the
needs and wishes of even the remotest inhabitants of his kingdom. A royal regulation setting forth the details of the election was issued by Louis XVI on 24 January, 1789. The number of delegates, the manner of electing them, and the costume to be worn by each order were all set forth in this regulation. The electoral district prescribed was the bailiwick (senechaussee). Generally the three orders elected their deputies separately. The deputies of the nobility and clergy were elected by direct vote, whereas the deputies of the third estate were elected indirectly. The third estate chose the members of an electoral assembly which in turn selected the deputies to the Estates-General. Nearly all cities except the largest had local assemblies; hence the average townsman had less voting power than the villager. This accounts for the large number of village lawyers who were deputies to the Estates-General. This also reflects the fact that suffrage was practically universal although only a fourth or fifth of those entitled to vote took part. The Estates-General opened on 5 May, 1789. Cahiers had been drawn up by the voters as well as by the local assemblies. All three estates were agreed in demanding a constitution embodying the liberties promised by Necker in the name of the King. Many cahiers of the Third Estate complained of the economic situation. Above all they complained of the abusive and equally oppressive feudal system. The factors
underlying this system which embraced a wide variety of social, political and economic combinations are too well known to warrant a detailed discussion at this point. These complaints called for the abolition of the hunting privileges of the nobility and the cutting down of their game preserves. This last request would guarantee better protection for crops. This feudal economic system was overburdened with taxes, both direct and indirect, such as the taille, capitation or poll tax, vingtieme, gabelles, and corvees. The cahiers were almost unanimous in demanding a reform of this economic evil. The attitude towards the problems of poverty and unemployment, as expressed in the cahiers, has been discussed in the preceding chapter.

Immediately following the opening of the Estates-General, the three orders were involved in a controversy over the manner of voting. The nobility and the clergy declared that the voting should be "by orders" while the third estate took the position that all voting should be "by head." The nobility and clergy refused to meet with the third estate. 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 place of meeting and found the door locked. Led by Mirabeau and Abbe Sieyes, they proceeded to a building which had been used as an indoor tennis court. Here they took an
oath as members of the National Assembly that they would not reporte 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. The deadlock was broken when Louis XVI, on 27 June, 1789, ordered the other estates to meet with the Third Estate as one body. Thus, the Estates-General gave place to the National Assembly. The Limited Monarchy of the second period of the Active French Revolution covered the years 1789-1792. This limited monarchy was dominated by mesocratic, that is, middle class or bourgeois tendencies.

After the recognition of the National Assembly, insurrections broke out all over France. On 14 July, a parisian mob 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 after 17 July, soon replaced the Bourbon standard of white studded with golden fleur-de-les. This revolutionary act was followed by the "August Days."

A wave of disorders after 14 July had swept France. After hearing a long report made by a special investigating committee, the members of the assembly attacked the
privilege of the upper classes. A frenzy of generosity seized the Assembly. Noble vied with noble, clergymen with clergymen, and citizen with citizen in renouncing their privilege. Manorial courts, serfdom, feudal and servile dues, and equality of taxation were all involved in this emotional outburst. The "August resolves" were consolidated into one decree which was promulgated after the heat of the emotional wave had subsided. This decree made very few practical changes in the existing economic and social conditions.\(^1\)

The events of the "October days" (5-6 October, 1789) helped to show to what extent the people were suffering. On 5 October, a so-called mob of market 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, further, insisted upon his moving to Paris. This move to Paris took place on 6 October, 1789.

An interim step of the National Assembly was to draw up a Declaration of Rights. The Marquis de Lafayette had proposed, on 11 July, 1789, that such a declaration should precede the Constitution. The Assembly decided on 14 July that the Constitution would have a Declaration of the Rights of Man.\(^2\) Among the interesting declarations proposed were those of Lafayette, Mounier (a revision of Lafayette's), Target, de Servan, Sieyes, and Gouges-Carton.\(^3\)
Splendid arguments and notable additions were contributed by Malouet, Du Pont de Nemours, Alexandre de Lameth, Lally-Tollendal, Barnave, Talleyrand, and Mirabeau. A group led by the Jansenist, Camus, and including Abbe Gregaire, the Duke of Levis, and the Bishop of Chartres, demanded that the declaration be drawn up as a Declaration of Rights and Duties. The suggestion was rejected in favor of a document relating only to the rights of man. After long discussion (20-26 August, 1789) the Declaration of Rights was adopted by the National Assembly on 26 August and sanctioned by the king on 5 October, 1789. In this document they enunciated a doctrine of natural rights. They declared that man has a right to "liberty, property, security and resistance to oppression."

The absolutist monarchy was to be 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, religions, and economic conditions.

As there were notable changes in these fields, so were there notable changes in the social field. Piety and paternalism of the preceding period had given way to philosophy. This new 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
society, the controls of its functions, and its practices. The "cults" of civism were dominated by two theoretical groups: the Utilitists and the Perfectibilists. The philanthropism of the utilitists and the theophanthropism of the perfectibilists sought voluntary progressive racial regeneration; while civism demanded "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," that is, civic justice and a chance at 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 and relief. As has been seen, the cahiers, together with the provincial assemblies practically dictated a program of social reform to the National Constituent Assembly.5

Presently we shall see how the National Assembly was made very aware of the unemployment problem. The pamphlet material of Bonnerf, Foulletier, Grisard, Villiers, Houard, Poyet, Lambert, Mittie, and others were read by local and district assemblies, as well as by members of the National Assembly. We shall soon see how the subsequent writings of Lambert, Bailly, Rueballes, Fromant, and others were to affect the liberal and progressively minded deputies of the National
Assembly. The Committee on Mendicancy, as will be shown, is a direct result of the influence of these writings and individuals. These eminent individuals include such men as Lambert, Dumetz, Barnove, and La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt. The creation of the Committee on Mendicancy will be considered because of its outstanding value as a research group. It studied the problems of relief. Legislation proposed by this Committee, we will find, was based upon its theories and long range planning. The relief work at Paris during the early months of 1789 has already been discussed in the preceding chapter. The further development of the Paris situation, the shutdown of the Montmartre projects, and the beginning of a new work relief program will be presented in Chapter II of Part II. This chapter will show that all the theory, work, and planning of the Committee on Mendicancy was not in vain. The program for relief did not stagnate. Pressure from the outside, as well as from the Committee itself, found fruition in a number of decrees. Also we will find there was a practical working out of numerous theories and proposed solutions. Toward the close of this period, 1789-1791, we shall see much progress had been made toward the concept of national responsibility for relieving unemployment and its attendant evils.

During the period preceding the meeting of 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 further advanced by numerous memorials sent to the National Assembly by individuals or organized groups. Point was given to this feeling in May by a proposal of the Third Estate Deputies that the king cut down on festivities in order to save the money for poor relief. On 9 June, 1789, a member proposed that they renew their pleas to the Clergy, again asking them to join with the Third Estate and plan together measures for relieving public misery. Actively supporting this proposal was Bailly, Dean of the Third Estate deputies and later the first president of the National Assembly. On 17 June, 1789, the president of the National Assembly sent a letter to the representatives of the Nobility expressing a desire to see the three Orders united for the verification of powers and more particularly to discuss ways and means of relieving public misery which was now so acute. Target and Le Chapelier submitted, on 19 June, 1789, a proposal for creating a committee to consider the problem of relief. Action was taken by the Assembly and a temporary committee of thirty-two members, called the Committee on Subsistence, was appointed. This committee, on that same day, undertook the task of studying the causes and proposing remedies for the recent crop failure. This committee lasted only a short time, for on 13 October,
1789, it was suppressed as being no longer useful. M. Fremont, Master of Surgery, presented to the National Assembly, on 3 October, 1789, a project which would provide free medical and surgical aid to the poor in all the provinces. Du Tremblay de Ruebelles sent to the National Assembly a pamphlet entitled "Memorial on the Destruction of Mendicancy." This treatise, of 28 November, 1789, urged the increase and perfection of the offices for supplying charity and work (bureaux et ateliers de charité). In the meantime, a relief-works program had already started in Paris. The extensive Montmartre project, previously discussed in the preceding chapter, was now well under way. Its climax, abuses, and final shut-down appear in the following chapter.

As we will note in the discussion of social legislation in the National Assembly, our attention is focused on one outstanding liberal noble (member of the nobility) who firmly believed in the obligation of the state toward the poor.

The notable genius back of all the philanthropic work of the National Constituent Assembly was Francois-Alexandre-Frederic, Duke de la Rochefoucauld-Liancourt. This great peer was born at Roche-Guyon, Lower Seine, 11 January, 1747, of illustrious, opulent parents. During his early years he spent much time between Roche-Guyon and
Liancourt. He had studied physical sciences in preference to other subjects. He had travelled in England and on the continent as well as throughout France. Later in life his humanitarian interest brought him to the United States during the years 1795, 1796, and 1797. He associated with the great men of his time including statesmen, economists, and scientists. A member of the army under the Ancient Regime, he held the rank of Colonel. Army life nor court life appealed to him. He soon became interested in rural life which seemed to be undergoing a veritable renaissance during the last thirty years of the Eighteenth Century. He was counted among the founders of the Royal Agricultural Society. In 1785 he presented a memorial to this society on the cultivation of the turnip and on the proper care of stock.

The year 1786 saw Liancourt as one of the leading philanthropists of late Eighteenth Century France. Hygiene, relief work and assistance of various types, and universal education for all the people were the principal ideas that directed the remainder of his life. He was practical in his agricultural interests; operating a large farm, importing new agricultural school. Already he had founded (ca 1780) on his farm at Faience de la Montagne the first school for technical instruction in France. The school was both military and professional. It was his idea
to teach a useful trade to the young people. The chief objective or ultimate end for which his schools were founded was to give to the French nation educated, laborious citizens, not indigent, shiftless, and ignorant soldiers. In 1786 this technical school, with an enrollment of more than one hundred students was placed under royal protection by Louis XVI. Liancourt continued to preach his doctrines by example. Upon the grounds of his Chateau he established two factories, one manufacturing woolens and the other spinning cotton. He further used his wealth in aiding hospitals. His firm belief in relief through providing work was the guiding motive of his work as chairman of the Committee on Mendicancy of the Constituent Assembly.

France was still suffering from the bad effects of the 1786 Eden treaty. Conditions grew worse. The severe winter of 1788-1789 brought with it increased suffering. Numerous recent crop failures had led to a scarcity of grain. Mendicancy and vagabondage increased. These social evils soon developed into serious lawlessness. The relief problem became very acute and memorialising pleas consequently increased. These finally stirred the National Constituent Assembly to action.

The creation of a Committee on Mendicancy 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, of workmen, and of mendicants. 15

The Assembly received, 4 December, 1789, a treatise 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 previously published pamphlets on the draining of marshes. 16 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 nation, it is needful to encourage useful works, to prevent emigrations, and to bring about a union of the charitable foundations and establishments." 17

On 18 December, 1789, the Commune of Paris sent six deputies to the National Assembly to ask that body to consider the petitions of Boncerf and Lambert. 18 Virieu proposed a committee of seven members to examine the documents sent in by Boncerf and Lambert. 19 Petion de Villeneuve held "that the creation of this committee would be dangerous, that being deprived of active means for
succoring the poor in a useful manner, the Assembly ought not to meddle in projects foreign to it." Gillet de la Jacqueminiere suggested 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 Spectateur National of Paris on 21 December, 1789, an anonymous letter from a citizen of the district of the Mathurins. The unknown author suggested to the mayor of Paris the opening of a subscription for the poor and the appointment of a committee to receive and dispense these subscriptions. This suggestion was followed on the 16 January, 1790, by another from Boutteville-Dumetz, who proposed to the National Assembly the nomination 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 establishment of workshops as a means of poor relief.

In a letter of 20 January, 1790, addressed to the National Constituent Assembly, Bailly, mayor of Paris and a leader in the Assembly, indeed its president in July, 1789, stressed the extreme misery existing in Paris. He spoke of honest men, who lacking work, were reduced to beggary. In this letter Bailly begged the Assembly to consider very earnestly the condition of the poor. Even the king had
sponsored some workshops for men. Bailly, himself, proposed to take the charity funds at his disposal as mayor and create spinning shops for poor unemployed women. Indeed, Bailly later collected funds privately and established a small workshop. This workshop operated quite successfully for several months. The Assembly appeared impressed by Bailly's pleas and later by his practical demonstration, although it was slow taking positive action.25

On 21 January, 1790, Bailly's letter, which had been received the day before, was read. Barnove was so impressed that he immediately proposed a decree. He stated in this decree that the Assembly was not in a position to deliberate in the manner suggested by the latter. The decree urged the appointment of four commissioners to receive whatever gifts the individual Assembly members proposed to contribute. Liancourt moved as an amendment that these four commissioners be required to present views on some means of wiping out mendicancy. Barnove's decree as amended by Liancourt was accepted.26

By the end of January, 1790, the National Constituent Assembly had appointed La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt, Francois Simmonet de Coulmiers, the Abbe d'Abbécourt, Massieu, parish-priest of Gergy (Oise), and Prieur, deputy of the third estate from Chalons-sur-Marne, as the four commissioners
provided for in the decree of 21 January, 1790. From time to time other members were added until the Committee numbered nineteen with La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt as its president. Some of these members had been elected by the National Constituent Assembly while others, because of their particular competence, had been chosen by the Committee 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; Villotrix de Faye, Bishop of Oleron; Lambert, inspector of hospitals, apprentices; Boncercf; Bonnefoy; Seignelay Colbert de Castte Hill, Bishop of Rodez; Du Tremblay de Rubelle; de Cretot; Barer de Vreuzac; Lucien David; Virien; Perisse du Luc; and Dr. Joseph-Ignace Guillotin.

Some idea of the importance of these men to the Committee on Mendicancy can be had from the biographical notes which follow.

François-Simonet de Coulmiers, Lord of Escolmiers (frequently called Abbe et legislateur) was born at Dijon (Cite d'Or) 30 September, 1741. His parents were Jacques Simonet Descombers and Anne Rougeot. François was a member of the order of the Premonstratensians and later became Abbe of Abbecourt. While holding this position he was elected, 1 May, 1789, deputy of the clergy of Paris.
(outside the walls) to the Estates-General. He allied himself with the reformers and submitted to the Civil Constitution of the clergy. François Simonet de Coulmiers was given his first assignment of importance 19 June, 1789, when he was made a member of the Committee on Subsistence. Later the Constituent Assembly, on 21 January, 1790, made Coulmiers a member of the Committee on Mendicancy. He remained active in government affairs, serving in the Corps Legislatif and later as Director Administrator of the Hospice of Charenton. He died at Paris, 4 June, 1818. 29

Associated with Coulmiers on the Committee on Mendicancy was Jean-Baptiste Massieu, who was to become a constitutional bishop, noted legislator and archivist. He was born 17 September, 1743, at Pontoise (Seine-et-Oise) and died at Brussels 6 June, 1818. At the outbreak of the Revolution he was a parish priest of Gergy. Elected to the Estates-General 21 March, 1789, as deputy of the Clergy from the bailliage of Senlis, he later (22 December, 1789) became secretary of the Constituent Assembly. Massieu was active as a member of the Society of Friends of the Constitution (Jacobin Club). Bishop Massieu, having taken the civil oath required of the clergy, was elected by the department of Oise as its deputy to the National Convention. Here he became a member of the Committee on Public Instruction. He voted for the death of Louis XVI. In 1793 he resigned his
episcopal office, married, and was sent as government envoy to Ardennes and Marne. At one time Massieu was denounced as a Terrorist but was later liberated. He soon became archivist of the War Department which position he held from 1794 to 1815. His last service was rendered as professor at the Central School of Versailles. Exiled in 1816, he died 6 June, 1818, at Brussels.30

Prominent among those selected for the Committee on Mendicancy was Pierre-Louis Prieur, born at Sommesous (Marne) 1 August, 1756. A lawyer in the parliament of Chalous-sur-Marne and an ardent revolutionary, Prieur was elected 24 March, 1789, to the Estates-General. His activity won for him a place on the Committees of General Security and Public Safety. Prieur was later exiled and died at Brussels 31 May, 1827.31

The interest shown by Charles-Antoine-Joseph-Leclerc de Montlinot in the welfare of the unfortunate is perhaps responsible for his being selected for the Committee on Mendicancy. Montlinot was born at Crespy-en-Valois in 1732. At first he was a monk of St. Pierre de Lille but quit the order in 1765 and became a bookseller in Paris. Necker appointed him inspector of the mendicancy depot of Soissons in 1778. During the Revolution he became head of the bureau of civil hospices under the executive Commission on Public Aid. He became a sort of under-
secretary of the Department of Interior in An VI (1797). As a result of his work as director of the depot de mendicite of Soissons, he published (1786) a pamphlet "Actual Conditions Existing at the Depot of Soissons." The preface to this pamphlet contained his essay on mendicancy. This pamphlet was printed by the royal government at Paris in 1789. Montlinot served as first superintendent of the School of Veterinary Science at Alfort. He died at Paris in 1805.32

It is natural to assume that men in the field of medicine would be interested in other phases of aiding the poor. Such a man was Michel-Augustin Thouret, born 5 September, 1749. Being an outstanding physician and surgeon, Thouret was made inspector-general of hospitals. He was elected to membership in the Royal Society of Medicine in 1776 and attached to the Bureau of Nurses for the bourgeois of Paris. He was one of the first members of the Academy of Medicine and in 1794 became director of the School of Health. His political activities led him into the Tribunat in 1802 and later as a member of the Corps Legislatif. In 1809 he was appointed Counselor to the University of Paris and was later made dean of its Faculty of Medicine. He died at Bas Meudon 19 June, 1810.33

Antoine-Louis Chaumont de la Milliere was born 25 October, 1746, at Paris. After holding varied government
positions, La Milliere took over that of Intendant of bridges and public highways in 1781. He gave up this position to accept one that placed him in charge of all that referred to hospitals and mendicant depots. In 1787 he refused the post of Controller-General which had been vacated by the fall of Calonne's ministry. Several times during the Revolution he was arrested as an emigre and subsequently released. Ill health caused him to refuse further political positions. He died at Paris in 1803.34

Very little is known of the life of Jean-Baptiste-Auguste Villoutrix de Faye, Bishop of Oloron, deputy to the Estates-General for the clergy of the district of Soule. According to the Dictionnaire des Parlementaires, he died in April, 1792, but according to other sources, he died in 1798 in England where he had fled as a refugee.35

Perhaps no one has written as much on the problem of humanitarian relief yet about whom so little is known as Lambert. He is constantly referred to only as "Lambert, inspector of apprentices of the various divisions comprising the great General Hospital of Paris." As early as 1777, in a brochure addressed to the Academy of Chalons, he posed as champion of the poor. He continued to display this interest in five pamphlets published in 1789 or shortly thereafter. These brochures were discussed in the preceding chapter.36
Like Lambert, Pierre Francois de Boncerf also wrote extensively on the problem of the unemployed. He was born about 1736 at Chasot. At the age of 57 years he became a member of the Royal Agricultural Society. Among his many administrative duties, he was an engineer, treasurer and administrator of the district of St. Etienne-du-Mont at Paris, administrator of public buildings of the Commune of Paris (19 October, 1791), member of the Legislative Assembly and intendant of the house of Orleans. Because of his economic proposals, he was offered the directorship of the department of bridges and highways, which he refused. The economic projects which he submitted aimed at improving the agricultural and commercial welfare of the nation and at the same time providing work for the able-bodied poor. These proposals have been presented in the preceding chapter.37

Another member of this notable Committee on Mendicancy was Louis de Bonnefoy born at Thiers 3 July, 1748. He was a monk of Saint-Gemes de Thiers and grand vicar of Angouleme when he was elected deputy of the clergy from the senechaussee of Riom. His liberal views led him to accept the civil constitution of the clergy. He died 14 July, 1791, at Saint-Victor (Puy-de-Dome).38

The very active interest shown by the Bishop of Rodez reflects the sterling qualities of his illustrious
predecessor, Colbert, seventeenth century economist and minister of Louis XVI. De Seignelay-Colbert de Castle Hill, Bishop of Rodez and deputy to the Estates-General, was born in 1736 at the Ancient Colbert seat of Castle-Hill, Scotland. He was sent to France at an early age. He entered the service of the church and made rapid progress. At twenty-six he had already served as head of the abbeys of Val Richer and Soreze and as vicar general of Toulouse. He was elevated to the bishopric of Rodez in 1781. His contributions to public welfare as president of the provincial Assembly of Haut-Guienne attracted the attention of Louis XVI who invited him to two Assemblies of Notables. In 1789 de Seignelay-Colbert was elected deputy to the Estates-General by the clergy of the senechaussee of Rodez. Although a prudent conciliatory man, he was animated by true popular sentiments. He desired to see the Estates-General become one body through a union of the three orders. Colbert was the first of seven bishops to join the Third-Estate in constituting the National Assembly. He favored the adoption of serious reforms, especially those that would lead to the relief of the suffering poor. Hence, Colbert was made a member of the Committee on Rules and the Committee on Mendicancy. Believing his position and that of the Church were threatened by the Civil Constitution of the clergy, he left Paris and lived as an emigre in London. He further refused to
recognize the Concordat of 1802 and remained in London where he served as secretary to Louis XVIII, dying in 1813, at London.  

Liancourt was fortunate in having on his committee the accountant Antoine-Pierre Du Tremblay de Rubelles (1745-1819). He was an administrator of the Department of Paris, Commissioner of the National Treasury, and later a member of the Directory. Du Tremblay de Rubelles published a pamphlet entitled "Memoire sur la destruction de la Mendicite." The National Constituent Assembly, considering this pamphlet to be of much significance in dealing with the problem of mendicancy, ordered it published as an annex to the proceedings of 28 November, 1789.  

Jean-Baptiste de Cretot, a merchant, was born at Louviers 9 March, 1743. He became assessor of this city in 1772. The Third-Estate of the bailliage of Rouen elected him as their deputy to the Estates-General. In 1804 Cretot received the decoration of the Legion of Honor, and on 18 June, 1809, was created a knight of the Empire. He died 9 May, 1817.  

Lucien David, a parish priest of Lormaison, born at Beauvais 13 October, 1730, was the clerical deputy of the bailliage of Beauvais and a liberal in the Constituent, but in 1792 he became an emigre.
Joseph-Ignace Guillotin (1738-1814), doctor-regent of the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Paris, was for many years a friend and colleague of La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt. Elected to the Constituent as a deputy of the Third-Estate from the city of Paris, he became best known for sponsoring use of the guillotine. Positions he held with the assembly included those of member of the Central Committee on Animal Vaccine (where he had previously collaborated with Liancourt), and of president of the Academic Society of Medicine. While serving as a member of the Committee on Mendicancy, Dr. Guillotin was appointed by the Constituent Assembly as president of its Health Committee. Indeed it was Dr. Guillotin, who, on 12 September, 1790, suggested that the Assembly create a committee on public health.\(^{43}\)

Count Francois-Henri Virieu, a liberal nobleman, was given a place on the Committee on Mendicancy. He was born at Grenoble in 1752. Virieu, a deputy of the nobility of Dauphine, and their representative at the National Constituent Assembly, was also elected to the Committee on Subsistences, 19 June, 1789. He was a colonel of the regiment of Limousin-Infanterie and knight of Saint-Louis. He and the column he was commanding were wiped out, 8 October, 1793, in the last attack during the siege of Lyon.\(^{44}\)
Jean-André Perisse du Luc, printer and book-seller, was born at Lyon 4 July, 1738. The Third Estate of the Senechaussee of Lyon elected him as their deputy to the Estates-General. Perisse du Luc was made inspector of the National Government Printing Office and Commissioner for the printing of the assignats. He became, at first, counsel of the prefecture of Rhone and later counsel general of Rhone. The other positions he filled in the Constituent Assembly, besides the Committee on Mendicancy, were on the Committee on Constitution (7 July, 1789), Committee on Health (30 September, 1789), and the Committee on Colonies (25 August, 1791).\(^45\)

After noting the significant biographical data on the members of the Committee on Mendicancy, let us now consider the work of the Committee itself. This Committee was very active from its first session, 2 February, 1790, until its last session, 25 September, 1791. There were exactly seventy sessions.\(^46\) Its work embraced relief for the poor in the cities and in the rural districts, succor for foundlings, aid for the infirm and sick, employment for the able-bodied poor, and suppression of mendicancy. Later, houses of correction and prisons were brought within the scope of this Committee. Its productive genius was Liancourt who worked very assiduously, drawing up the questionnaires, directing the researches and visits, and writing the Committee's monumental reports which were both scientific
and doctrinaire.47

In order to carry on such an extensive program, the Committee was divided into sections and the work was distributed among these sections. The first and second allocations made on 26 April and 2 June, 1790, proved not to be very feasible. They were followed by a third and more workable allocation on 3 September. This general distribution of work among its members was as follows:

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

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

3. On aid for the foundlings:
   Prieur, Dr. Guillotin, and Montlinot.

4. On funds:
   Liancourt, du Tremblay de Rubelle, and Thouret.

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

6. On aid for the infirm:
   The Bishop of Rodez, Dr. Guillotin, and Thouret.
7. On mendicants and the suppression of mendicancy:
   Liancourt, Montlinot, and Thouret.

8. On transportation:
   Liancourt.\(^{48}\)

Aside from this general distribution of work, each member was charged with the investigation, examination, and planning of specific projects which he reported to the Committee. Here they were discussed before being presented to the National Constituent Assembly.

Definite relationships were established with the other committees of the National Assembly. In this connection, Liancourt very jealously guarded the domain of his committee's operation and permitted no encroachments. This was clearly seen in his opposition to the Assembly's proposal for giving part of his work to the newly created Committee on Health (Comité de Sante or Comité de Salubrité). This Committee on Health had taken over the relief of the sick among the poor. Liancourt reproached Dr. Guillotin, a member of this recently organized committee, for having forgotten the deliberations of the Committee on Mendicancy on this very subject; deliberations in which Guillotin had taken part. Liancourt, assisted by Malouet, succeeded in having the National Assembly declare that it did not intend by its decree of 12 September, 1790, to give to the Committee on Health any functions previously assigned to the Committee
on Mendicancy. Aside from this slight friction which grew out of a misunderstanding of overlapping functions, these two committees thenceforth worked together very harmoniously.49

The proposed legislation for the extinction of mendicancy was referred by the National Assembly, at the instance of Liancourt, to the Constitutional Committee and the Committee on Jurisprudence (Judiciary Committee).50 The Committee on Finance was consulted on the subject of canal projects, and relief funds for beggars and for hospitals as well as other matters involving funds.51 A decree of the National Constituent Assembly ordered the Committees on Agriculture, Domains, Finance, and Mendicancy to meet jointly and prepare a report on aid and work to be distributed throughout the departments.52

The Committee on Researches was consulted concerning measures to be taken against mendicancy. This committee was also asked to consider the subject of a decree relative to the charity workshops.53 The ecclesiastical Committee was called in to give its advice on hospitals, since the majority of such institutions either belonged to or were under the direction of religious organizations. This Committee was also asked for its advice on the administration and sale of hospital and national property, and above all, the suppression of fetes. Numerous fetes, certainly did reduce the effective number of working days.54 The
suggestions and advice of the Committee on Domains and the Committee on Alienation were also solicited by the Committee on Mendicancy. Moreover, Liancourt sought to enlist the services of various scientific groups. The Royal Medical Society was consulted with respect to the projects of the Committee dealing with aid for the indigent sick in both urban and suburban centers, and for projects dealing with the establishing of surgeons in the rural districts, and projects dealing with the hospitals of Paris. On its part the Royal Society of Agriculture similarly collaborated with Liancourt's Committee in studying the means to combat mendicancy. The Committee on Mendicancy 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 Mendicancy sent out circulars to the intendants, to the departments, to the districts, and to the municipalities.

La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt did not content himself with correspondence alone. He received and heard individuals as well as group deputations who brought to his committee their suggestions and remedies. Thus, on 31 May, 1790, a deputation from the Agricultural Society presented their
views on mendicancy. On the same day Bailly, a mayor of Paris, headed a group which presented a project for the construction of a canal that would provide work for hundreds of the unemployed. A joint deputation composed of representatives from the district of Saint-Jacques-du-Haut-Pas and the district of Val-de-Grace called on the Committee on Mendicancy, 23 June, 1790, to present their plan for home relief (Assistance a domicile). On 30 October, 1790, the Committee listened to the Abbe Sicard who discussed his plan for aiding the deaf and dumb. A deputation from Mauconseil was admitted to the session of the 19 November, 1790, to discuss means of aiding the poor of their section. The administrators of the Department of Seine-et-Oise, appearing before the Committee on 24 November, 1790, asked aid for the laborers who were unemployed as a result of the chomage existing throughout that department. On 4 April, 1791, the deputies of Amiens visited the Committee on Mendicancy and requested funds to be used in securing work for the unemployed of the Department of the Somme.60

Apart from these conferences with visiting deputations of interested civic groups and individuals, Liancourt also considered what was being done elsewhere in Europe; more particularly, England. He had previously sojourned in England (1768 and afterward) and was quite impressed with what he saw. He had studied the English
relief institutions both at first hand and through correspondence. Liancourt's sons had spent some time at Bury St. Edmund's in Suffolk County. He studied the workhouse system of Suffolk County. The report on the regulations and operation of the houses of correction of Suffolk County, which Liancourt read to his Committee on 30 April, 1790, was the direct result of his personal observations supplemented by those of his sons made while at Bury St. Edmund's. The English poor tax and the operation of the poor houses, however, he did not like. Liancourt carried on a rather extended correspondence with Dr. Alexander Hunter and Dr. Richard Price, both of whom were interested in medicine, agriculture, and philanthropy. Two of these letters will show the comparative interest Liancourt had in the English institutions. Both were written by him in the name of and with the authorization of the Committee on Mendicancy. The first letter, dated 23 April, 1790, was written to Dr. Hunter, one of the founders of the York Hospital for the Insane. Liancourt asked Dr. Hunter for information on the administrative and other procedures involved in the operation of a large insane asylum. The letter, dated 1 November, 1790, was written to Dr. Price for material on the policy of the English in dealing with the insane and on their methods of handling illegitimate children. 61 These letters, visits, and exchange of ideas
show how France attempted to profit by such examples as a sister nation, experiencing like social conditions, might have to offer.

The members of the Committee on Mendicancy utilized a number of contemporary works of philanthropic and humanitarian character. These included the pamphlets of Montlenot, du Tremblay de Rubelle, Lambert, Boncerf, Regnier, Dupre, Vollant, the proceedings of the provincial assemblies, Arthur Young's *Annals of Agriculture*, John Howard's book on prisons and hospitals, and Becarria's *Crime and Punishment*.

Liancourt's committee would not be satisfied merely with the correspondence with administrative officials, with the receiving of deputations nor the using of specially prepared monographs. 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. Then 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 admirable organization of the work of the Committee on Mendicancy by La Rochefoucauld-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 containing recommendations for remedial legislation. Although there were numerous other reports, these seven stand out as being the most general and yet comprehensive ones and are therefore more suitable for our study.65

The first of these reports was made by Liancourt to the National Constituent Assembly on 12 June, 1790. The First Report was an exposition of the general principles which had directed its work. Assistance of the poor was considered a social duty, but only in exchange for a payment in work.66 If it is granted that those who live in the nation have the right to say to society "Give me the wherewithal to live (Faites-moi vivre)" then society equally has the right to say to him "Give me your labor (Donne-moi ton travail)." The misery of the people was considered, in this report, to be a fault of the government. If the state does not provide work for those who need it, then the state is favoring mendicancy, vagabondage, and makes itself guilty of the crimes that grow out of these evils. Assistance ought to be provided for by the Constitution since it was not included in the Declaration of the Rights of Man.67 Without such provision, the Constitution would be imperfect since this unfortunate group is an integral part of some society. Therefore, any legislation which governs this class of people necessarily ought to be a part of that constitution
set up for governing society. Otherwise, these sentiments on relief would remain a beautiful concept with no legislative means of giving it life. Such legislation as may have as its objective to aid the poor should have in view principally the undertaking of researches aimed at destroying the basic causes of poverty. Means of securing work or providing work should be sought through the expansion of agricultural and manufacturing enterprises. Liancourt here clearly indicated as never the necessity of cooperation with the other committees. Problems pertaining to funds necessary for relief would be discussed with the committees on taxation and finances. Those dealing with methods of wiping out mendicancy would be discussed with the Committee on Jurisprudence. This type of collaboration, he indicated, would take place before the Committee on Mendicancy would present any reports or projects for decrees to the Assembly. In this first report Liancourt outlined the plan of procedure the Committee intended to follow. The following are the outstanding points in the plan:

1. A study of the existing state of legislation throughout the kingdom relative to the poor and to beggars.

2. A report on the bases for the distribution of aid in the different departments, districts and municipalities, their administration, and
the general tie-up of this branch of legislation and administration with the Constitution of the kingdom.

3. A report on the estimation of funds assigned to the division of assistance.

4. A report on the amount of assistance given to the unfortunates of various ages and circumstances of life.

5. A report on methods dealing with beggars who refuse to work.68

In concluding, Liancourt added that the Committee's work would embrace the hospitals, hospices, and prisons. 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, the useful practices that ought to be followed and the glaring abuses that ought to be shunned. This first report was well received by the Assembly which ordered that it be printed and widely distributed.69

The Second Report, 15 July, 1790, dealt with the actual status of the legislation of the government relative to hospitals and mendicancy. This survey contained a historical account of the administration and royal legislation concerning hospitals in France from their origin up to 1790, the time of this report.70 The report's most important feature, from the standpoint of unemployment
relief, was its criticism of the way in which the Ancien Regime had handled the problem of assistance.\textsuperscript{71} It was found that the Ancien Regime had, more or less half-heartedly, interested itself in preventing misery rather than relieving suffering.\textsuperscript{72} Very little had been done in that era to support industry. This critique further stated that the legislation of the Ancien Regime on assistance was imperfect and dangerous because it was not founded on the common basis of politics and justice. In conclusion, Liancourt, as reporter, declared that the task before the Assembly was, without doubt, difficult; 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.\textsuperscript{73}

The subject matter and proposed legislation of the Third Report, originally presented on 15 July, 1790, were centered on the constitutional bases of the general system of legislation and administration of relief. This report was revised and resubmitted on 21 January, 1791. This later date of the report does not prevent its inclusion here in the logical sequence of the seven reports.\textsuperscript{74} It stressed the necessity of collecting all the hospital and other resources devoted to charity and poor relief into a common fund to be placed at the disposal of the national government.\textsuperscript{75}
This report criticised the idea of a municipal poor tax. The burden of relief would not be shared equally. Those sections in which the need was greatest usually were those in which the resources were least. A national legislation would prevent some of the injustice and inequality attendant upon local taxation and distribution. 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.  

Liencourt, in the name of the Committee on Mendicancy, presented a project for a decree which consisted of twenty-nine articles. The first article asserted that the National Assembly should place in the category of its most sacred duties the relief of the poor of all ages and circumstances. This relief, as well as the expenses to be incurred in the extinction of mendicancy, should be supported by public revenue. Article 2 provided that sums for such expenses would be given to each department for the type of relief set up in Article 1. The funds would be distributed in proportion to the number of active and inactive inhabitants, that is, the number of employed and unemployed inhabitants. The average pay for a day's work in each department would be used in determining the amount to be given. These funds were to be used to give assistance to foundlings, the sick, the infirm, the aged, through relief
workshops (ateliers de secours), houses of correction, and other expenses relative to assistance and the wiping out of mendicancy. The sums, for these relief workshops, would be given to the departments who in turn would augment them in proportion to the amounts received. These distributions must have the approbation of the National Assembly and the sanction of the king. Each department would set up a relief council or bureau to be composed of citizens, other than members of its assembly, who would be charged with the details of the general administration of relief in that department. These departmental councils would be composed of four persons selected by the electors of that department. The agency for the district would be composed of two members elected in the same manner. Provision would be made for a police committee presided over by a justice of the peace to look after the houses of correction. In order to be eligible for assistance the individual must be a resident of the canton in which he applies for aid. His application must be supported by affidavits of two eligible persons living in his canton. 78

This article was designed to reduce the number of vagabonds who roved from canton to canton. The proposition as stated in Article 1 of the proposed decree found in the Third Report of Liancourt was further elaborated and presented to the Assembly as the Fourth Report of this series of seven reports.
The Fourth Report appears as an annex to the 31 August, 1790, deliberations of the National Constituent Assembly. At the evening session of that date, Liancourt asked permission to read the Fourth Report which had been prepared for the Assembly by his Committee on Mendicancy. But for some unknown reason the report was never read to that body. However, it was printed and distributed pursuant to the decree of 12 June, 1790.

Although the National Assembly seemed too occupied for the reading of such a lengthy report, the report, nevertheless, merits some consideration here. This report is notable not only for its immediate grasp of the existing situation; but because of its broad views on unemployment and relief, its far-reaching vision, and its ideas on a general national program of assistance. In this report, the Committee recommended relief for the sick, both in the city and rural sections, aid for foundlings, aid for the aged and infirm, relief for the able-bodied unemployed poor 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 work individually for those who lacked it. The government must encourage the will to work which is so essential to national prosperity. It must not undertake to secure work for those who are not absolutely
unable to find it for themselves. At the same time, Liancourt 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 multiplication and expansion of those devices which make work possible.

The national government through its agencies should encourage agriculture, commerce and industry, but its intervention therein should be indirect. The Committee on Mendicancy, supported by the Ecclesiastic Committee and the Committee on Agriculture, strongly advocated diminishing the number of festive holidays because they cut down the number of working days and created unnecessary expense and idleness. The projected decree requested that a fund be set aside for workshop aids (ateliers de secours), which fund was to be augmented twenty-five per cent (25%) by the departments. The departments, in an emergency created by a shortage of work, were to facilitate work by means of temporary advances to industries which were more or less permanently established.

Thus far, we have noted the evolution of the Assembly's Committee on Mendicancy. As has been pointed out, the Committee conducted important researches on the causes and possible solutions for this unprecedented unemployment crisis. The result of such researches we have seen summarized in their reports and reflected in their
projected legislation. Theories advocated by Committee members were not entirely abstract ones. Although the National Assembly did not enact the proposed legislation, it nevertheless was aware of the alarming need for immediate social legislation. The Montmartre project had been shut down and new programs undertaken. These new ventures, which will perhaps show the indirect influence of the Committee, will be discussed in the following chapter. The program of new appropriations and new workshops pursuant to later enactments will also appear in the following chapter which is devoted to the practical working out of the Assembly's relief program. The critical situation, especially in Paris, was aggravated by a threatened closure of the projects operating under the decree of May, 1790. Although Liancourt's Fourth Report and proposed decrees were not given a hearing by the Assembly, he still was regarded as the leader in fighting for assistance and unemployment relief. His leadership brought about new legislation on 31 August, 1790, as we shall see in Chapter II of Part II.

In spite of the apparent disregard of its suggested legislation, the Committee continued its studies and reports. The Fifth Report of 1 September, 1790, represented the first budget on matters of relief. The remedial legislation recommended an expenditure to be distributed as follows:
For the care of sick (urban and suburban; including fees for surgeons and physicians) . . . . . . . . 12,000,000 livres

For securing work for able-bodied poor in charity workshops (approximately 60,000 livres to each department) . . . . 5,000,000 livres

For work houses, houses of correction, and the suppression of mendicancy . . . . . . . . 3,000,000 livres

For the aged, infirm, and foundlings . . . . . . . 27,500,000 livres

For administrative expenses and a reserve fund . . . . . . . . 4,000,000 livres

TOTAL . . . . . . . . 51,500,000 livres

The Committee decided to reduce the budget to 50,000,000 livres before drawing up the final decree to be sent to the Assembly for debate and adoption. Article I of the decree proposed in this Fifth Report would set aside at the beginning of the year (1 January, 1791) an appropriation of 50,000,000 livres for public assistance and expenses relative to the program against mendicancy. The 5,000,000 livres that were to be set aside for the workshop aids (ateliers de secours) were to be divided equally among the various departments. The Committee asked that this estimated budget of fifty millions be appropriated every two years.

This proposed decree was not acted upon by the Assembly, thus suffering the fate of the other projected
decrees. The failure of the Assembly to act at this time was no doubt due to the fact that it had just passed a decree (31 August, 1790) opening new workshops in a number of departments, as well as in Paris. The expediency of these projects seemed to have outweighed the theoretical and national long range planning of the Committee.

The Sixth Report, 31 January, 1791, dealt with the suppression of mendicancy and the creation of houses of correction and other means for dealing with those who were arrested. Habitual offenders were to be transported. Section VII of the Sixth Report discussed houses of correction. The reporter began by noting the humanitarian ideas of Cesare Beccaria, Italian economist and jurist, as set forth in his *Treatise on Crimes and Punishments*. Liancourt wished to reform these houses of correction. He suggested that the work given the inmates be of such a nature as to improve both the inmates and the institution. This report, as did many of the previous ones, struck at the causes of mendicancy and suggested humanitarian methods of dealing with this class of offenders. Although the Constituent ordered the printing of the Sixth Report, it failed to discuss or vote upon the proposals found therein.

The Seventh Report of the Committee on Mendicancy (31 January, 1791) was a summary covering all the researches,
recommendations and projected decrees which had previously appeared in each of the six preceding reports. The Committee again pointed out the fact that a national program of assistance was to be preferred and must be placed on a constitutional basis. The various methods of assisting the poor were reviewed. The budget of 51,500,000 livres proposed in the Fifth Report was again discussed and re-submitted. Other important points reasserted were the allocation of funds among the departments, the bases for such distribution; contributions by the departments, the districts and municipalities; eligibility for assistance, and administrative personnel. This final report was signed by Liancourt, Prieur, Bonnefoy, Decretot, and Massieu (bishop of the department of Oise).92

The objective which the Committee on Mendicancy purposed to accomplish was the nationalization of assistance and unemployment relief. This is clearly seen in each of the preceding reports. Nothing of significant national character was accomplished until the definitive discussion of the Constitution which will be presented in a following chapter.

In view of the approaching constitutional debates, Liancourt and his Committee felt that the least they could do would be to keep the Assembly constantly reminded of the Committee's views and the Assembly's
obligation to the nation. Thus, all previous researches, decisions, projects, and proposed decrees were rechecked, altered and summarized in this immense Seventh Report. This was the last in the series of seven great reports. Of the fourteen extant reports, these seven are the most interesting, and the Seventh, the most extensive and conclusive. This Seventh Report to the National Constituent Assembly was ordered printed by the Assembly which, however, again failed to act upon the proposals made by the Committee.

The failure of the Constituent Assembly to act favorably upon the reports and recommendations of its Committee on Mendicancy did not mean that this body entirely ignored the subject of relief. There can be no doubt that the Assembly was influenced by outside pressure in the form of petitions from local groups, departmental assemblies, and by individuals writing on philanthropy, assistance and other matters of social relief. We shall consider the practical demonstration of this influence.
CHAPTER II

National Constituent Assembly:

Evolution of Practices of State-Controlled Relief

It has been demonstrated that the National Assembly had an open mind regarding the numerous petitions it willingly received from individuals or organized groups. The Assembly was also mindful of the enormous amount of work done by its Committee on Mendicancy in keeping it informed as to the causes and remedies for the miserable condition of the poor and unemployed. It did not completely ignore the pressure exerted by outside groups nor the insistence of its individual members. The crisis immediately called for practical and expedient action, that is, short range planning. The Assembly enacted a number of decrees. The most notable expedient decrees were of these dates: 30 May; 31 August; 4, 16, and 24 December, 1790; 16 June and 25 September, 1791. They were largely the result of practical relief measures being conducted at the time such as the Montmartre project, partly discussed in Chapter II of Part I.

The Montmartre project was well under way by 10 July, 1789. The number of workers had increased to such a strength that they defied an armed force and entered a prison, releasing two of their comrades. Rumors spread that the project workers had quit their jobs. In reply the
workmen issued a pamphlet which was distributed throughout Paris. In it they explained their actions by saying "we are the unfortunate poor, but we are honest; you have nothing to fear from us."¹

There were already by 14 July, 1789, 8,600 laborers divided into fourteen groups. The majority of these groups were in the city of Paris rather than in its environs. There was great fear of possible rioting by the crowd of those yet unemployed. Because of this, one J. P. de Smith, treasury-director (caissier-directeur), and the engineer, Duchemin, pointed out to the Parisian Assembly the prudence of providing continuous work for these unfortunates.² Among these unemployed were now numerous foreigners including Italians, Spaniards, Savoyards and many provincials. Numerous abuses had crept into the operation of this work relief program. Women disguised themselves as men in order to obtain work on the Bastille project because it paid 20 sols per day, but only to men. Bastille workers exacted from the curious public a fee for the privilege of visiting the old fortress which they were being paid to demolish. The deputies of Paris collected, by private subscription, 45,000 livres for relief. Of this amount 20,000 livres were given to the archbishop of Paris for distribution to the unemployed in whatever manner he saw fit.³ Armed vagabonds became a source of danger to the
municipality. They were promised, on 21 July, 1789, nine livres if they would lay down their arms. This compromise was a bad precedent but seemed to be the only immediate practical solution.

Of the 22,000 people employed in the work relief program in August, 1789, 18,000 alone worked on the Montmartre project. They became an unruly group on many occasions. LaFayette was sent on 15 August, 1789, to the workyards of Montmartre to restore order. On 23 August two workers from the Vertu highway project were arrested for threatening to cut their supervisor to pieces. Two others were arrested for having started (fomented) a rebellion against the bookkeepers of the Montmartre project. Cannon were placed at the Montmartre entrance as a safeguard against further trouble. Bailly, mayor of Paris, supported by the Police Committee and a special commission previously appointed on 12 August, 1789, by the Parisian Assembly, sought to shut down these work projects. For among other abuses, they had become dangerous to public peace and security. A regulation was adopted on 17 August, 1789, closing the Montmartre project as of the 23 August. This regulation said that all strangers in Paris should be sent back to their own provinces. Some of the specially appointed commissioners even proposed founding a colony. Article 3 of the regulation of 17 August, 1789, clearly
indicated the principle that the poor ought to be provided for by his own local community. Article 4 reflected the principle later recognized by the Committee on Mendicancy; that principle being "to furnish to the foreign poor a living until he is returned to his own community." This viewpoint was further supported by Article 6 which promised a gratuity of twenty sols to be paid at once. An additional subsidy in the form of travel pay was granted. Travel funds were given at the rate of three sols per league from the place of departure to the end of the journey. When the migrant laborer reached the borders of the province, he automatically lost all claim to the travel pay.

For those unemployed poor who were residents of Paris, Articles 7, 8, and 9 announced the next opening of the workshops. This was evident proof that the city of Paris was not departing altogether from this type of unemployment relief, but that the program would be reorganized along more sound and systematic lines. The police officials of Paris and surrounding territory meanwhile were called upon to patrol the highways and help maintain order during the exodus from Paris. In order to hasten the migration from Paris, the Commune decided that each emigrant should receive, in addition to the gratuity of 20 sols and travel pay, a sum of 12 sols per day for a period of seven days. This dole was to take care of living expenses while
the migrant was looking for a job. This situation is not very different from our own unemployment compensation paid to the unemployed while seeking employment.

With the migration from Paris underway, the Commune now turned its attention to completing the closure of this work project. The shutdown, announced for 23 August, 1789, did not actually take place until 31 August. LaFayette was warned to double his guard. The "Volontaires de la Bastille" were set up in the vicinity as a guarantee against rioting. Four commissioners gave out the passports. The workers appeared two by two, turned in their tools and received 24 sols and a passport. About 4,000 were paid off, terminated, and given passports all without the slightest trouble or murmuring.

There still remained a large number of unemployed in Paris. They continued to be a source of grave concern to the municipality and the Constituent Assembly. Work relief projects (ateliers de charite secours) now were no longer looked upon as repressive measures but as a real and practical means of foresight and assistance. The new program of "ateliers" which opened in September, 1789, was started under a new principle: the right of every man to subsistence. This principle, placed along side of that of assistance through work, made these charity workshops no longer a generous and beneficent gesture of the government.
Instead, in periods of misery and work stoppage, these projects became a means whereby the government paid its debt to society.

The Parisian regulation of 17 August, 1789, fixed the basis for employment in the outdoor workshops. Laborers must be (at least) sixteen years old, a resident of Paris and must be selected by commissioners of the district. The laborers must present a certificate attesting their need for relief.

At the same time the Parisian Municipal Bureau of Public Works actively followed through with the established program of purging the city of its vagabonds and unemployed transients who were not seeking jobs (looking for work). More than 2,000 additional passports were given out. These migrants left Paris, going in all directions. This heavy migration brought complaints from nearby towns. At Dieppe, the influx was so great that the town council set up outdoor workshops for these emigrants who had been forced out of Paris.¹²

Many migrants returned to Paris with the thought of collecting the twenty sol gratuity and travel pay a second, yes, even a third time. Indeed, hundreds of these unfortunates never left Paris.¹³ The municipal government considered the project of constructing (building, digging) a canal from the Ourca to join the Seine and Loire. They
sent out 600 men to work on a canal in Burgundy. 14

Discipline was badly needed. Cellerier, Minister of the king's household, presented a plan for the discipline of the workshops to the Parisian Assembly. This plan was readily accepted. The workers were to be divided into groups of 200 men with supervisors, foremen, and assistant foremen. 15 Despite this breakdown, the number of unemployed steadily increased.

Trouble broke out among the citizens and vagabonds in the faubourg of Saint-Antoine. This incident further proved that the unemployment problem was not one merely of local assistance. It was a national issue vital to public security. Liancourt made a report of the Paris incident to the National Assembly and called upon that body to take action that would alleviate existing conditions. This report was founded upon his observations and the researches undertaken by his Committee.

On 30 May, 1790, Liancourt drew up a decree. 16 He proposed to establish workshops in Paris independently of those already in operation. These projects would provide spinning for the women and children and navvy work (travaux de terre) for the men. 17 The able-bodied beggars (unemployed) were to find employment within eight days or be forced to leave Paris and return to their original homes. 18 Each department under the provisions of the decree of 30 May,
1790, was granted 30,000 livres to be applied to "useful works" which were to be established to relieve the situation. 19

Liancourt stated to the Constituent 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. The project to which he referred was a canal which would connect the Marne from Meaux to the Seine at Paris and go from the Seine along the Oise to Dieppe. Such a canal would prove most useful to the capital as well as to the provinces through which it passed. This canal project was suggested as a very prompt means of employment. A large number of the Assembly demanded an immediate second reading of the proposed decree. Such a reading took place on 30 May, 1790, at which time the entire decree was adopted. 20

Practically for the first time the Committee on Mendicancy expressed its general views on the question of assistance to the able-bodied poor (pauvres valides). Also, for the first time, the Committee was going to undertake a work essentially temporary and empirical in character and founded upon principles more or less intangible. The decree of 30 May, 1790, which the Committee sponsored, renewed some of the tradition of the Ancient Regime ateliers which had been abandoned by the ateliers of Montmartre and those of
September, 1789. On the other hand, it was going to enact a program based on the principles of justice and the right of the poor to assistance but only in exchange for work. It was the application of these new ideas which gave the ateliers of the Revolution their distinct originality.

As has already been noted, this decree of 30 May, 1790, provided heavy outdoor work for the men and spinning and sewing shops for the women. These forms of work remind us considerably of the type of "work-relief" attempted in the United States during the early administration of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. That work relief program of the New Deal, as carried out in both the Civilian Conservation Corps and the Public Works Administration, seems now to have had precedents here in revolutionary eighteenth century France.

In these ateliers of the early revolutionary period, the most common type was the construction and repair of roads. Under the newer ateliers canals were dug, marshes drained, harbor facilities improved, river banks cleared, streets cleaned and reforestation begun. The demolishing of the Bastille (1789-1791) under the direction of Palloy was made a more definite part of this relief program. A gigantic amphitheater was built on the Champs de Mars. The unemployed were even put to work on the beautiful but yet unfinished church of St. Genevieve, now the Pantheon.
A new departure in this 1790 workshop program, differing from that of 1789, was the stress placed upon local responsibility and control. Local officials were in a position to exercise choice in the selection of work projects to be undertaken (executed). Everywhere we find the officials careful to avoid selecting any form of work that would hurt private enterprise. This attitude it may be recalled was also characteristic of the WPA officials in the United States, who, likewise wanted no competition with private business. The workshops of 1790 were later severely criticized because they had not accomplished more in the way of permanent gains for local community or even for the national state. Yet, from their very beginning, these ateliers were limited because of the prevailing desire to have them avoid private business competition. Their primary purpose was to aid the unemployed who wanted work and who deserved assistance through work; not to achieve material ends for the state. These workshops served as a morale builder as well as providing a living.

It is astonishing how widespread was the feeling of the obligation of the state towards the unemployed. This attitude also applied equally to the poor in general, to the aged and infirm, to the sick, and to the foundlings. The idea of an imperative duty of the state to care for its needy is constantly reiterated in the speeches of politicians
in local and national assemblies. Public officials and writers issued pamphlet after pamphlet. Our own unemployment crisis with its attendant problem of relief during the years 1929-1935 did not bring any stronger feeling of the state's responsibility in this respect.

Unhappily the May, 1790, decree soon proved inadequate. The situation was continually growing worse. In August, three months after the enactment of the decree, 4,350 passports had been given out. France had her swarms of "hoboes" even as did the United States during the depression's worst years. In a letter to the Committee on Mendicancy, Cellerier reported that 17,897 useless, costly, and dangerous idle laborers had descended upon the Paris which already had put to work in its workshops more than 18,000 unemployed.

Why such an influx at Paris? These persons imagined that they could find work, and if not, they felt that they would surely be cared for. Many had heard of the relatively high wages (now 20 sous per day, formerly 15 sous per day) being paid in the Paris workshops. These wages were a trifle below the regular market price for labor in Paris. On the other hand, it exceeded the price paid for such labor in the provincial cities and smaller towns. The foregoing reasons indicate very clearly that the migration
to Paris was no more than a natural desire to improve one's condition. The charge was even made that carpenters in Paris were leaving their regular jobs to work in the ateliers where there was more pay and less work. For, as the number of laborers increased in the workshops, there was less work for each individual to do.22.

Abuses in the workshops multiplied. Workmen trafficked with their work permits (admission cards). Foremen and their assistants falsified (padded) their payrolls. At the end of the week many laborers were paid three and four times on payday, and each time under a different name. Abbe Gautle made the accusation that hundreds of persons who worked outside the workshops on other days of the week reported at the workshops on Saturdays and received pay for the week. This was made possible by bribing the inspectors with a gift, usually 20 sous.23 Finally to offset this "black market" selling of work permits (billets d'admission, cartes d'admission) the districts continued to have the permits show the name, age, and facial description (physical features) of the holder. This same information was entered on a permanent registration sheet in the municipal registration bureau or employment office.24.

Liancourt desired to read to the National Assembly, on 31 August, 1790, the Fourth Report of the
Committee on Mendicancy. We have already pointed out that this report and the accompanying decrees which it proposed were neither read, discussed, nor adopted by the Assembly. However, a decree relating to charity workshops for Paris was adopted on 31 August, 1790. Gellerier had previously suggested to the Town Council of Paris, on 20 August, 1790, that the National Constituent Assembly be petitioned for a decree suppressing the present workshop program in Paris and immediately creating a new program. This new program was to place the entire responsibility of operation, pay, and utility of such workshops upon the city. The Town Council (Conseil de Ville) accepted this idea. On 23 August, 1790, it drew up a petition and forwarded it to the National Assembly on 26 August. Liancourt received this petition and at once prepared a report on it which he read to the Assembly along with a decree for putting these ideas into operation.

This decree, was opposed by Galissoniere who did not favor making a special provision for Paris. Massiu, curate of Geray, fellow committee member of Liancourt, answered Galissoniere, saying 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 foster a uniform legislation on relief since such type of legislation had not been adopted. The project was voted upon and resulted
in the adoption of five of its articles. The existing Parisian workshops were to be closed and new ones were to be opened immediately in Paris and in the different departments in which such works might be 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 wages for such work, whether by the job or by the day, were always to be lower than current wages for such work. The wages to be paid were to be determined by the administrative bodies in the localities where these works were to be opened.

In conformity with the provisions of the decree of 31 August, 1790, the old ateliers were closed in preparation for the new ones. These new ones were divided into two classes: one for those laborers working by the job and one for those working by the day. Spinning and sewing shops were set up for women needing employment. These new public workshops were only a means of aid offered to the true laborers who wanted, yet lacked, a means of gainful employment. These ateliers were not to be prejudiced toward either agriculture or manufacturing; nor were they to become a means of encouraging laziness. Another important forward step in
this new program was the fact that for the first time departmental workshops were officially envisaged and announced. The continual over-running of Paris by countless unemployed was no doubt responsible for this innovation. It was also hoped that by this latest measure these surplus workers would be dispersed throughout France.33

The organization of the workshops (ateliers) was quite simple as revealed by a comparison of those of 1789 with those of 1790. The old workshops of September, 1789, were composed of 200 laborers divided into two sections of 100 men each. Every workshop had a foreman, two assistant foremen, and two overseers. Originally the laborers were distributed in the different workshops at random and without distinction as to district or quarter. Later, the Department of Public Works grouped all the laborers from a particular district in the same workshop and located that work project within the vicinity of that same district. This procedure was the result of requests from the districts registering the unemployed as well as from the unemployed themselves. The Department of Public Works kept in touch with the district registration committees. They were notified of those who had been given work and where they were working. Employment Agencies were invited to visit these workers on the job in order to be able to inform the Department of Public Works of whatever changes should be made. The newly
employed were required to provide their own tools. An absence of eight days without proper authority led to exclusion from the workshop. All insubordination, injury to passersby, poor quality of work, and insurrection were punishable with arrest by the National Guard. Wages were paid every Saturday. There were daily inspections; checking and rechecking of one group of officials by another. The foregoing organization of 1789 continued in effect until September, 1790.34

The adoption of the decree of 31 August, 1790, setting up new workshops brought with it significant changes. The number of laborers per workshop was increased from 200 to 300. This workshop of 300 laborers was subdivided into five sections of sixty men, having a chief foreman as their head. The groups of sixty were further subdivided into three groups of twenty men each. The overseer of these small groups was chosen from the group itself. The police of these workshops were more severe than those of the preceding period. Penal workhouses were set up for the disobedient and disorderly laborers. Those guilty of laziness and of poor quality of work were also sent to the correctional workhouses. In these penal workhouses the wages were far less and the work much harder than in the public workshops.35
On 4 December, 1790, Vernier, in the name of the Committee of Finance, introduced a proposition for granting 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. The remaining three-fourths was to be used in support of public works. These funds were to be advanced by the Public Treasury. Martineau, Barneve, and Frieur felt it would be dangerous to make a special direct appropriation for one preferred department. Barnave offered a substitute proposal for that of Vernier. Barnave's project, as decreed by the Assembly on 4 December, 1790, provided that the Public Treasury would make an advance, only, of 50,000 livres in four equal installments to the department of Seine-et-Oise, to be used for charitable workshops and for the construction and repair of the most useful highways. The Committees of Mendicancy, Finance, Agriculture, Commerce, and Domains were asked under the Barnave decree to report continually on the mode of relief that ought to be furnished to each department. This decree also stated that in the month of its publication, every 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-Liencourt, representing the Committees of Mendicancy,
Finance, Agriculture, Commerce, and Domains, presented on 16 December, 1790, a project for a decree. This decree, adopted the same day it was presented, received the royal sanction three days later.

Through it the national government provided from the Public Treasury a sum of 15,000,000 livres to be distributed to the several departments for the creation and support of relief works. Of this sum, 6,650,000 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 own territory, works suitable to the needs of the laborious indigents. Their objective should be to initiate 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 expenses were to be sent as soon as possible to the Minister of Finances who in turn was to report it to the National Assembly. In this manner they provided a clearing house for worthwhile projects, methods and miscellaneous information which might be passed on to other departments. These works were placed under the
supervision 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 withhold jurisdiction from either municipality. Such jurisdiction should be placed in the hands of the directory of the district in which this project lay (the district being more extensive in territory than the municipality). 41

In his instructions of 26 December to the departmental directories on the execution of the above decree of 16 December, De Lessart, Minister of the Interior, made many recommendations. 42 He emphasized the necessity of a useful choice of works; of wise, cautious direction; of severe economy; and above all, of the exactness in keeping accounts. 43 Among the different works to be undertaken, he suggested the clearing of certain lands, the draining of marshes, the construction of canals, the replanting of domainal forests, and the repair of local roads. 44 Wages, following his recommendations, were to be kept lower than the local wages for the same kind of work. De Lessart concluded his instruction 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. 45
From time to time there had been proposals for draining the marshes on public lands. M. Heurtault, Vicomte de Lamerville, 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 a 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 Mendicancy. This project would not only give work to needy laborers, but would reclaim vast tracts of land and improve the sanitary condition in the various 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 time 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 National Assembly proposing a partial distribution of the 8,360,000 livres remaining after the initial (first) distribution of 6,640,000 livres out of the 15,000,000 livres set aside by the decree of 16 December, 1790. This decree, we have already seen, made provision for
15,000,000 livres to be spent in creating jobs by establishing outdoor workshops in all 83 departments of France.\textsuperscript{50} In response to this letter, La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt brought the National Assembly's attention to a decree which he had drafted. This decree was adopted 16 June, 1791. It set aside 2,600,000 livres (of the original grant of 15,000,000 livres) to be used in forwarding the most useful public works.\textsuperscript{51} This new allocation of money was to be given to twelve selected departments. The amounts to be given and the work to be undertaken were stated in the decree. These works consisted chiefly of canals, river improvements, construction of dikes, and repairing of quays. 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 to the men with families.\textsuperscript{52} Provision was made for aiding workmen in returning to their original homes so as to be employed in public works there.\textsuperscript{53}

The success of the first and second distributions inspired the Assembly to make a third and final distribution of the money remaining of the fifteen millions voted on 16 December, 1790. The Committees of Mendicancy, of Agriculture, of Commerce, of Finance, and of Domains sent to the Constituent Assembly a project for 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. 54

This decree of 25 September, 1791, provided for the distribution of the sum 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 already given them in May and December, 1790. The Minister of the Interior was to report on the progress of these works every three months. 55 Among the public works enumerated in the decree were the drainage of marshes, the building and repairing of cikes, the rebuilding of port facilities, the clearing of land, the construction of bridges, and the improvement of rivers. 56

On 27 September, 1791, Liancourt made a last attempt to have the National Constituent Assembly enact legislation which would make unemployment relief a duty of the state, to be supported by public funds. 57 Perhaps he felt a greater urge to do this since the Constitution, which was accepted on 3 September, 1791, 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 legislation, presented by him in the name of the Committee on Mendicancy, covered in general the recommendations and decrees that had accompanied the seven great reports previously made by that committee.

His 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 mendicancy, 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, in the creation of work for the unemployed, and in wiping out generally the scourge of mendicancy. Liancourt was of the opinion that these objectives should be achieved at public expense; hence, the proposed law provided for an appropriation of 50,000,000 livres. This sum was to include the revenue which belonged to the hospitals and other charitable foundations.58

This decree was so very long and complicated and the time was so short that it discouraged immediate discussion. M. Andrieux moved that the discussion be postponed. Liancourt, in response to this, said that if the Assembly believed that it did not have time to consider this
projected decree, he would favor postponement. He even suggested 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 last suggestion was put to a vote and was adopted on 27 September, 1791, three days before the termination of the National Constituent Assembly.
CHAPTER III

The Legislative Assembly (1791-1792):
Shift From the Constituent to the Legislative Program

In accordance with its adopted Constitution, the National Constituent Assembly closed its sessions on 30 September, 1791, and gave place to the prescribed Legislative Body. The period for constitution making was at an end; the time had come for normal legislation. The National Legislative Assembly, on 1 October, 1791, began its great work of organizing the government under the Constitution of 3 September, 1791. This body was composed of 745 representatives, mostly men of the middle classes. They were nearly all comparatively young men filled with the spirit of revolutionary ideology. No members of the National Constituent could be elected to the new legislature. The exclusion of the old deputies (but not their "alternates" called "suppleants") deprived the Legislative of many well-known figures. On the other hand, the new assembly contained men of real ability. Included among such men were Tenon, noted surgeon and hospital expert; Arbogaet, a noted mathematician; Koch, professor of History and Diplomacy from the University of Strasbourg; Lacépède, the naturalist, and Buffon's pupil and successor; Dr. Broussanet, a Fellow of the Royal Society whom Napoleon later made Consul at
Mogador; and Guyton-Marveau, author of a Dictionary of Chemistry, who used his skill in the production of military balloons. Others of interest in this group were Gerutti, the ex-Jesuit editor of the *Feuille villageoise*; Quatremère de Quincy, the architect-archaeologist; Dusaulx, noted translator of Juvenal who had served in the Seven Years War; and François de Neufchâteau, the dramatist-author of *Pamela*. Among the soldier deputies sat Carnot, the future "architect of victory" who already had several clever writings to his credit as well as an enviable reputation for his silent mathematical efficiency. Mention must be made of the philosopher Condorcet—systematizer of the sciences, proponent of a national system of education, social pathologist, and one of the ablest apologists of Jacobinism. Other distinguished deputies included Mathieu Dumas, also the Protestant ex-Marquis de Jaucourt, Talleyrand's understudy in the Foreign Office and later Louis XVIII's Minister of Marine. Bigot de Préameneu was one of the great champions of the Constitution in the Legislative Assembly. Ten years later he became one of the authors of the "Code Napoleon."

The group of intellectuals from Bordeaux, who gave the name of their department to the Girondin party, counted in their number Verginaud, protégé of Turgot; Gensonné, a Girondin political leader and later president of the Legislative; and Guadet, one of their chief debaters.
Their hostess and a quasi-party leader of the Girondins was Madame Roland. No listing of the more important Girondins would be complete without mentioning Jacques-Pierre Brissot de Warville who, preceding the Revolution, had written pamphlets or edited newspapers in England, Switzerland, and America. He had studied law with Nolleau and science with Dr. Marat, the editor of L'Ami du Peuple, outstanding extreme revolutionary journal. Brissot manifested his humanitarian interests by founding a society to liberate the slaves of the West Indies.

Generally, the deputies of the Legislative Assembly were neither better nor worse than those of the Constituent Assembly. They adopted the procedures of their predecessors, meeting daily from nine (o'clock) in the morning till two or three in the afternoon, and again from six to nine-thirty at night. They also met on Sundays, as on week days, not adjourning for holidays, even including "Bastille Day."¹

The Legislative Assembly lasted from 1 October, 1791, to 21 September, 1792. It witnessed the invasion of foreign armies, the fall of French royalty, and the September, 1792, massacres. Nevertheless, it had its own ideas for organizing a system of public relief.

The Constituent Assembly had placed "in the category of the most sacred duties of the Nation, the relief of the poor in all age-groups and circumstances of life." The
Constituent's Mendicancy Committee, led by Liancourt, had hoped to implement this doctrine by means of its series of reports and decrees which constituted a rather complete organization of social welfare. These projected decrees embraced rural public aid, hospital administration, home medical aid, aid to foundlings, mendicancy depots, houses of correction for recalcitrant beggars, transportation for transient unemployed, and charity-workshops to counteract chomage.

The Constitution had made provision for a general foundation of public relief for aiding the infirm poor, rearing foundlings, and providing work for those who, themselves, were unable to find it. Pursuant to this provision, the Assembly at once set about to establish the necessary committee. François Pierrot, deputy from Ardennes, submitted, on 9 October, 1791, a list of committees. Among these committees he listed a Committee on Mendicancy and Subsistences.² Louis-Francois Ramond, deputy from Paris, proposed, on 10 October, three groups of committees—Legislation, Administration, and Finances. In the group on legislation he placed a "Committee on Mendicancy, Prisons, and Hospitals" to be composed of twelve members.³ Similar proposals were made the same day by Leonard Robin, deputy from Paris, and Carnot, deputy from Pas-de-Calais. On
13 October, Condorcet, another Parisian deputy, submitted his suggestion.4

Verginaud, deputy from La Gironde, felt that at this time the Assembly needed guidance or information as to the scope and functions of such a committee before making a final decision. He read to the Legislative Assembly, on 13 October, a report prepared by Armand-Gaston Camus, a former deputy of the Constituent Assembly and now serving as National Archivist of the Legislative Assembly. This document reviewed the general and specific work of the Constituent Assembly's committees. Camus emphatically pointed out that the old Committee on Mendicancy, through its many reports and proposed decrees, had tried to show the Constituent Assembly its indebtedness to the unfortunate. This indebtedness, according to the old Committee, became the Nation's obligation when the Constituent Assembly declared all ecclesiastical holdings at the disposition of the Nation. Camus further stated in this report that a large number of important papers containing much pertinent information had been left in the National Archives by the Committee on Mendicancy. He concluded his report by praising the notable social work that had been done by the Constituent's Committees on Health and Mendicancy and called on the Legislative to continue these two committees and thus fulfill the government's obligations toward suffering humanity.5
This report was well received and the Assembly resumed its discussion of an appropriate committee. Jacques Tenon, deputy from Seine-et-Oise, advocated that the Committees on Mendicancy and on Public Health of the Constituent Assembly be combined into one new committee so as to organize a program of relief pursuant to the constitutional guarantees.6 This idea of combining the two former committees, however, was not received favorably. Broussonet, deputy from Paris, recommended the appointment of a Committee on Public Welfare. Garran de Coulon, another Parisian deputy, suggested a Committee on Public Aid. The Assembly rejected Broussonet's Committee on Public Welfare and accepted de Coulon's Committee on Public Aid or Relief (Comité des Secours publics).

Ducastel, president of the Legislative Assembly read to that body, on 27 October, 1791, a list of the members elected to the new Committee on Public Aid. According to the listing given in the Archives Parlementaires, there were twenty-four full-time members and ten substitutes. Ferdinand-Dreyfus, who has made a rather complete study of this committee, indicated there were twenty-five full-time members and eleven alternates.7 Many of these committee members were relatively unknown. The majority were physicians and surgeons. The remainder included a bishop, departmental officials, lawyers, and justices of the peace,
Among its more active and important members were Tenon, Beauvais, Maizonet, Tartanac, Bo, Siblot, Dépéret, Desbois, Gastellier, and Bernard de l'Yonne. Tenon, deputy from Seine-et-Oise, and senior member of the group, was elected Committee president, while Desbois, Bishop of Amiens and deputy from the Somme, was elected vice-president. Beauvais, deputy from Paris, and Gastellier, deputy from Loiret, were named as secretaries. Later six additional secretaries were appointed, of whom four—Simon, Viehl, Hecquart, and Gay—had previously served in this same capacity under the old Committee on Mendicancy.

Jacques René Tenon, on whom fell Liancourt's mantle, was born 21 February, 1724, at Sepaux near Joigny and died 16 January, 1816, at Paris. His paternal and maternal grandfathers had been doctors. In 1748 he was made a member of the staff of La Salpêtrière where he achieved great renown as a surgeon and professor. Tenon was named a member of the Academy of Sciences in 1759. This society, in 1786, appointed Tenon, along with Bailly, later first mayor of Paris, to investigate the great Parisian charity hospital, the Hotel-Dieu. Having visited hospitals in England and collected statistics especially on their sanitary conditions, Tenon was considered the logical man to conduct such an investigation. His monumental report caused such a sensation that the Academy of Sciences was
given 3,000,000 livres to construct additional hospitals. Elected a deputy to the Legislative Assembly, he served that body until it was replaced by the National Convention. As president of the Committee on Public Succor, he was charged with presenting a plan for the re-organization of the hospitals. But the College of Surgery closed on 10 August, 1792, before such a plan could be put into operation. In 1793 he had retired to the village of Massy and did not return to Paris until 1815, only to find his libraries and collections looted. Tenon was an outstanding writer on medicine, surgery, and hospitals. Because of his contributions in these fields, Tenon was elected in 1795 to the Institute.  

Charles-Nicolas Beauvais (de Presau), physician and legislator, was born 1 August, 1745, at Orleans and died 27 March, 1794, at Montpellier (Hersault). He took part in local politics, later becoming a justice of the peace. At Paris Beauvais first practiced medicine. From Paris he was elected a deputy to the Legislative Assembly on 5 September, 1791. About a year later, 15 September, 1792, he was elected to the National Convention by the same department. A very active deputy in matters of humanitarian relief, he fostered two great principles as basically underlying any program of assistance and relief. These principles were: (1) every man was by right entitled to
his subsistence through work, if he is physically able; and by means of gratuitous aid, if unable to work; (2) the providing for the poor was a national obligation. He was sent on a mission to Toulon by the Convention; was captured by the English at Toulon and later liberated by the victorious French. But Beauvais was again captured by the English and died from maltreatment on 27 March, 1794, at Montpellier. The National Convention conferred great honors upon him. They recovered his body, cremated it with much ceremony and deposited his ashes in an urn which was later placed in the National Archives. His bust was placed in the assembly hall of the Convention.9

Étienne Maignet, legislator, was born 9 July, 1758, at Ambert (Puy-de-Dome) and died 28 October, 1834, at Ambert. He began his political career as a lawyer and was made, in 1790, administrator of Puy-de-Dome. Elected a deputy to the Legislative Assembly on 6 September, 1791, by this department, he was subsequently appointed a member of the Comité des Secours Publics. His successful work in the Legislative won for him reelection, 6 September, 1792, as a National Convention deputy. At one time Maignet served as "envoy on mission" to La Moselle.10

Jean Tartanac was born 10 April, 1759, at Flamarans and died 12 January, 1827, at Agen. He was a justice of the peace at Valence, and represented the department of Gers in the Legislative Assembly. He later served
under the empire as councilor to Napoleon. Tartanac is best known for his report of 9 March, 1792. This report, containing a plan for aiding the indigent class, will be noted later in the present chapter.11

Another of the more important committee members and one whose work will be subsequently analyzed was Charles Siblot, born 6 October, 1752, at Lure (Haute-Saone). He was elected deputy to the Legislative 29 August, 1791, by the department of Haute-Saone. He later served in the National Convention, being elected thereto on 4 September, 1792.12

Associated with Tenon and sharing his opinions on relief was Gabriel Dépéret, also a physician and later legislator. He was born at Limoges (Haute-Vienne). Dépéret followed in the footsteps of his father who had achieved some success as a doctor. Gabriel Dépéret became the leading physician at Limoges. He was elected a deputy to the Legislative on 2 September, 1791, by the department of Haute-Vienne. His reputation as a doctor and his interest in the lack of hospital facilities in Limoges and other parts of southwestern France won for him a place on the Committee of Public Succor. After his service in the Legislative, Dépéret returned to Limoges and became a justice of the peace. Later he removed to Paris where he died.13
The Legislative Assembly did not completely ignore the former patronage of the Church in matters of relief and hospitalization. The former Committee on Mendicancy had six members of the clergy, two of whom were bishops. The Legislative's Committee on Public Succor had only one member of the clergy, Éléonore-Marie Desbois (de Rochefort), parish priest and later Bishop of the Somme. This legislator and constitutional bishop was born 28 April, 1749, at Paris and died there on 5 September, 1807. As cure of Saint-André-des-Arts, he was well known for his charities. He was made a constitutional bishop of the Somme on 13 March, 1791. This department elected him as their deputy to the Legislative on 31 August, 1791. Under the Revolutionary Tribunal, he became suspect, was arrested and placed in detention for two years. Antecedent to the Concordat of 1809 between Napoleon and Pius VII, Desbois resigned his bishopric.14

Among the many physicians and surgeons on the Committee on Public Succor was René Georges Gastellier, doctor and later legislator. He was born 1 October, 1741, at Ferrières (Loiret). He became mayor of Montargis 10 September, 1783. Here he continued medical practice while fulfilling his political duties. On 4 September, 1791, he was elected by the people of Loiret as their deputy to the Legislative. Like Desbois, he was considered suspect
by the Revolutionary Tribunal in 1793; was imprisoned and
later released. He died 20 November, 1821, at Paris.15

Perhaps no member of this Committee sensed more
keenly the need for a national program of public relief
nor fought more strongly for its adoption than did Pierre
Bernard of L'Yonne. This lawyer was born 3 July, 1755 at
Hery (Yonne). He became one of the department adminis-
trators of Yonne in 1790. This department, on 2 September,
1791, elected him as its deputy to the Legislative Assembly,
where he rendered excellent service as a member of the
Committee on Public Succor. Bernard was later (9 thermidor
An VIII, 28 July, 1799) named councilor of the prefecture
of Aulerre. He died 23 April, 1833, at Sens (Yonne).16

The first step taken by the newly formed Committee
on Public Succor was to request of Fieux, chief clerk in the
Ministry of the Interior, the files of the Committee on
Mendicancy. These had been stored with Delessart, then
Minister of the Interior, by order of Liancourt, head of
the old Committee on Mendicancy.17

The Committee of Public Succor was at first
divided into three sections: (1) public aid, (2) mendicancy,
and (3) health. Some members suggested a redivision into
four sections, viz., (1) hospitals, (2) foundlings,
(3) medical schools, and (4) unemployed men. However, its
first plan calling for three sections—public aid, mendicancy,
health--was retained.

Meeting in the former Capuchin monastery, the Committee held one hundred and six sessions beginning 29 October, 1791, and ending 19 September, 1792. Aside from its innumerable resolutions, the Committee on Public Succor was successful in having fifty-six decrees pertaining to relief enacted by the Legislative Assembly. These decrees embraced relief for all forms of misery, all classes of indigents, and all types of charitable endeavour, whether individual or collective.

Before proceeding with its work, the Committee waited for the report of the Minister of the Interior on the state of the nation. In this report, which was read on 1 November, 1791, Delessart reviewed the work of the Constituent Assembly relative to all phases of assistance and relief. He emphasized the fact that those funds which had been appropriated by the Constituent Assembly would soon be exhausted. Delessart, therefore, asked that the Legislative Assembly do its utmost to continue such a needful and productive expenditure of public money.

After having heard the report, it was suggested that the Committee 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 it
early in December.21

In accordance with a request made by the Legislative Assembly on 23 November, 1791, Dépéret, from the Committee, did make such a report. This report dealt with the relief funds to be given to the departments for aiding the sick and unemployed. It summarized the relief work of the Constituent Assembly, and pointed out the necessity of continuing such work. The proposed decree, which followed this report, provided for an appropriation of 15,000,000 livres. Of this sum, 5,300,000 livres were to be used in opening up communications (i.e. roads) in the departments thereby employing the idle laborers. Such workmen must present certificates from their municipalities in order to be employed. The remaining sum of 9,700,000 livres was to be distributed as follows:

For mendicancy depots ... 1,300,000 livres
For foundlings ....... 2,400,000 livres
For hospitals ......... 6,000,000 livres

This projected decree, presented to the Assembly on 26 December, 1791, was ordered printed but discussion on it was postponed.22

In the meantime, the Legislative Assembly did not turn a deaf ear to the cries of suffering that came as a result of fires and floods. The Assembly voted 12,000 livres to be sent to the inhabitants of Saint-Sauveur who were the
victims of a disastrous fire. 23

On 2 January, 1792, Deperet's proposal favoring an appropriation of 15,000,000 livres was again brought before the Assembly and again definite action on it was postponed. In spite of this attitude, the Assembly was interested in continuing some projects already undertaken, but whose completion was lagging because of lack of funds. On 1 January, 1791, a subsidy of 600,000 livres was voted for the Burgundy canal project which was employing many men. 24

The proposal of Déperet, which had been sent to both the ordinary and extraordinary Committees on Finances, was again reported by him on 6 January, 1792. The financial committees had reduced the original demand of 15,000,000 livres to 4,100,000 livres. Now unfortunately this whole matter was yet again pushed aside because of more pressing legislation. However, Déperet kept this proposal before the deputies by circulating copies which had been printed by the Assembly's order. When presented again on 17 January, 1792, this decree of Déperet, together with the reduced budget of 4,100,000 livres, was adopted.

Provision was immediately made for distributing the appropriation to the various departments. Of the budget voted, 100,000 livres were given to the foundling institutions. The major portion of the budget, consisting of
2,500,000 livres, was to be used in facilitating the work of unemployment relief throughout the departments. The then Minister of the Interior, Cahier de Gerville, was to watch carefully over these funds in order to prevent wasteful expenditure and duplication of work. The remainder of the budget, 1,500,000 livres, were allotted to hospital aid. Thus was completed the first step of the National Legislative Assembly towards a national program of public succor under government sponsorship.

The problem of unemployment, as has already been seen, was closely linked with that of mendicancy. To wipe out that scourge would be solving, in a large measure, the unemployment problem and its related social evils. The members of the Committee on Public Succor were not the only ones in the Assembly who recognized the need for legislation, national in its scope, that would aid in solving the problems created by work-stoppage, crop failures, fires, and floods.

Pierre Laureau (Sainte Andre), legislator and publicist, deputy from l'Yonne, was equally impressed with the cries of the suffering poor and the problem of providing work for countless thousands of idle laborers. Born 26 April, 1748, at Cussy-les-Forges (Yonne), Laureau had risen rapidly to political prominence. In the early years of the Revolution, he became vice-president of the department of l'Yonne. On 1 September, 1791, he was selected as
that department's deputy to the Legislative Assembly. Here he became closely associated with Tenon, Bo, Siblot and others of the Committee on Public Succor. When his mandate to the Assembly expired, he reentered private life and occupied himself with historical studies. He produced an admirable study dealing with the wiping out of mendicancy (L'Extinction de la Mendicité). He later became mayor of Saint André and died there 28 March, 1845.26

Recognizing the rights as well as the duties of the poor, and the troublesome problem of idle and dangerous beggars, Laureau proposed, on 21 January, 1792, a plan for the general wiping out of mendicancy. This plan recommended that the national government appropriate annually a budget of 12,000,000 livres for a period of five years. Such sums were to be used by the Minister of the Interior for initiating varied public works. In such a program of public works would be found a job solution for those able-bodied poor who sincerely wanted work. In providing such work, Laureau felt that the morale of these unfortunates would be raised, children would receive better care, and family life maintained. He proposed to set up in each department institutions for the invalids, the aged, and the incurables.

It is regrettable that the Legislative Assembly failed to deliberate on this worthwhile plan. However, the Assembly voted to refer this proposal to its Committee on
Laureau himself was accorded the honors of the Assembly which he refused saying that he had only done his duty.

Before this enthusiasm for humanitarian relief had cooled, the Assembly favorably received a petition from the residents of Port-Sainte-Marie. To aid needy families there, a decree was rushed through the Assembly on 12 February, placing 300,000 livres in the hands of Cahier de Gerville, Minister of the Interior.

The spirit exhibited by Laureau was emulated by other members of the Committee on Public Succor, such as Tartanac, Bo, Siblot, and Bernard of l'Yonne. Tartanac strongly advocated public works to relieve the situation. The decree which he presented on 9 March, 1792 for creating and supporting public works was adopted on 4 April, 1792. The first article of this decree authorized the Minister of the Interior to distribute 5,760,000 livres among the departments in the manner prescribed by the decree of 9 October, 1791. Article 2 required that these funds be used to employ the indigents, particularly in the reparation of local roads. These projects were to be selected according to the requests coming from the towns and with the advice of the district directories. By Article 3 the departmental directories were ordered to submit a report not later than 1 October, 1792, to the Minister of the
Interior as to the amount of funds used and projects undertaken. Pursuant to Article 4 of this decree, the Minister of the Interior would submit in November, 1792, a general report to the National Assembly of all expenditures and projects completed. Article 5 provided that of the 2,500,000 livres voted by the decree of 17 January, 1792, 150,000 livres were to be sent to Paris for aiding the work relief program in progress there.29

In the meantime temporary aids were decreed upon the recommendations of Tenon, president of the Committee on Public Succor. When disasters struck, it seemed only natural that those localities involved should turn to Tenon's committee for help. He succeeded in having the Legislative Assembly grant, on 15 March, 1792, a provisional aid of 200,000 livres to each of the districts of Vaucluse and Louveze. This was followed on 8 April by grants of provisional aid to the departments of Eure-et-Loire, Moselle, and Nord where suffering had been aggravated by disastrous fires. Many other hard-hit departments and districts looked to the Committee on Public Succor for help. As a result, Tenon drafted an emergency decree which provided that the Legislative Assembly would make grants of provisional or temporary aid wherever suffering and want were occasioned by fires. This decree was immediately adopted on 23 April, 1792, the day on which it was presented.30
It has been shown that the Legislative Assembly took a forward step in the direction of a national program of relief by its decree of 17 January, 1792. This decree, it will be recalled, provided a budget of 4,100,000 livres for this purpose. It was also indicated that of this sum, 2,500,000 livres were to be used in setting up work relief projects. The decree of 4 April, 1792, (Article 5) deducted 150,000 livres from this work relief budget of 2,500,000 livres, leaving 2,350,000 livres that had not as yet been utilized. The distribution of this balance of 2,350,000 livres was made the object of a decree presented to the Assembly by Siblot on three occasions: 30 May, 23 June, and 5 July, 1792.

Siblot proposed to distribute the money according to the needs of each department rather than by equal distribution to each department. 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, therefore, 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 of departments embraced those which had undertaken important works of local and national utility which ought to be continued. In the fourth class Siblot placed those departments whose needs were not so pressing.
The Legislative Assembly considered this logical classification as being most practical and adopted it on 5 July, 1792. With this accomplished, the balance in the work relief budget, amounting to 2,350,000 livres, was ordered distributed by the Assembly in the following manner. It designated a sum of 1,180,000 livres to be distributed among the thirty-nine departments in the first class. Among ten departments in the second class 315,000 livres were to be divided. The third class which embraced eight departments was given 480,000 livres. To the fourth class, consisting of twenty-six departments, was given the sum of 375,000 livres. There was to be a proportionate distribution, according to needs, in all classes except the fourth in which there was to be an equal distribution of approximately 15,000 livres. Thus the 2,350,000 livres were finally distributed among the eighty-three departments. It was felt by all concerned that this would aid each department in dealing with its problem of aiding the worthy poor.

The relief doctrine of the Legislative Assembly was effectively summarized by Pierre Bernard, deputy from l'Yonne, in a long and diffuse report read to the Assembly on 13 June, 1792. It repeated and confirmed the doctrines of the Constituent Assembly. This report took as its text the principle that every man had a right to subsistence; by work if he were able-bodied, 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 unable to find it for themselves. In support of these ideas he proposed a decree.

This decree provided for an annual appropriation 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 wage for a day's work in that department. Since the relief of the poor was admittedly a national charge, the property and revenues of the hospitals were to be placed in a common fund. Bernard further recommended that each canton establish an agency charged with the distribution of work and aid to the unemployed and to the infirm residing in that canton whose names had been placed in a 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 the entire kingdom was to be as follows:

(a) Relief works (travaux de secours) for the unemployed in times of work shortage or 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. 36

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

Through this plan Bernard had hopes of establishing a national organization of public aid. Assistance was not to be gratuitous for those who could work. Work was considered by Bernard as being the surest means of destroying indigence. If a man were poor, it did not necessarily mean that he had nothing, but that he had no work. The final opinion of Bernard was that the nation should seek to improve itself and national prosperity by providing work for those who needed it yet lacked it. 37

This report and projected decree were read a second time to the Assembly on 28 July, 1792. Unfortunately this important report and the practical solution that accompanied it were set aside by the Assembly because of the more pressing political situation. Paris and the nation had become alarmed. The nation was declared to be in a state of danger by the Assembly. An invasion seemed imminent. The actions of the royal family were under close scrutiny. Yet while occupied with the war scare, the Legislative Assembly did not forsake altogether the social problems of which it had been reminded constantly.
The last act of the Legislative Assembly in the matter of unemployment relief through public works was an emergency measure initiated by Jean-Marie Gregoire, deputy from the Seine-Inferieure. His project was presented on 16 September, 1792, and adopted that same day. This decree placed at the disposal of the Minister of the Interior, now Roland, the sum of 6,000,000 livres for the support of public works. These work projects were to consist chiefly of the construction and repair of highways and bridges. In addition, this decree made provision for an appropriation to cover the expenses involved in the operation of a free school for the study of bridges and highways (école libre des ponts et chaussées).38

The period of Enlightened Despotism, dominated as it was by aristocratic tendencies, distinctly showed the beginnings of the overthrow of the Ancien Regime. The famous "Tennis Court Oath" of 20 June, 1789, was the prelude to the fall of absolutism and gave birth to the limited monarchy which was dominated by middle class or bourgeoisie tendencies. The French nation received a new flag, the "tricolor" composed of the red and blue of Paris combined with the white of the Bourbon standard. The Estates-General transformed itself into the National Constituent Assembly, the first of the three great revolutionary assemblies. Its chief work was to give a constitution to
France. Significant changes in thought and practice had taken place in the social field and were now pressing for attention and solution by the Constituent Assembly.

Our study of the cahiers, those documents prepared prior to the meeting of the Estates-General for purposes of determining the necessity for national rehabilitation, has clearly indicated the need for a program of social reform. Preceding the meeting of the Estates-General many pamphlets and treatises appeared. The common plea of these pamphlets was that the state ought to be responsible for unemployment relief. These writings were followed by numerous others sent by individuals and groups to the Constituent Assembly. All of these, the cahiers included, called for state responsibility for relief of the suffering poor and the unemployed.

Mendicancy and vagabondage which usually accompany poverty, work stoppage, and idleness were by 1789 rampant. The task of solving this problem was immediately made the work of the Committee on Mendicancy appointed by the National Constituent Assembly. No greater champion of the cause of the poor could have been found than La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt. His previous interests and activity seemed to have singled him out as the best man to supervise the work of such a committee. Liancourt directed its researches, wrote the majority of its great reports, and drew up the
decrees it proposed. Although little was done in the way of actual relief legislation by the Constituent Assembly, this Committee on Mendicancy performed the great task of presenting its ideas to the nation. These ideas were (1) national responsibility for poor relief and (2) planning a national program for its solution. Assisted by Du Pont de Nemours, La Fayette and others, Liancourt succeeded in having these ideas incorporated in the fundamental guaranties of the new constitution. Time did not permit the Constituent Assembly to legislate fully on the proposed program. In spite of this drawback, the Assembly did include public assistance in the Constitution which it left to its successor, the National Legislative Assembly, to implement.

The program of public relief on a broad national scale received its second impetus from the National Legislative Assembly through its provision for a Committee on Public Succor. Decrees were proposed by this Committee and enacted by the Assembly. No unusually large single appropriations were made. Small sums amounting to more than 22,700,000 livres were voted for distribution to the departments for assistance of the aged, infirm, foundlings, and the creation of work projects for the unemployed. This expenditure of over 22,700,000 livres, although slightly less than half of the budget proposed by Liancourt and his
Committee, does show the continuing influence of Liacourt and the Committee on Mendicancy. The growth of an attitude of national responsibility for relief and the enactment of legislation leading to a solution of the social problem mark the work of the National Legislative Assembly as a connecting link. This Assembly served as a connecting link of much significance between the initial beginnings under the National Constituent Assembly and their culmination under the National Convention.

The National Constituent Assembly was about to undertake the third of its three historic functions. The first of these was to meet the emergency with short-range palliatives. As a result, the earlier work of the Assembly was more or less expedient. The second historic function was that of planning a long-range program of reform. Thus, measures were enacted for controverting the political, social, economic, religious, and cultural aspects of the Ancient Regime. The third function consisted primarily of drafting a constitution which would definitively insure the long-range planning.

Our demonstration has shown how expedient measures were earlier suggested and adopted as means of offsetting famines, crop failures and the unemployment crisis. However, in pursuing its second function, the Assembly failed to enact the proposed program of long-
range social reform. Instead, it still resorted to short-range planning. We have seen this expedient program in actual practice. The Assembly was now ready to complete its third historic function, the drafting of a fundamental act making its accomplishments secure for the future.

The Constituent Assembly on 5 August, 1791, took up the final discussion of the basic statute as presented by its Committee on a Constitution. This final discussion followed the order of the divisions of the proposed document. The "Declaration of Rights" was placed at the head of the Constitution. Du Pont de Nemours suggested that an addition, relative to the poor and infirm, be made to the "Declaration of Rights." He insisted further that the original statements concerning public instruction and relief be restored to the list of "rights." M. l'Andre, deputy from the nobility of Aix, answered Du Pont's criticisms and demands by saying that the subjects of public instruction and relief had been placed in that section of the Constitution entitled the "Fundamental Guaranties." Du Pont acknowledged having read the constitutional provisions but contended that these matters rightfully "belonged with, and ought to be placed in" the Declaration of Rights. The Assembly, however, voted to support the viewpoint of M. d'Andre, thus permitting no further additions to the "Declaration."
M. Thouret, Third Estate deputy from Rouen, and reporter for the Committee on the Constitution, read to the Assembly, on 9 August, 1791, that section of the Constitution which embraced the fundamental guaranties.

The particular section dealing with relief read as follows:

There will be created and organized a general establishment (program) of public aid for the relief of the infirm poor and the able-bodied poor who lack work.41

M. Rabaud-Saint-Étienne, Third Estate deputy from Nîmes, a Huguenot minister, demanded that the above 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 end a general establishment (program) of public relief.42

Barère de Vieuzeac, deputy of the Third Estate from Bigorre, requested that foundlings be included in this revision. He told the Assembly that these foundlings were also a national charge; more so because the abolition of the feudal regime had disrupted the finances of the church, their former patron. He was warmly supported by the elder Garat. In the opinion of Du Pont de Nemours, Barère had advocated a new principle. Du Pont referred to Barère as another Saint Vincent de Paul. In support of Barère's
suggestion, Du Pont submitted his revision of the amend-
ment as follows:

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.43

A further recommendation for revision was presented
by Liancourt. He contended that the Nation should be
obligated to provide work for the able-bodied poor who
might not be able to find it for themselves. Such an
addition to the disputed article would not, in Liancourt's
opinion, encourage laziness and idleness. On the contrary,
Liancourt felt that providing jobs for idle laborers would
tend to raise their morale and finally lead them to develop
individual resourcefulness.44 Thouret, a jurist, drew up
the revised amendment which embodied the suggestions of
Barere de Vieuzac, Du Pont de Nemours, and La Rochefoucauld-
Liancourt. In its final form the constitutional guaranty
respecting relief read as follows:

There will be created and organized a
general establishment of public aid for
rearing orphans and foundlings, to aid
the infirm poor, and to provide means
of work for the able-bodied poor who
would not be able to find it for them-
selves.

As thus revised, this fundamental guaranty was immediately
adopted.45
The work of organizing relief as provided for
by the Constitution was not undertaken by the Constituent
Assembly. This was clearly shown by the continual pleas
of Liancourt in the Assembly on 26 September, 1791. He
was, however, successful in having the Assembly place the
subject of relief on its agenda for the following day.

On 27 September, 1791, Liancourt's report and
projected decree which had been set aside the previous day
was placed before the Assembly. Liancourt reviewed the
entire work of his Committee for the past eighteen months.
He submitted a decree, consisting of thirty-four articles,
and embracing a diversified program of assistance and
relief. M. Andrieux, Third Estate deputy from the
senechaussee of Riom, was very much impressed with this
proposed legislation of Liancourt. However, Andrieux
pointed out that the Committee on Mendicancy itself had
previously indicated that it did not as yet possess all
the necessary information regarding possible financial
resources to support the desired appropriations. For this
reason, M. Andrieux suggested that the whole matter be
postponed. Liancourt responded by saying that if the
Assembly believes it is not able to undertake this matter
of relief legislation, the least it could do would be to
state its reasons for postponement. Such procedure was
considered by him as being necessary because of the
Assembly's new obligation as stated in the fundamental guaranties recently adopted.

Liancourt summed up the reasons for postponement and presented the following decree for enactment:

The National Assembly, considering with regret that the immensity of its work prevents it at this session from occupying itself with the organization of assistance, the establishing of which it has ordered in the Constitution, leaves to the following legislature the honorable task of fulfilling this important duty.

When placed before the Assembly by President Thouret, this decree was forthwith adopted.46

A few positive gains had been made. Charity workshops, although on a small scale, had been set up. Liancourt and his Committee had succeeded in drawing national attention to the problem of relief. An attitude of national responsibility for a well organized program of assistance was beginning to develop. This was signalized in the struggle over including relief in the fundamental guaranties of the Constitution. The Committee on Mendicancy, led by Liancourt, won this fight with the aid of Du Pont de Nemours, Thouret, Rabaud-Saint-Etienne, and Barere de Vieuzac. Finally, by the decree of 27 September, 1791, which postponed the work of organizing relief, the National Constituent Assembly left the task to its successor, the National Legislative Assembly, as a dictated obligation.
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The National Convention, 1792-1795

As the Legislative Assembly adjourned on 21 September, 1792, the third great Revolutionary Assembly opened its first session. This body, known as the National Convention, controlled the third stage of the revolutionary cycle, the "Democratic" Unlimited Republic (1792-1795). Until a new constitution could be framed, the government was administered by the National Convention through its numerous Committees. Two major parties, the Montagnards and the Girondins, struggled to control the Convention and to direct the Revolution.

The Convention, erelong, resorted to a rule of force in order to preserve the nation from the civil strife and revolts within the departments, as well as the foreign invasions of their seemingly victorious enemies. This rule was carried out under the direction of the Committee of Public Safety (Comité du Salut Public); its course was marked by the "Rise" of the "Terror," its "Reign," and its "Reaction." The Girondins ruled during the coming of the Terror (September, 1792--June, 1793). This period opened with Valmy, the first victory of the Revolutionary Government under the "tricolor." This was coincident with the decree of 21/2 September, which abolished the monarchy and
proclaimed 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, Carnot, Hébert, Danton, Barère, and Robespierre. Their rule, which witnessed the Terror at its height, was followed by the Thermidorean Reaction of July, 1794—October, 1795.

During the course of these years (1792-1795) the French Republic, through its military successes, had extended its boundaries to the natural frontiers of the Rhine, the Alps, and the Pyrenees. Internally, the National Convention sought to promote greater social equality. Thus it abolished all remnants of seigniorial dues which had thus far survived. Confiscated lands were divided by the Convention into smaller tracts so that the peasants were enabled to purchase small farms. This step favoring producers was followed by a limiting of prices on food-stuffs.  

For the benefit of the needy, likewise, the work of the National Convention resulted in making the relief program a national one. The Constituent and Legislative Assemblies had paved the way for nationalizing assistance. Although these assemblies produced a large amount of material on the subject, neither of them accomplished the desired end. The impetus back of this new development came
from the members of the National Convention when discussing the new constitution and its Declaration of Rights. These two documents were finally adopted 9 August, 1793.

The doctrine of assistance had been prepared by the Committee on a Constitution which began its sessions on 11 October, 1792, by inviting proposals for a new basic law. Philosophers and writers submitted a wide variety of proposed documents. All of these recognized that education and public aid were "sacred debts" owed by the government to those whom it governed.

Lazare Carnot, deputy from Pas-de-Calais, submitted his ideas for a declaration of rights on 17 April, 1793. In Article 16 of this proposed declaration Carnot held that society ought to provide for the needs of those from whom society claimed services.2

Pierre Daunou, deputy from Pas-de-Calais and episcopal vicar of Paris, in his "Vues Rapides sur l'Organisation de la Republique Francaise" recommended the opening of public works and supporting them at the expense of the government. In the Constitution which he submitted to the National Convention, Daunou would have the French Republic set aside 50,000,000 annually to be divided among the departments. These funds were to be used in creating public work especially designed to aid the needy who were out of work or unable to work. Such a program, Daunou
felt, would aid in solving the problem of idle workers. 3

De Sacy, deputy from Haute-Garonne, made aid for the foundlings an integral part of his plan of a new constitution. "In this group," said De Sacy, "may be found a future painter like David, an orator like Demosthenes, a marine like Barth, or a military tactician like Turenne." 4

In his "Projet de Constitution Populaire," Poultier, deputy from Nord, developed a plan for relief. With him, the right to existence was a right of all citizens; therefore, indigent citizens should receive aid, and that in proportion to their needs and services. He wished to establish in each department a hospice for the aged and one for the orphans, hospices for the invalids and the sick, and work shops in each section where the poor would be able to find employment. 5

Condorcet, as we have seen, was also one of the constitution makers. He believed in assistance through providing work. Society, he argued, was obliged to provide for the subsistence of all its members whether it be 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 voluntary aid. 6
An interesting plan for unemployment was given by J. F. A. Bourgois, deputy from the department of Seine-Inferieure. His plan for public succor contained the following provisions:

1. There will be established in each canton a public workshop in order to employ the able-bodied poor who lack work.

2. There will be hospices for the poor who are suffering from temporary maladies.

3. There will be lying-in hospitals for expectant mothers.

4. There will be hospices for infirm incurables and hospices for foundlings.

5. The National Assembly will regulate the government of the public workshops and the administration of the hospices.

6. There will be officials elected by each canton for the operation of its workshops and hospices.

7. There will be officials elected by each department for the department's hospices.

This plan, like many of the other propositions for a new constitution, was referred to the Convention's Committee on Constitution.7

The report on the Girondin Constitution was read on 15 February, 1793, to the National Convention, first by Condorcet and later by Barère. This constitution began with a Declaration of Rights consisting of thirty-three articles.
Article 24 declared that public succor was a debt of society and that laws should determine its extent and application. "Society is obligated to provide for the subsistence of all its members, whether it be in securing work for them or in assuring them the means of a livelihood if they were not able to work."

Discussion of this article began on 22 April, 1793. The Montagnards insisted upon the obligatory character of the debt of assistance. Boyer-Fonfrède, deputy from Gironde, said that society owed this debt only to "those infirm who have been ill-favored by nature and who are no longer able to live by their own labor." "You will kill industry and labor if you assure subsistence to all who have nothing but who are still able to work."

After much discussion, altering, and several readings, Article 24, now listed as Article 23, was adopted. The Girondin Declaration of Rights was revised and the entire document adopted in May, 1793. This declaration, together with the new constitution, was signed by Condorcet, Gensonné, Barère, Barbaroux, Thomas Paine, Pétion, Vergniaud, and Emanuel Sieyès. These had all agreed that the Convention must recognize its obligation to society. The Convention, in adopting the Declaration of Rights, declared that relief was a sacred debt of society. Society, it held, owed subsistence to the unfortunate citizens whether
it be in providing work for them or in assuring them the means of existence if they were unable to work. Thus the Girondin Constitution recognized the right of the able-bodied to work for their living and the obligation of providing a living for those unable to work.

Concurrently with the discussions on the new constitution, the National Convention had undertaken the legislative organization of assistance. On 22 September, 1792, the Convention appointed four commissioners to draw up a list of committees for this body. Constant Joseph Gossuin, deputy from Nord, read to the Convention a list of committees on 2 October, 1792. Among these was a Committee on Public Succor. It was to be composed of twenty-four active members and twelve substitutes. The Convention adopted the recommendation of Gossuin and undertook immediately the formation of such a committee. Guadet, deputy from Gironde, and secretary of the Convention, submitted on 18 October, 1792, a list of the twenty-four deputies who had been elected to the Committee on Public Succor. Attached to this list were the names of twelve deputies who had been elected as substitutes. Among the more active committee members were such prominent men as Bishop Jean Baptiste Massieu, Charles Beauvais, Jean Baptiste Bo, Étienne Maignet, Pierre Sautayre, Claude Siblot, Elie Lacoste, Jacques Germignac, and Pierre Nicolas Perrin.
Bishop Massieu, listed among the nine most influential members of the Committee on Public Succor, had rendered similar service as a member of the Constituent Assembly's Committee on Mendicancy. The selection of these twenty-four deputies for the Committee on Public Succor was very significant in that one-third of the Committee; viz., Beauvais, Maignet, Sautayre, Bo, Siblot, Lacoste, Germignac, and Perrin, were former members of the Legislative Assembly's Committee on Public Succor. The Convention added other members to this Committee on 3 November, 1792. 12

This Committee on Public Succor worked under the supervision of the Committee on Public Safety. During the remainder of the year 1792, this committee on Public Safety fostered many projects for relief of the unfortunates. It succeeded in getting an appropriate of 5,000,000 livres on 8 October. This money was given to Roland, Minister of the Interior, to be used in various ways for relieving suffering. Providing work for the unemployed was the chief method used by Roland in aiding these unfortunates. 13

In the meantime, temporary relief and work were being provided in specific cases. A special deputy was sent to the National Convention by the city of Lille (department of Nord) to obtain a grant for emergency aid. This town had suffered a very devastating attack by Austrian brigands who pillaged and burned most of the town and
surrounding territory. In his plea for aid the deputy further stated that the town had already received 100,000 livres, but this amount was insufficient, considering the recently increased suffering. Of the 60,000 inhabitants there were 28,000 poor. He requested that 400,000 livres be given to Lille immediately to help them in this emergency.

Cambon, deputy from Herault, addressing the Convention, said that the Convention could not properly make an appropriation for a particular case, but should adopt legislation that would provide for such emergencies generally throughout the nation. As a result the Convention decreed that 2,000,000 livres be given to the Minister of the Interior for supplying provisional relief to besieged towns. Of the appropriation voted, 400,000 livres were to be sent to Lille.14

Roland, Minister of the Interior, on 10 October, 1792, sent a circular to the department administrators regarding relief to be given the Acadians and other French Canadians pursuant to an old law of 21 February, 1791.15 The national treasury on 13-14 October, 1792, gave Roland 300,000 livres to be distributed for relief and work.16 Distribution of funds allotted for relief by the decree of 14 May, 1792, was cancelled and a new distribution was voted on 12 November, 1792. By this act the departments of
Bouches-du-Rhône, Calvados, and Corsica were added to the list of departments already being aided through the original distribution of 14 May, 1792.17

The National Convention, by a decree of 26-27 November, 1792, voted the sum of 2,000,000 livres to be given as succor to the fathers, mothers, and children of soldiers of all ranks who were in the service of their country.18 This initial effort in patriotic relief was a quite new development and will be dealt with later on in the present chapter. Funds for the care of foundlings were supplemented at this time by the Convention. This additional grant consisting of 1,500,000 livres was provided by a law passed on 9 January, 1793.19 These specific cases are representative of the wide variety of relief granted by the Convention directly, exclusive of the work of its Committee on Public Succor. However, relief on a more general national basis was continued.

Jean Debry, deputy from Aisne, was interested in procuring work for the able-bodied poor as a means of wiping out beggary. 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 charity workshops for the benefit of the unemployed. The opening of these workshops and the use of unemployed for repair of roads by the departments, Debry felt, would employ many of the indigent. The Convention
did not take immediate action on this plan but ordered that it be printed and referred to the Committee on Finance. 20 Fayau, deputy from Vendee, presented in the name of the Committees of Public Succor and of Finance a plan for aiding the unemployed. In this plan, which Fayau introduced on 6 February, 1793, he asked for 3,000,000 livres to be distributed among the eighty-five departments to be used specifically in carrying on public works. Barbarou proposed 8,000,000 livres instead of 3,000,000. Lesage amended the proposal of Fayau, substituting 6,000,000 livres in place of the original 3,000,000. Fayau's proposal as amended by Lesage was adopted by the Convention on 6 February, 1793. Throughout the eighty-five departments public works were to be inaugurated at once. The Convention in its decree of adoption insisted that these public works must be of the most useful sort and, above all, must employ as many indigents as possible. 21

One of the most significant laws enacted by the Convention regarding unemployment relief was that of 19 March, 1793. Jean Baptiste Bo, deputy from the department of Aveyron, on 19 March, 1793, read a report on a general organization of public succor. Attached to this report was a proposed decree. This report and decree, having been previously submitted to and approved by the Committee on Public Succor, was now presented to the National Convention. It accepted the combined report and decree as one of its
basic laws for the nationalization of assistance. Much of the relief doctrine of the National Convention can be found in the preface to this law of 19 March. It enunciated the proposition that the organization of relief should be founded upon the eternal principles of 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 voluntary aid.

(2). This duty of providing for the subsistence of the poor was a national charge or obligation.22

This law of 19 March, 1793, provided that an annual appropriation be made to each department for aiding the indigent. The bases for this division of aid throughout the Republic were to be determined according to taxable and non-taxable inhabitants and the average daily wage in each department. These same bases were to be used by the departments when dividing, among their cantons, the annual appropriation decreed by the Convention.23 In each canton an agency was to be formed under the supervision of the administrative and executive officers charged with the distribution of relief and work.

Relief funds appropriated by the national government were divided in the following manner:
(1) Aid for the able-bodied by means of employment in times of a shortage or cessation of work or in times of disaster.

(2) Outside relief, i.e., home-relief.

(3) Asylums for the homeless sick.

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

(5) Emergency relief in cases of increased suffering occasioned by unforseen calamities.

Such relief works (travaux de secours) were to operate daily, except on Sundays. Free maternity wards and health officers were to be provided for the poor. They were to be taught the benefits of thrift through a national savings bank that was to be organized. Since work was to be made available, begging would be dealt with very rigorously. The distribution of food or money in public buildings was strictly forbidden. This former method of administering relief was to be replaced by voluntary subscriptions to the relief agencies. The adoption of the foregoing legislation was the second significant step taken by the convention towards nationalizing assistance. Upon adopting this law, the Convention insisted that one-fifth of the funds appropriated should be set aside as a reserve emergency relief fund. In this plan, unemployment relief through work received direct consideration as a possible solution.
The trend towards nationalizing relief was further developed by the laws of 26-28 June, 1793, and of 21-24 vendémiaire an II (12-15 October, 1793). The first article of the law of 28 June, 1793, definitely stated that families were entitled to government relief if the wages they earned were not sufficient for their needs. Working families with two or more children were to receive aid from the government. This was temporary relief, expiring when such children reached the age of twelve. As for the foundlings, the nation took upon itself the moral and material education of these abandoned children. Each municipality was to provide for the care of these foundlings. Aside from aiding the foundlings and aged, this decree of 28 June, 1793, made some slight provision for supplying work to the unemployed.

The next significant step taken by the National Convention was the enactment of the law of 21-24 vendémiaire an II (12-15 October, 1793) which dealt with the problem of begging. The text of this decree seems to have been borrowed almost bodily from the projects submitted to the National Constituent Assembly by Liancourt's Committee on Mendicancy (see Part II, Chapter I). Here again we find the problem of the unemployed linked with that of destroying begging. The leaders argued that if mendicancy were wiped out or even sufficiently repressed, they would be able to determine who
were the true unemployed desiring work. This fact alone was responsible for many petitions and projects for healing this social ill. The Committee on Public Succor proceeded on this basis, working at great length on a project which they felt would attain the desired results. The decree which it submitted to the Convention was preceded with a long report. Not only did this report have a philosophical basis, but it was also practical and informative. The viewpoint of the Committee was summarized by Bo, its reporter. Being one of the more important and influential members of the Committee on Public Succor, a short biographical note at this point would be of interest.

Jean-Baptiste-Jerome Bo was born 1 July, 1743, at Mur-de-Barrez (Aveyron). He studied medicine at the University of Montpellier, receiving his degree there on 5 May, 1770. Bo began his medical practice in his home town. In 1790 he was elected to a high administrative position in his district. The next year the department of Aveyron elected Bo as its deputy to the Legislative Assembly and the following year sent him as their representative to the National Convention. Bo was made a member of the Convention's Committee on Public Succor and also its representative on the Central Committee. Also, his colleagues, having noticed his interest in public welfare and particularly popular education, elected him along with Fourcroy, Mathieu, Gregoire and others to the first
Committee on Public Instruction to be organized by the Convention. Among the many special positions he fulfilled was that of deputy on Mission to Corsica. Although very popular, Bo was accused of terrorism, arrested, and later set free (25 October, 1795). Subsequently, Bo withdrew from active political life and accepted a position as chief of the bureau of emigres in the Ministry of Police. Giving up this position 18 brumaire VIII, Bo returned to Fontainebleau to resume his medical practice. Here he spent the last fourteen years of his life, dying 15 May, 1814.31

The report and decree proposed by the Committee on Public Succor were sent to the Convention by Bo on 21 vendemiaire an II (12 October, 1793).32 The definitive decree was divided into the following sections:

Section I. Relief Works (Travaux de secours)
Section II. Means of Repression (Moyens de repression)
Section III. Houses of Repression (Maisons de repression)
Section IV. Concerning Transportation (De la transportation)
Section V. Local Relief Centers (Du domicile de secours)

The first section was devoted entirely to succor by means of work relief. Each town was ordered to make a study of its own unemployment problem. These municipalities,
at the request of their cantonal relief agencies, should submit annually a register of their able-bodied poor. This register was to contain the name, sex, and age of each unemployed person listed; his normal type of work, and the periods when such work was lacking. These towns were also to suggest useful means and types of re-employment. These cantonal agencies, in turn, were to forward these inventories to the administrative directory of the district, together with their observations, recommendations, and requests for the aid they considered necessary for the relief works suggested. The district directories were to add their observations and advice to these inventories and forward them to the directory of their respective departments. These department directories would then present the entire inventory to the national administrative council, after adding their advice and requests for appropriations for the proposed work relief projects. A duplicate of this report was to be sent by the administrative council to the executive council with a request for the necessary funds involved. The final action was to be taken by the Convention upon receipt of these reports from the executive council. In all cases, the voting of appropriations for work relief lay in the hands of the Convention, who after careful study of the propositions, generally granted the amounts requested. Only able-bodied poor were to be admitted to
these work projects. Before being opened for receiving the unemployed, these relief works must be announced fifteen days in advance of the opening date. This announcement was to be made throughout the district where such work was located and this by means of placards, handbills, signs, and similar advertising devices.

The poor person who sought employment had to have a passport from his native canton. Preference was to be given, first, to the projects benefiting the cantons, then to those having advantages for the municipalities. In some localities where circumstances warranted it, there were to be established relief works of a sedentary nature for those workers who might not be able to perform the more laborious jobs. The Committees on Agriculture and on Commerce were asked to suggest what public works might be undertaken which would bring prosperity to agriculture and commerce, as well as to public welfare in general. The wages to be paid for labor in the relief works were to be three-fourths of the average wage paid in the cantons. The agencies, before receiving the second and all subsequent appropriations, must submit an accounting of the money previously given to them.

The decree further stated that in conformity with the law of 19 March, 1793, all distribution of food and money in the cantons was to cease with the opening of the
relief works. Any person caught giving such aid to beggars was to be assessed a fine amounting to wages ordinarily paid for two days work. If caught offending a second time, this fine was to be doubled. Such fines, when collected, were to be deposited in the reserve fund which took care of outside or home relief.33

As for begging, the Bo report divided the beggars into three types. The first type consisted of those who begged during certain seasons of the year, especially when work was scarce and many factories were closed. Beggars of this type did not leave their cantons, nor did they disturb public peace and security. The second and third types of beggars, according to this report, included those who would not work as well as those habitual and lawless vagabonds who were a menace to public peace. These latter two types were to be dealt with severely, while those of the first type were to receive ample consideration.

In the foregoing law, the Convention struck a hard blow at beggary. Houses of repression were to be established for those who refused to work; while relief works were created for those who desired to work. Provision was made by this law for deportation of all vagabonds over eighteen and under sixty years of age who were habitual offenders. French Guiana, in South America, and Fort-Dauphin, in Madagascar, were designated as possible penal
colonies for such offenders. Thence, through this program, France was given one of the best plans of the period. This plan did much to solve the problem of unemployment as well as that of mendicancy.

Since a great deal of money had been appropriated from time to time for public works, some leaders felt that the National 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 and give them the form of definite legislation was the work of Barere de Vieuzac, deputy from Bigorre and a former member of the Committee on Mendicancy of the Constituent Assembly. On 21 ventose an II (11 March, 1794) Barere read before the National Convention an extremely long and diffuse report on public works and what had been done to encourage them. This voluminous report of Barere sounded like a "summation of the doctrines of the Montagnards drawn up by a moderate who had become a Jacobin in order to save his head." He emphasized the fact that the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies had tried to wipe out beggary. Barere recommended the creation of a Commission on Public Works to centralize the control and financing of such works. This system of public works, he maintained, would solve the problem of mendicancy. Repression and severe penal codes were to be laid aside and work was to be given to the masses
of unemployed. Individual work should be associated with national prosperity. His project for a Commission on Public Works was adopted the same day it was presented, 21 ventose an II (11 March, 1794). This same law provided for a Central School of Public Works. This school was eventually established by the law enacted on 7 vendemiaire an III (28 September, 1794). Prieur de la Côte-d'Or was very instrumental in getting the school started. The number of unemployed persons was somewhat reduced by the fact that the Central School of Public Works took in young men sixteen to twenty years of age and prepared them for future jobs.

The Register of National Beneficence (Le Livre de Bienfaisance Nationale), created by the law of 22 floreal an II (11 May, 1794) further nationalized assistance. It did very little immediately for relief of the city unemployed through providing work. However, much relief was directed towards rural areas. The work of assistance after 9 thermidor an II (27 July, 1794) was administered by the National Succor Commission (Commission nationale de secours) which worked in conjunction with the Committee on Public Succor. This National Commission was created on 12 germinal an II (1 April, 1794). Through the law of 26 thermidor an II (13 August, 1794) this Commission was granted a sum of 20,000,000 livres to be used in support of the various charitable establishments under its supervision.
among such establishments were the relief works. 39

The Convention, in the thermidorean period, took under consideration the idea of a general classification of all relief legislation which had, thus far, been enacted by the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies and the National Convention. This relief legislation centered around assistance, checks on beggary, and unemployment relief. On 3 floreal an II (23 April, 1794) Cambaceres, Marlin de Douai, and Gouthon were appointed to draft this code. This commission worked steadily and without interruption. It had the able assistance of the great legalist, Louvre, who later under Napoleon became Secretary of the Council of State. All of the important committees in the related fields of subsistence, finance, agriculture, commerce, police, etc., collaborated with the commission in drafting this "Code des secours publics." The work alone of this commission would make a long and interesting story in itself. However, the present treatment will be brief, highlighting principally the materials dealing with public succor. From 21 January, 1790, to about the time of the appointing of this commission, more than 1,500 laws dealing with mendicancy and relief had been enacted. This figure does not include the 1,000 or more decrees which granted relief to particular individuals and in isolated cases. 40
In a study of the development of a national social responsibility, it is of interest to note the following statement from the preface of the "Code of Public Succor:

The French nation recognizes two classes of citizens to whom it may grant succor: the poor who merit its assistance; and soldiers, who, having served the nation well, are entitled to some compensation.

With this as the guiding principle, the Code was divided into two sections: succor for the civilian public and succor or pensions for military personnel and their dependents. Of particular significance was the introductory paragraph of Book I. In it, the Convention expressed the opinion that such codification of relief legislation would insure a constant relief program. The continuity of such a program, they believed, would certainly contribute to its nationalization.

Book I of the Code of Public Succor was devoted to civil succor as opposed to succor for military personnel and their dependents. This legislation was grouped in the following manner:

Section I. Laws providing for:

1. Succor for civilians.
2. Succor given at home.
3. Relief work projects.
4. Hospices and the repression of mendicancy.
Section II. Laws providing for special groups of civilians:

1. The blind, the deaf and dumb.
2. Those unjustly imprisoned for a long period.
3. Those who suffered by reason of enemy invasions.
4. Those families who sustained losses occasioned by the long trial of the heads of such families.
5. Those who suffered because of the inclemency of the seasons.
6. Impoverished artists.
7. Improvement of sanitary conditions in penal workhouses as a step towards scientific reorganization of the penal system.

Section III. Laws providing for the administration of public succor.

Book II embraced all the legislation giving succor to military personnel. This may be briefly summarized in the principles stated below:

1. The nation will grant pensions and indemnities to military personnel who have merited such from their country.
2. Pensions and indemnities will be granted to the dependents of military personnel who engaged in the great "struggle for liberty."
3. Military hospitals will be provided by the national government.
4. In addition, the national government will furnish a place of convalescence for the wounded in the national "Hotel des Invalides."[41

The foregoing codification of relief legislation indicated very clearly that the nation recognized its debt to society. The Constituent and Legislative Assemblies looked to the sale of clerical holdings (biens ecclesiastiques) as an additional source of finances for relief. The National Convention went further. It wanted all money for public succor to be placed in one fund or treasury, centrally located. This fund was to be dispensed by the national government through its administrative organization consisting of departments, districts, and communes. This was accomplished by means of a decree which the Convention adopted 23 messidor an II (11 July, 1794).
CHAPTER II

The Convention—Charity Workshops and Patriotic Relief

While the administration's program of long-range planning was slowly getting started, a few emergency measures were deemed necessary. From time to time, food and other items were distributed to the needy. A further example of this type of expediency can be seen in the following action taken by the National Convention on 9 May, 1793. On this date, the Convention granted the city of Puy 6,730 livres to be used for providing free soup to its poor.¹ The district of Toulouse on 23 September, 1793, subsidized the sale of bread to its poor at a sub-market price and distributed printed bread cards to those qualified to purchase bread at this reduced price.² Early in vendémiaire an III (ca 21 September, 1794) the Paris Welfare Committee distributed bread and meat (including fresh pork) to the needy on the first day of each "decade" of the revolutionary calendar. In addition free medicine was given, although on a limited scale.³

By an order of the Committee of Public Safety dated 5 prairial an II (24 May, 1794) needy infirm persons in all the large communes were to be given a dole. Invalid poor, if single, were to receive 15 sous a day; if married, 25 sous a day, and 5 sous additional for every child under
the age of twelve. Those indigents who were not totally
disabled were eligible for only two-thirds of this aid.

Steady decline in the value of French currency
during the Reign of Terror led the Committee on Public
Succor to increase the dole. This increase ordered on
24 floreal an III (13 May, 1795) gave 20 sous to single
invalid poor and 30 sous to the married ones. The
allowance for children under twelve years remained the same.
The dole for partially disabled poor was raised from 10 to
15 sous.4

Most of the charity funds were appropriated by
the national government. These amounts varied as to cir-
cumstances and locality. Some, as was noted in the preceding
chapter, concerned the whole nation, others a single depart-
ment, district, or municipality. As has been previously
seen, a decree of 13 June, 1790, provided 30,000 livres to
be spent in each of the eighty-three departments in establish-
ing charity workshops. A similar decree of 19 December, 1790,
provided 15,000,000 livres for the same purpose. An appropi-
atation of 2,350,000 livres for poor relief had been made to
the departments on 24 January, 1792.5 Relief work to be
done at home (secours a domicile) was provided for through
an appropriation of 10,000,000 livres granted to the depart-
ments on 2 prairial an II (21 May, 1794).6 Disabled
indigents also received consideration when the National
Convention, on 16 ventose an II (6 March, 1794) granted an appropriation of 500,000 livres for such aid. Funds for the operation of the "depots de mendicité" during 1794 had been previously arranged for by a grant of 1,000,000 livres on 5 June, 1793.

It must not be assumed that the charity workshops disappeared altogether after the closing down of the badly managed Montmartre projects (see preceding chapter). The vast majority of charity workshops that operated subsequently to 1791 were supported mainly by funds allotted to the departments for support of a public works program. Much freedom was allowed the departmental directories as to both the nature of the works and the means by which they were to be accomplished. The ends for both the charity workshops and the public works program were frequently the same; namely, the construction of works of public utility and the reduction of unemployment. At the same time there were probably some differences of emphasis. In the case of the charity workshops, the primary end was the reduction of unemployment. In the public works program the emphasis was upon the work projected. In the charity workshops most of the labor was unskilled and simple projects had to be undertaken, whereas in the public works enterprises skilled workmen might be employed. Thus the charity workshops benefited unskilled laborers while the public works program might
benefit both skilled and unskilled laborers. Discontent and slovenliness often resulted in the charity workshops because the wages paid in these projects were always at a level lower than that of the normal labor market. On the other hand, in the public works enterprises, where normal labor wages prevailed, workers were more satisfied, and probably performed better work.9

Of the numerous forms of work undertaken through charity workshops, the most usual was the building or the reconstruction of roads and highways. During the last quarter of the eighteenth century hundreds of miles of French roads received attention from these workshops. Occasionally, the project was the construction of a new road, but in most cases it was the repair of an old one. Projects might take the form of resurfacing, the correction of drainage and the removal of ruts, the reopening of the ditches along the sides of the road, or the planting of trees along the road sides. All of this work was done by the charity workshops under the expert supervision of the Department of Bridges and Highways (Departement des Ponts et Chaussees).

Among other types of projects, the most common was the cleaning and repairing of city streets. In winter this labor often was the removing of snow. In Paris workers were employed also to break the ice on the river in order
that the mills might operate. Other workers were used to spread sand on icy landings. Old ramparts of a city were removed, or new ramparts were constructed, or a hill was leveled. Still other types of work projected included improving the navigability of local rivers, the building of sea-dikes, the excavating, cleaning and enlargening of ports, the digging of canals, and the drainage of swamps.10

Sometimes dump-heaps were removed, quays and river banks were cleaned, streets were resurfaced with rocks, and trees were planted along the streets.

The National Convention, on 22 February, 1793, set aside an appropriation of 20,000,000 livres for highway repairs and beautification.11 Garat, Minister of the Interior and Roland's successor, sent to the Convention on 15 March, 1793, a report on the charity workshops in operation as a result of the appropriation made on 22 February, 1793.12

In June, 1793, the local directory of the department of Seine-et-Marne ordered four workshops established in the canton of Donnemaire for the benefit of the vine-growers who had lost all hope of a harvest.13 The increasing trend towards nationalizing these charity workshops as a method of combatting beggary and widespread unemployment was the chief motivating force behind the efforts of Jean-Baptiste Bo. His report and decree of 21-24 vendemiaire
an II (12-16 October, 1793) ordered the establishment of charity workshops in all the departments.\textsuperscript{14}

Although the status of unemployment relief and relief work projects in Paris was typical of most of France, an accounting of other sections may prove equally revealing.

At Lyons, after the illfated insurrection of 1793-1794, the richer quarters of the city were condemned to be demolished; and 15,000 charity workshop laborers, gathered not only from Lyons but also from neighboring departments, were employed. Although little was accomplished, it was estimated that the expenses paid these motley, unorganized laborers amounted to 400,000 livres a "decade."\textsuperscript{15}

In January, 1794, charity workshops were operating in the Dordogne, employing laborers on the roads. Also in the department of Haute-Garonne in the district of Toulouse, there were in 1794-1795 a large number of charity workshops.\textsuperscript{16} Likewise in the district of Alencon (Orne department) there was a widespread use of the charity workshops and other relief measures. The district's general council, on 23 September, 1792, took under advisement the use of an appropriation of approximately 1,026 livres, this amount having been previously granted by the Alencon district directory. This sum was clearly earmarked for the opening of a charity workshop project on the highway leading from
Courtomer to Gapree. Charles Lecoeur of Ferrieres was named as chief foreman of these road projects. A daily report was required of the chief foreman. Such report was to show the number of laborers employed and the amount of wages paid them. Supervisory commissioners, Jue and Letellier-Galaisiere, were charged with writing to all the towns of the canton, inviting their unemployed to accept work in these projects. On 7 February, 1793, an additional grant of 300 livres was made by Alencon to the town of Marchemaisons for that section of the Sees--Mele-sur-Sarthe highway which passed through this town. Again, the project supervisors were directed to file weekly reports covering the number of men employed and funds spent. In response to a request made by the district general council, on 10 February, 1793, a subsequent grant was made on 24 February, 1793, by the Alencon directory. This appropriation made possible the opening up of another outdoor work project on the highway from Sees to Mele-sur-Sarthe.

Outdoor workshops were evidently popular in Orne department. For the unemployed poor of the commune of Carrouges, one was begun on 9 February, 1793. Tartarin, the procureur (fiscal agent) of this commune was given a grant of 200 livres to be used for employing the poor in repairing the Carrouges-Argentan route. A similar work
project was undertaken in the commune of Gandelain. Here, Michel Preaux, the procureur, was given on 18 February, 1793, relief funds in the amount of 400 livres for employing the poor on the road repair projects along the highway from St. Denis to Giral. In the parish of Conde-sur-Sarthe, a large number of laborers had been removed from the relief rolls and put to work on repairing the Alencon-Poote route. Houet, the commissioner in charge of this project, reported to the Conde-sur-Sarthe municipal council on 3 November, 1793, that he had spent 2,733 livres of the 2,738 livres appropriated for this project.

The general council of Alencon, on 17 ventose an II (7 March, 1794) drew up an ordinance providing work for poor indigents. This ordinance called for a proclamation inviting all needy unemployed men, women, and children to register with Hardy, for work in their locality. Hardy was the municipal inspector in charge of promenade maintenance.

In this department (Orne) government funds were supplemented by popular contributions made by many playhouses, entertainers, and dramatic companies. The Dramatic Society of the commune of Alencon gave to the general council of the city 1,500 livres, the receipts from a charity performance. The council ordered, on 26 pluviose an II (14 February, 1794), that this sum be used to employ
the poor in work projects that would beautify or improve the commune of Alençon. The theater "La Comédie," on 3 ventose an II (21 February, 1794) contributed 335 livres from a benefit performance. The general council voted to use this gift to employ those who needed work in the projected improvement of the promenade of Alençon. Again the Dramatic Society gave on 12 germinal an II (1 April, 1794) to the commune of Alençon, 1,100 livres. This amount, coming from a charity performance, was specifically designated "to be used for relief of the needy." These foregoing examples are indicative of hundreds of benefit shows, during the period of the National Convention, performed "for aiding the unemployed." Some persons may look upon these benefit shows as acts of charity; while to others they might have the appearance of a "good business" venture. However, a national tax on entertainments was later adopted (7 frimaire an V--27 November, 1796).

Further appropriations were made for relief work during the year 1795. The Convention by an act of 21 pluviose an III (9 February, 1795) granted 10,000,000 livres to be divided among the departments for their charitable needs. The distribution of this money was modified by the Convention later on. On 7 germinal an III (27 March, 1795) a law stipulated that half of this 10,000,000 livres should go to indigents who were old or
infirm, and the remaining half be used for "useful works, and principally for the repair of neighborhood roads."27 These are by no means all of the appropriations for public works during this year but they do reveal the trend of the time.

The idea of a specialized relief set-up for needy women was not new as we have already seen. We recall how Turgot, in his notable pamphlet on state-supported charities, advocated spinning shops for women and girls. Recall, too, the interest shown and work done by Bailly for women's charity workshops in the earlier period. In administering the program of relief work for needy women, shops were set up at first for the spinning of hemp. Later, cotton and flax were added. Besides the spinners employed, there were cleaners and carders of the raw materials. These later two groups were usually made up of older persons or of children (ages 8 to 16 years). Their work was light and payment often trivial. Hours for all workers were long. In summer, work began at 6:00 a.m. and ceased at 7:00 p.m. In winter, the hours were from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. During the day the women had two free periods of an hour each for eating. By way of compensating for the low wages paid, it must be noted that the government furnished free meals daily to these workers. Later, free meals were discontinued and workers were given six pounds
of bread each week. This amount was subsequently reduced to four. When the Revolutionary calendar replaced the seven day week by ten day periods, the amount of free bread was again altered. The new amount was six pounds a "decade."28

The creation of additional spinning schools at Paris in order to perfect the art of spinning had been previously proposed on 15 April, 1792, by G. Virchaux who suggested that the pupils be recruited from German families, especially from Lunebourg and Voigtland. The Department of Public Works, however, did not favor this later idea. As a reason for opposition the Public Works Department asserted, "We already have too many poor foreign families attracted to this city by facilities from which they hope to make a living." As to increasing the number of workshops, this Department advocated their reduction rather than their extension.29

Subsequently the municipal government of Paris introduced a new practice. On 12 October, 1793, a ruling allowed mothers who had two or more children to do their spinning relief work at home. These women were given the same quantity of materials they would have worked on in the spinning shops.30

An idea of the number of persons employed in the variety of jobs connected with the spinning shops of Paris
can be obtained from the report of Lemit and Reverdy, interim administrators of public establishments. This report, rendered on 29 thermidor an II (16 August, 1793), represented the situation as of 10 messidor an II (28 June, 1793). The two principal groups involved were the North Workshops (Atelier du Nord) and the South Workshops (Atelier du Midi). The workshop in the old monastery of the Recollets was removed to the building formerly occupied by the Sisters of Charity and became known as the North Workshop. The workshop in the Jacobin Monastery became known as the South Workshop. This report not only shows the number employed but the various jobs such as spinning of linen, hemp, and cotton, and the preparatory tasks of picking and carding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atelier du Nord</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filature du lin et du chanvre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atelier de la citoyenne Gentil</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; Lecoq</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filature du coton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atelier du citoyen Christophe</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; de la citoyenne Metayer</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epluchage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atelier du citoyen Christophe</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardage</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Records of these two workshops, together with those of the General Magazine, revealed that up to the end of 1794, there had been an average of 2,500 workers employed in Paris alone. 32

Numerous complaints, at one time or another, were made against the North and South Workshops. A spirit of violence characteristic of the Montmartre outdoor workshops 1789-1790, was present also in these two women's workshops, and flamed anew from time to time. Yet it did not provoke their closure, as it did that of the outdoor workshops, doubtless because the officials were less afraid of the women than of the men. Chief among these complaints were those concerning internal management, expenditures, and the effect of these workshops upon private industry. 33 During
their early existence, complaints were made that these work projects did not readily absorb the poor, unemployed, and needy women.\textsuperscript{34} One writer complained of the great amount of profanity and vile conversation among the women employees.\textsuperscript{35}

Control of these charity textile rooms passed into the hands of the Commission on Agriculture and the Arts on 14 fructidor an II (3 September, 1794). The celebrated chemist, Berthollet, a former director of the Gobelins, was the outstanding member of this Commission. The Commission worked under the jurisdiction of a more authoritative group, the Committee on Agriculture and the Arts. To this latter group, Berthollet, in the name of the Commission, recommended on 12 frimaire an III (2 December, 1794), a decree closing the spinning shops.\textsuperscript{36} The Committee of Agriculture and the Arts approved the proposed decree and forwarded it to the National Convention which failed to sustain the Committee's action.\textsuperscript{37} The Convention, not satisfied with the administration of the spinning shops, placed these workshops, early in 1795, under the supervision of the Commission of Public Succor, subject to the jurisdiction of the Committee of Public Succor.\textsuperscript{38} Here the supervision and administration of the spinning shops remained until they were reduced to a single atelier. This reduction of spinning shops and the shifting of spinning from the shops to the homes were accomplished by a ruling
of the Committee of Public Succor on 29 prairial an III (18 June, 1795).39

The one remaining atelier was to serve as a clearing house for raw materials and finished products. From it the poor and unemployed women could obtain flax, cotton, and hemp for home spinning. Their finished products were bought by the spinning shop. At this sole surviving workshop, some instruction in making hemp and linen was given to young girls, aged 7-12 years. Such apprenticeships were to last for two months during which time the young workers were to receive 7 sols per day. Upon completion of their training, these girls would be given spinning relief work to be done at home.40 It was felt by the Committee on Public Succor that home relief work was far better for women than the charity sewing and spinning shops. Home work, it said, would reduce the tendency towards strikes and would greatly minimize the administrative problems involved. The one condition necessary for participating in the program of home relief was that the applicant must have been a resident of Paris for at least one year.41

Perhaps the most outstanding criticisms of the spinning projects were those charging wastefulness and fraud on the part of workers and worthlessness as regards the quality of their work.42 Much of this poor material was given to the hospitals to be used as shrouds for those paupers
who died there.\textsuperscript{43} The government made further disposition of this poorly spun cotton and cloth by having the workshops make mattresses and bed covers of it to be given to needy persons in Paris who lacked sufficient bedding.\textsuperscript{44} Later we shall see that the State required the workshops to convert much of this poor, coarse material into sail-cloth for the French marine.\textsuperscript{45}

Despite the abuses of the workshops and the small value of the articles either produced in them or under their supervision, these spinning shops fulfilled an important service. They provided employment for several thousand needy women in a period of severe economic crisis. The government had spent on the workshops, according to a report of 15 floreal an III (5 May, 1795), a total of 3,940,583 livres. Of this amount, 3,478,507 livres were refunded from goods sold or were represented by finished goods and other assets. This left a relatively small deficit.\textsuperscript{46} They offered little or no competition to private industry. They were not abolished, but only reduced in size and scope of production in 1795. Doubtless these institutions did not care for all the women, old men, and children of Paris who needed assistance and employment. Perhaps a greater number continued their begging and plundering. Nevertheless, the project rendered considerable service.
The war, as we have seen, had a rather wholesome effect upon the unemployment problems of the government. Through the "levy in mass (levee en masse) many of the unemployed were drained off; first into the army, and later, as we shall see, into essential production, especially munitions and agriculture. Although the war did much in reducing the amount of unemployment, the consequences of the war, however, threatened to produce a new group of unemployed persons. Such a group would include honorably discharged soldiers invalidated for further military service because of wounds or sickness while on active duty, or for superannuation. These men being no longer capable of military service, would, by reason of such fact, be thrown into the class of unemployed persons.

The numbers of this group of unemployed, some skilled and many more unskilled, was likely to be increased. This increase would logically flow from dependents of men conscripted for military service as a result of the levee en masse. There can be little doubt that aiding these dependents would prevent their joining the ranks of the unemployed. The war, apparently, forced a new solution for those dependents who could not be employed.

Patriotic assistance, that is, aid for military personnel and their dependents, received much attention
during this period, 1792-1795. This group included the widows, children, or near relatives of military and naval personnel who lost their lives defending the nation.

Following the outbreak of the war in April, 1792, the national government found itself faced with continually increasing demands for aid to soldiers and their dependents. The Committee on Public Succor had submitted a report regarding this problem. The National Convention, after having heard this report, enacted, on 26-27 November, 1792, a decree of principles relative to such patriotic assistance.

The Minister of the Interior, according to Article 1 of the law of 26-27 November, 1792, was given 2,000,000 livres to be distributed in form of aid to such persons as were designated in Article 2. These persons were the fathers, mothers, wives, and children of volunteer soldiers of all ranks, and they had to indicate that their "soldier-relatives" had been their sole support.

Registration bureaus for all eligible dependents were to be set up in each municipality, and at Paris, in each section of that city. This was to be done within fifteen days after the publication of the decree. All applicants had to submit their baptismal certificates, as well as a copy of the soldier's military service registration blank. These applications, after final processing,
were turned over to the Minister of the Interior. After verification of these, the Minister of the Interior forwarded the necessary amounts to the proper municipalities or sections. Payments were made quarterly and were reckoned from the date of the soldier's enlistment. Such relief was to cease upon the soldier's return or at his death while in service. Additional provision was made for dealing with those ineligible "dependents" who attempted to get on the patriotic relief rolls.47

While this initial effort in patriotic relief was being established, the government decided, by means of a new decree, enacted 4-5 May, 1793, to extend these benefits to others in the armed services. The report upon which the decree was based was presented jointly by the War and Navy Committees. In substance, the decree stated that relief will be granted to the families of soldiers in all branches of army service, to the families of sailors, gunners, and marine soldiers in active service on vessels and other ships of the Republic. Again the list of possible dependents included mothers, fathers, wives, children, and other close relatives on both sides. Local governments were to appoint judges who were to determine the eligibility of the dependents. The remaining twenty articles of this decree contained essentially the same methods of certification, distribution, and payment as that of 26-27 November,
1792. There was, however, one notable exception in this new law. This exception excluded from patriotic relief all dependents of substitute or replacement soldiers. It was made clear that the names of all applicants who were refused aid were to be listed together with the statement of reasons for refusal and forwarded to the Minister of the Interior.48

Aid, in the form of pensions, was given to the soldiers' widows by a special enactment of 4-5 June, 1793.49 The Convention, on 15 September, 1793, voted to place 5,000,000 livres at the disposal of the Minister of the Interior for the purpose of aiding needy dependents of the fallen "defenders of the country."50 This aid was to be administered by the local municipal and departmental governments. Weekly reports on the spending of this fund were to be made by the Minister of the Interior to the Committee on Finances. In turn, this committee was to make monthly reports to the National Convention.51

The relief granted to widows and children of soldiers killed in battle was extended to all other dependent relatives by a law of 9 nivose an III (29 December, 1793). Similar aid was subsequently granted to the dependents of wounded military personnel.

Increasing demands for aid and the steadily rising higher cost of living moved the Convention to
grant relief, pensions, and gratifications to grenadiers and national gendarmes through the laws of 27 nivose and 4 pluviose an II (16 and 23 January, 1794). 52

From all appearances, the earlier patriotic relief legislation had not made the intent of this new program sufficiently clear. In order, therefore, to clarify and strengthen their previous legislation, the Convention, on 21 pluviose an II (9 February, 1794), stated that fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, as well as wives and children of the nation's defenders were eligible for monetary aid from the government. In certifying themselves for this aid, applicants must declare themselves as being, or having been, wholly dependent upon the labor of their soldier relatives. 53 By a decision of 11 thermidor an II (29 July, 1794) the Committee of Public Safety ruled that young men drafted for work in the manufacturing of sailcloth were not to be regarded as "defenders of the Fatherland," and that their dependents would not be eligible for aid granted under this law. 54

Other groups were added to the patriotic relief rolls by later legislation. Dependents of soldier replacements (previously excluded from relief benefits by the law of 4-5 May, 1793) were now to be aided. This was made possible by a ruling of the Convention on 24 floréal an II (13 May, 1794). Likewise, dependents of sailors who
manned the nation's freighters, and dependents of deceased army male nurses were declared eligible for relief by the laws of 24 pluviose and 7 floreal an II (12 February and 26 April, 1794).55

A decree of 13 prairial an II (1 June, 1794) was passed for the express purpose of accelerating the distribution of relief, pensions, and gratifications due the dependents of military and naval personnel. All relief measures formerly applying to the dependents of the volunteers, were now, by the law of 1 June, 1794, extended to the dependents of those who had been drafted.56

The mounting costs of patriotic relief became alarming. It became very necessary to curtail expenditures. Some slight retrenchment was made under the decree of 26 brumaire an III (16 November, 1794). They cut off aid to dependent survivors of soldiers, who, although on active service, had died of other than war incurred causes.57

More stringent measures were deemed advisable in the certification of applicants, the granting of relief funds, and the payment of pensions. The greater part of this curtailment was accomplished through the laws enacted on 13 prairial an II and 18 ventose an III (1 June, 1794 and 8 March, 1795).58
CHAPTER III

Effects of War and Terror on Unemployment

On 6 April, 1793, the National Convention organized an executive committee composed of nine members. This committee, the most famous of all the Revolutionary committees, was later known as the Committee of Public Safety (Comite de Salut Public). Its membership was subsequently increased to twelve. To it was entrusted the supreme executive authority of France, in spite of the Convention's refusal to give it the name "Comite de gouvernement."

By a decree of 10 August, 1793, the Convention placed the Executive Council, the ministers, the generals, and all administrative authorities under the supervision of this committee. It was empowered to issue orders to ministers or other executive agents. It was merely required, in these matters, to submit a report to the ultimately controlling Convention. The Committee of Public Safety directed the appointment of local officials and the administration of the whole country. Among other duties, it conducted the foreign relations, supervised the armies and secured the active support of the French people in all phases of the war effort. It reached its fullest powers when the Convention, by a decree of 4 December, 1793,
made it the hub of the Revolutionary government.

The Committee's meetings were secret. At its first meeting were elected a president, vice-president and two secretaries, but records of subsequent meetings clearly show that this type of organization was soon abandoned. If the Committee is called "Danton's government" from April to July, 1793, and "Robespierre's government" from July, 1793 to July, 1794, it is excusable but nevertheless not quite true. Danton's hot forcefulness and Robespierre's cold efficiency gave to each a more or less informal leadership, but no more. However, credit must be given, first, to Danton for the creative phase of the committee's work, and, second, to Robespierre for the consolidation and growth of the committee's power and work. Meetings were held every morning and evening. In the morning they met to allot the work of the day; in the evenings they met to report results, sign decrees and arrêts, to discuss policies, and receive ministers and deputations. Seldom, if ever, did all twelve members meet at any one session. Some members stayed at their desks while others either attended meetings of the Convention or travelled on missions to the armies and the departments. It was not Danton's original Committee of Nine but the second and more famous Committee of Twelve which actually ruled France during the Terror.
The lesser members of this second committee were Frieur de la Marne, Collot d'Herbois, Billaud-Varenne, and the invalid Georges Couthon. Among the most prominent members of this Committee were Barère, Carnot, Frieur Duvernois de la Côte-d'Or, Lindet, Robespierre, Jeanbon Saint-André, and Saint-Just. All members of this "Committee of Twelve," except Frieur de la Marne, served at one time or another as president of the National Convention. A glimpse into the life, training, and background of the more important Committee members may be useful for understanding their relationship to their work and to each other.

Bertrand Barère de Vieuzac, widely acclaimed as "the Anacreon of the Guillotine" was born at Tarbes (Hautes-Pyrénées) on 10 October, 1755. He was given the name "Anacreon" because of the florid language of his speeches in the National Convention. Reared in a lawyer's family, trained in the law school of the University of Toulouse, where, through a special dispensation, he was admitted at the age of fifteen, Barère became a notable lawyer. Elected 23 April, 1789, as deputy of the Third Estate to the Estates-General, he soon allied himself with the liberals. At this time, also, he started his journal Point du Jour which later became the journal of liberal views and opinions. After his period of service in the
Estates-General, Barère became a judge in the court at Tarbes. The people of Hautes-Pyrénées elected him on 4 September, 1792, as a deputy to the National Convention. He led a very active political life. Easy-going, hard-working, affable, very eloquent, he was to become known as one of the most shifty and demagogic of the Revolutionary politicians. This shows in his leadership of a policy of economic warfare against England, shouting in every speech--England must and shall be destroyed. He was, consequently, among the first deputies elected by the Convention to its Committee of Public Safety on 6 April, 1793. Here Barère faithfully served this executive division of the French government until his resignation from the Committee on 15 fructidor an III (1 September, 1794). While other members of the Committee were tied at their desks by work or were travelling in the provinces, Barère was always at hand. He was the most regular attendant at meetings of the Committee and its most indispensable member. This body's long and often confused discussions would be summed up by Barère in a few lucid yet pertinent words and presented to the Convention as resolutions or legislative proposals. According to many writers, Barère was an unprincipled, smooth politician peculiarly fitted for such rapportorial liaison functions. Yet Barère had specific ideas and interests which quite positively affected the course of French diplomacy,
education, the fine arts and poor relief. His life, overlapping the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, witnessed the beginnings of the first French Republic and came to a close in 1841 shortly before the advent of the second Republic.

Associated with Barère was Lazare Carnot, the "organizer of victory." Born in 1753, Carnot spent much of his early life in one army post after another. He was an outstanding mathematician as a result of his studies under Monge. Carnot was the scholar-soldier type. He was the author of papers anticipating modern discoveries. La Grange had once said that Carnot had anticipated one of his discoveries. Carnot's work had been crowned by more than one learned academy. A captain in the engineers, Carnot was a keen believer in military discipline and army reform. In the capacity of a soldier-deputy who understood warfare, the Convention called him, on 14 August, 1793, to the Committee of Public Safety. It was through Carnot that the Committee implemented its projects. Though a Jacobin, a republican, and at times a radical and a revolutionary, he was never a party leader. Hence, like Barère, Carnot survived many government changes. His reputation for sound thinking accounted for his being placed on three important Convention committees. However, his great work as organizer of the military successes of the army was
done as a member of the Committee of Public Safety.

After the fall of Robespierre on 27 July, 1794, Carnot was retired on 6 October, 1794, from the Committee. This retirement was by normal procedure enacted by the Convention as a popular Thermidorean move. Following his work with the Convention, he became, in October, 1795, one of the original five Directors, but after the coup d'etat of 18 Fructidor an V (4 September, 1797), Carnot fled from France and spent some time in Switzerland until Napoleon's overthrow of the Directory by the coup of 18-19 brumaire (9-10 November, 1799). Under the provisional consulate, Carnot accepted the Ministry of War which he filled for a few months. During the "Hundred Days" he rallied to Napoleon, again serving him as Minister of the Interior and Count of the Empire. Banished as a regicide and an incorrigible Jacobin, Carnot sought asylum in Warsaw. Finding the climate there too severe, Carnot moved back to Prussia, dying at Magdeburg in 1823.5

Another soldier, a captain in the engineers and Carnot's chief assistant, was Claude-Antoine, Count Prieur-Duvernois, deputy from Côte-d'Or. Prieur was born 22 December, 1763, at Auxonne. He entered the military engineering school at Mezières in 1782 where he studied mathematics under Gaspard Monge, the first exponent of the principles of descriptive geometry.6 Graduating
1 April, 1784, as second lieutenant along with Rouget de l'elise, Prieur was advanced to the ranks of first lieutenant 19 October, 1788, and captain 1 April, 1791. After leaving the army engineering school, Prieur spent some time at Dijon University. Having represented the Cote d'Or in the National Legislative Assembly, Prieur again was selected by his constituents as their deputy in the National Convention. Here, on 4 August, 1793, he was made a member of the Committee of Public Safety and remained with it until he retired on 6 October, 1794, along with Carnot.

Prieur was a man of many talents: a member of the Dijon Academy, the Natural History Society of Paris, and many other learned groups. He was well acquainted with the leading scientists of his period. Later he made use of their technical knowledge and services in the production of armaments and munitions. His knowledge of military matters was reflected in his widely known L'Art du militaire—a book of instruction for all branches of the army. Prieur, more than any one else, was responsible for the decimal system of weights and measures which gave France a sound metric system. Educational interests of Prieur de la Cote-d'Or can be seen in his untiring efforts in behalf of the School of Arms, Medical Schools, Normal Schools, and Polytechnical Institutions. Prieur's
Industrial and commercial activity are readily seen in his work of organizing the supply of arms and munitions without which Carnot would never have achieved his military successes. Heading the Ministry of Munitions, Frieur deserves to share equally with Carnot the title of "organizer of victory." For a short time, Frieur served in the Council of Five Hundred after which he retired to private life with the rank of Colonel in the Engineers. Exiled in 1816 as a regicide, he returned to France after the Revolution of 1830, dying at Dijon 11 August, 1832.11

Equally important in the role of services of supply was Jean-Baptiste-Robert Lindet, oldest member of the Committee and a man with an immense reputation for good hard sense. Born 2 May, 1743, at Bernay (Eure), Robert Lindet entered the legal profession. In 1790 he became mayor of Bernay. Eure department elected him a deputy, first to the National Legislative Assembly and later to the National Convention. Lindet was given a place on the Committee of Public Safety on 6 or 7 April, 1793, where he served until he was retired from it also on 6 October, 1794. Lindet, having reentered his private law practice, died peaceably in 1825, aged eighty-two, and was buried at Pere Lachaise, the only one of the "Twelve" to have a grave in Paris.12 At first, Lindet, as a committee member, worked chiefly in the field, going to Lyons and Normandy.
to deal with the federalist rebellion. When in Paris, he sat regularly with the Subsistence Commission, devoting his energies to the Ministry of Supply. Lindet proved himself to be an extremely efficient quarter-master-general. His sphere of action was soon extended over the whole field of commerce, agriculture, and food control.13

On 27 July, 1793, Maximilien Robespierre was selected for the Committee of Public Safety primarily, it seemed, to strengthen its hold on Jacobins and sans-culottes. He became the committee's most experienced parliamentarian and acceptable orator. Robespierre was born 6 May, 1758 at Arras and spent most of his early life under the care of two maiden aunts. After his early schooling in Arras, he attended the College of Louis-le-Grand. Here he met Camille Desmoulins and Freron. His law studies were completed at Paris in 1780-1781. Having returned to Arras for his legal practice, Robespierre was named a member of the Academy of Arras, a very active literary society. It was in this society he met the engineer-soldier Carnot, who was later to be his committee colleague. Robespierre began his political career as a delegate to the Estates-General in 1789; from there to the National Legislative Assembly. He was a Paris deputy in the National Convention, having been elected to it by the Commune on 5 September, 1792. For an appraisal of Robespierre and his work, one
should consult such studies as those by Hamel, Mathiez, Palmer, and Thompson.

In the Convention, Robespierre arose to great power. He was interested in the affairs of every department of the committee much to the discomfiture of his colleagues. While other committee members seemed to have definite tasks, Robespierre, dabbling into almost everything, remained a "minister without portfolio." On the other hand, assisted by Barere, he took much of the initiative in matters of police. Revealing no great amount of genius for organization, he never really dominated the committee to the extent generally attributed to him. As a political expert and ex-president of the Convention, Robespierre protected the other committee members from the onslaughts of hostile party members.

Tallien's interruption of Saint-Just's speech to the Convention on 9 thermidor gave the conspirators an opportunity to attack Robespierre and other committee members. As a result, Robespierre fell on 9 thermidor an II (27 July, 1794) exactly one year after entering the Committee of Public Safety. He was guillotined the next day along with others including two committee members, Georges Couthon and Saint-Just. The majority of Robespierre's old colleagues thought they could go on better without him. It appears that in this they were mistaken.
As the organization of the army was achieved by the Committee of Public Safety, so was the organization and supervision of the navy. This branch of service was fortunate in having as its supervisor Andre Jeanbon, generally called Jeanbon Saint-André. This former protestant minister and ex-merchant marine captain was born 25 February, 1749, at Montauban. His early education was at the local Jesuit college. After studying nautical science at Bordeaux and making several voyages with the merchant marine, Saint-André attained the rank of lieutenant, and later that of captain. Shortly afterwards, Jeanbon resigned his commission and entered the protestant seminary at Louvaine where he was ordained 20 April, 1793. His pastoral career lasted from 1773 to 1788. On 5 September, 1792, Jeanbon was elected to the National Convention by the Lot department. First elected to the "Danton" Committee of Public Safety on 12 June, 1793, to replace Lindet who was on mission, Jeanbon was reelected on 10 July. He remained with the committee until its final dissolution at the closing of the National Convention on 28 October, 1795. Jeanbon was not involved in the machinations of Thermidor, hence, he survived the reaction. Indeed he received new administrative appointments. A firm believer in order and strong government, he accepted the Napoleonic regime. Napoleon appointed him prefect of Mainz, created
him a baron of the empire and an officer in the Legion of Honor. While visiting the hospitals in his prefecture, he caught cholera and died 10 December, 1813. Throughout his entire public life, Jeanbon remained at heart an ardent republican.15

The youngest, and perhaps one of the hardest workers among the "Twelve," was Louis-Antoine Saint-Just (1767-1794), the "enfant terrible" of the Revolution. Although of major importance to the Committee of Public Safety in general, Saint-Just is of minor importance in controlling the war work policy of the Committee. However, he sought to protect the working classes by rigidly enforcing the army and labor requisitions and maximum prices.16 Saint-Just stands out dramatically as hurrying on the 9th of Thermidor which marked the fall of this powerful committee.17

On 11 thermidor an II (29 July, 1794) the Convention decreed that a quarter of the Committee must be retired each month and former members would be ineligible for re-election for one month following their retirement. Herault de Sechelles, Robespierre, Couthon, and Saint-Just had been guillotined. Six new members, therefore, were added on 13 thermidor an II (31 July, 1794); two of these replacing Prieur de la Marne and Jeanbon Saint-Andre who were absent on mission when the Committee fell. Within
a few weeks all significant authority had been taken from the Committee. Now reduced to equality with all other committees of the Convention, the Committee of Public Safety was gradually shorn of its great powers until it was but a shadow of its former self.18

Still, this famous second Committee of Public Safety was the executive body through which the National Convention operated. As the Convention turned to the Committee, in like manner the Committee had turned to its individual members. Such committee members as Carnot, Jeanbon Saint-André, Robert Lindet, and Prieur de la Côte-d'Or were the men upon whom the Committee depended for implementing its war policy. This war policy, although not directly aimed at unemployment, did much that reduced the over-supply of labor which in turn relieved the over-burdened charitable institutions.

The Committee of Public Safety, through its many conferred and assumed governmental responsibilities, aided greatly in allaying suffering and want, the direct results of unemployment. This the Committee achieved through means perhaps more indirect than direct. In spite of all that charity workshops and other relief work projects had done, unemployment was still a perplexing social problem. Presently we shall see how the war aided in reducing the number of idle laborers by diverting many of
such unemployed into the fighting forces as well as into the production of war supplies. As the French nation became more involved in defending its boundaries and its new government from foreign invaders, the problem of raising an adequate army became one of great importance. Equally important was the problem of feeding and equipping a large army.

From time to time, in the summer of 1793, there had been much talk of an "all out effort" on the part of everyone for winning the war. Previously the recruitment had been more or less of a voluntary character, supplemented by some local requisitioning as in La Vendée. The solution for attaining this "all-out effort" appears to be the national draft act of 23 August, 1793. This general levée en masse deserves some little attention because it became the chief means whereby the vast numbers of the unemployed were greatly reduced.

The idea of a levée en masse (i.e., a wholesale, compulsory enlistment) had been proposed by a deputation of the fedéres of 10 August, 1793. Previously the department of Paris had been demanding, since 3 April, 1793, that the Convention enact some measures marshalling all citizens and resources of the nation. It was debated in the Convention on 14 August. During these debates Barère proposed a decree favoring the levée but failed in
securing its adoption.20 The primary assemblies and the forty-eight sections of Paris demanded that the Convention pass a decree calling for a *levee en masse*. Their deputations were received by the Convention on 16 August, and their demands sent at once to the Committee of Public Safety.21 In the name of the Committee of Public Safety, Barere on the same day submitted a decree which stated that a *levee en masse* would be made throughout France for the purpose of "defending its liberty, its constitution, and to deliver its territory out of the hand of its enemies." This decree was adopted forthwith. Article 2 of this decree indicated that the Committee of Public Safety would, the next day, 17 August, 1793, present proposals for organizing such a *levee*.22 The committee's failure to comply with the provisions of Article 2 of Barere's decree caused Danton, on 20 August, 1793, to speak at length before the Convention urging the immediate adoption of measures to set the *levee* in operation.23 Finally Barere submitted, on 23 August, 1793, a long report relative to the purposes and procedures of the *levee en masse*. It was joined with a new decree originally drafted by Carnot, the committee member in charge of military affairs, and this proposal, as revised by Barere, was adopted on 23 August, 1793.24
The Committee realized that if compulsory service were to be readily enforceable, it must be made as universal as possible. Accordingly, the introductory report on this national draft law proclaimed "all Frenchmen, whatever their sex or age, are called by their country to defend liberty. Henceforth the Republic is a great city in a state of siege: France must become one vast camp and Paris its arsenal."25 The first article of the decree declared "From this moment until that when the enemy is driven from the territory of the Republic, every Frenchman is commandeered (en requisition permanente) for the needs of the armies.26 Young men will go to the front; married men will forge arms and carry food; women will make tents and clothing and work in hospitals; children will turn all linen into bandages; old men will be carried into the squares to rouse the courage of the combatants, and to teach republican unity and hatred of kings."27

This national draft law was perhaps the first example in modern history of the deliberate mobilization of a nation for the purposes of war. So effectually did the committee, through Carnot and his associates, enforce the military phase of the \textit{levee} that it did not become necessary to go beyond the first class of draftees—those aged from eighteen to twenty-five. This "class" alone
provided 425,000 men. Successive drafts from the same age-group, together with the flow of volunteers, kept the republican armies up to strength for the next five years.28

It has already been noted that, prior to the _levee_, voluntary service had been the chief means of building up the army. Now, thousands of unemployed men were conscripted for military duty. The army even took in many whose employment depended on certain skills which these unemployed men did not possess. Moreover, this _levee en masse_ conscripted not only for the army, but requisitioned all labor, capital, and technical knowledge for the services of the country.

Now that sufficient military forces were assured, the Convention was faced with the equally hard task of finding supplies. In order to accomplish this, it was necessary to organize what, at the present time, would be called a Ministry of Supply and a Ministry of Munitions. Robert Lindet was recalled from his enemy mission in Calvados and placed in charge of _supplies services_ by the Committee of Public Safety on 10 brumaire an II (31 October, 1793). His commission handled the requisition of supplies for Paris, controversies with manufacturers about the price of clothing materials, the establishment of army food stores, the purchase of meat in foreign markets, the organization of river transport, the drawing up of price
schedules for food control, and hundreds of other supply problems.

The work similarly undertaken by Frere de la Cote-d'Or as head of munitions procurement was no less formidable than that of Lindet. Frere was strongly supported by the Committee of Public Safety in his efforts. For the immediate production of arms, the Committee placed at the disposition of the Minister of War 30,000,000 livres.29 Aside from natural resources, metals were requisitioned from other sources including church bells, altar-railings, and other metal fixtures found in churches, convents, abbeys and similar religious institutions. Kitchen utensils and other metal possessions of emigres and victims of the guillotine were confiscated for purposes of national defense. These and similar materials given by patriots constituted another valuable source of metal supply. Later we shall see that work projects were set up specifically for locating and recovering all available saltpeter for the munitions factories.

The question naturally arises: "Where did Frere get the workers for producing these supplies?" The vast numbers of the unemployed, skilled and unskilled, solved his problem. The national draft law had a solitary effect upon the problem of unemployment. Hundreds of unskilled young men, without any specific profession or
occupation, were inducted into the army.

Then, too, there were many others, including slightly older men unsuited for military service, who were conscripted for the harvest fields.

Moreover, the government requisitioned its armament labor, which in any case, many idle laborers were willing to give in a spirit of sacrifice. Every man in Paris competent for such work was required to report to 4 Quai Voltaire, the seat of the Arms Administration. Conscripted as they were, these munitions laborers submitted to a quasi-military regime not too different from that lately found in our ordnance plants during World War II. These French ordnance laborers were registered, grouped in workshops, and watched by state-agents. They were threatened with a variety of fines and penalties. Again—their wages were low in contrast with our American war industries, where pay was relatively high. Increases for the French laborers could be obtained possibly through a workers' organization, but such unionizing efforts were repressed as revolts by punitive legislation. Attempts at sabotage, in the production of war materials, were punished with at least two years' imprisonment.

Keeping men at work in the war industries was only part of the larger problem of allocating the labor supply of the country. The Committee of Public Safety,
especially before 14 frimaire an II (4 December, 1793), had great difficulties with the local authorities, who, usually in an excess of zeal, tended to draft all available men into the army. A decree of 2 April, 1793, had exempted from recruitment certain classes of laborers. Article 1 of the decree of 2 April, 1793, stated that "All workmen employed in the manufacture of arms, in the cannon foundries, . . . in the forges, and iron mines are exempted from recruitment, and if any have already been drafted they will be sent back to their former jobs." The Committee of Public Safety was aware of the predicament that war industries would suffer when military conscription would become effective. Therefore, on 22 August, 1793, just one day preceding the promulgation of the levee en masse, the Committee took action. It affirmed strongly the necessity of observing the terms of the law of 2 April, 1793, as cited above. All who contrived to work against this law would hereafter be considered as "suspect" by the Committee. In spite of this ruling "local boards" drafted all young men eighteen to twenty-five. Their rigorous application of the military phase of the levee thus all but paralyzed the enterprises for national defense in several departments. The scarcity of weapons made it increasingly imperative that the greatest number of workers possible be employed in this field.
The selective character of the draft must be insured. So the Convention, on 8 September, 1793, decreed the exemption from military duty of all persons directly and actively employed in the production of arms. This decree, with appropriate instructions for its enforcement, was sent to all administrative officials in charge of the levée en masse. It is interesting to note that this law bore these signatures: Robespierre, representing Committee leadership; Saint-André, the navy; Carnot, the army; and Frieur de la Côte-d'Or, the ministry of arms and munitions.33

Once employed in armament production, no laborer could change his job for another. Our own employment controls, preceding and during the recent war, did not readily allow defense laborers to transfer from one job to another. France's supply of armament laborers was more or less insured when the Convention, on 18 September, 1793, adopted the above principle which had been submitted by Jeanbon Saint-André.34 It was Saint-André also who initiated, on 20 September, 1793, the decree reopening the naval foundry works at Ruelle.35

Private operators of basic industries, as well as operators of large farms, had to be furnished with laborers. Young men were especially in demand because of their alertness in learning new jobs—the very same men
who by the levée en masse were to be sent to the front. No doubt it was largely to save these laborers from overzealous recruiting agents that the Committee conscripted such laborers. Wishing to aid farmers in supplying subsistence for the new army, the Committee recommended that young agricultural laborers be exempted from military duty. The Convention not only adopted this in a decree of 9 October, 1793, but, in addition, aided the spread of republicanism by also exempting those young men engaged in printing. 36

To remedy errors of selective drafting, searches had to be made in the ranks for soldiers skilled in the varied industrial processes involved in the production of defense materials. 37 The Committee of Public Safety ordered the army generals to submit a list of men qualified for the production of arms who were presently in military service. We can recall very vividly our own situation here in the United States during both recent global wars. Time and again our government required the exemption from military conscription or even the discharge from military service of men vitally needed on the "home front" in our defense industries. General Hoche was among the first of the army officials to comply with the demands of the Committee. Such soldiers as he found among his troops, he ordered returned to Paris to work in producing the
weapons so badly needed by the army. Such exemptions from military service did not apply solely to armament production. These exemptions also embraced those laborers engaged in producing fuel for the factories, coal and iron mining, and the salt peter and powder workers. The overall result of the Committee's appeal to the army was that thousands of skilled and semi-skilled laborers were withdrawn from military service and placed in the various defense industries. All conscripting of idle labor for armament production did not take place in Paris. For instance, the general council of Orne department set up a bureau in Sees which requisitioned men for work in the Paris armories. This single instance is given to show that department organization for labor, sooner or later, matched that for military conscription.

The munitions factories, as we have seen, called for their share of drafted laborers. A short survey of the production of armaments and munitions will suggest the vast number of laborers employed. Implications concerning unemployment stand out very boldly when we consider the large scale demand occasioned by the growing defense industries.

Paris was not only the seat of the Revolutionary government, but the center of arms production as well. The leadership in establishing this branch of national defense
industries was taken by Frieur de la Cote-d'Or. He was ably assisted by Carnot, Fourcroy, Guyton-Morveau, Chaptal, Monge, Berthollet, Hassenfratz, and other pre-eminent military and scientific men.\textsuperscript{40} The Committee preferred to order the iron and steel plates made in the foundries of the departments.\textsuperscript{41} These materials in turn were to be welded and fashioned in the forges and other ironworks which were to be set up in the public places of the capital. On 24 August, 1793, the Committee decided to install these ironworks on the grounds of the Tuileries, in the Luxembourg gardens, not far from the experimental potato beds, and on La Place de l'Indivisibilité (now Place de Vosges).\textsuperscript{42} Those shops that were planned for the Tuileries were later set up on the esplanade of the Invalides. The architect, Poyet, supervised this wide scale construction.\textsuperscript{43} Many laborers, drawn from the ranks of the unemployed, were set to work constructing the public workshops and remodelling other buildings to be used in the manufacture of armaments, munitions, and other wartime equipment.\textsuperscript{44} Our own American problem of unemployment was greatly reduced by providing work which was much similar in character. Our federal government provided hundreds of jobs for idle workers—carpenters, plumbers, electricians, steam-fitters, bricklayers, plasterers, and countless other skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled
laborers. These laborers were employed in the construction of ordnance plants, army camps, air fields, and quartermaster depots as well as in the conversion of many industrial plants to war time production; these plants formerly having been devoted solely to civilian production. Also let us not forget that during World War II unemployment was reduced somewhat when our federal government established the "Seabees" who later performed construction jobs, notably in the Pacific, often preceding the marines in that area.

The building program of the Committee of Public Safety gave Paris 258 such public workshops: 140 at the Invalides, 54 at the Luxembourg, and 64 at the Indivisibilite.45 Few workers were employed at first, the majority of these being without experience. A report made on 13 brumaire an II (3 November, 1793) revealed that nineteen laborers in the Luxembourg shops had forged 10¾ cannon while twenty laborers at the Indivisibilite shops had made 13¾ cannon. Employment increased to ninety laborers on 10 nivose; 166 a month later; and by 30 floreal there were 270. Further increases in employment during this early period following the adoption of the levée en masse showed 39 blacksmiths, 2¾4 locksmiths, 108 fitters, and 2¾4 dressers (finishers). On 30 floreal an II there were 5¾2 ironworks located at the Indivisibilite, the Invalides,
and in the Luxembourg gardens producing an average of 6,000 cannon each "decade." This data is amplified by Bouchart who says, "The manufacture of arms in Paris ... employed 5,000 laborers and produced 1,000 guns daily." Technical workmen were needed to produce and assemble the delicate mechanism of the gunlock. The Committee called the watchmakers of Paris together. At first only nineteen were approved for this job. Soon plans were made for the conversion of all Parisian watchmakers and their shops for war production. The luxury industry had been paralyzed by the Revolution. These skilled workers would have remained among the unemployed had not the Committee appealed to their patriotism. Their zeal and readiness to aid in the war effort were paid a significant tribute in the Convention by Barere.

Hundreds of skilled laborers such as armorers, ironmasters, blacksmiths, filers, locksmiths, steel-workers and many more hundreds of unskilled laborers migrated to Paris. Nearly all sections of France were represented; these laborers having come from the vicinity of Paris (Seine-et-Marne, Yonne, Oise, Aisne), from Normandy (Seine-Inferieure, Calvados), from the east (Ardennes, Meurthe, Vosges, Haute-Marne, Cote-d'Or, Haute Saone, Doubs, Ain), from the center (Indre, Allier, Niouvre, Aveyron), from Brittany (Cotes-du-Nord, Ille-et-Vilaine).
There were also some who had migrated from Charente-Inférieure and Hautes-Pyrénées. Churches, convents, monasteries, and other former religious establishments helped to provide housing. The Committee had succeeded in attracting an ever-increasing group of unemployed persons to the Parisian defense projects. There were on 10 nivose (30 December, 1793) 2,249; on 30 ventose (20 March, 1794) 3,065; and at the end of germinal (ca 19 April, 1794) there were about 4,020. This group steadily increased until by frimaire an IV (November-December, 1795) employment of migrated laborers had reached the remarkable figure of 5,200-5,400.

In August, 1793, France, outside of Paris, had less than ten factories of significance in the production of armaments. Those located at Maubeuge, Saint-Etienne, Charleville, Tulle, and Creusot (Montcein) dated from the Ancient Regime. Three others had been created since the Revolution at Moulins 17 July, 1792, at Autun 27 January, 1793, and at Clermont-Ferrand 14 July, 1793. The expansion of the army now necessitated more weapons. The factory workers at Maubeuge had been dispersed by an invasion in that vicinity. The "federalist" agitation and civil revolt in Lyons had paralyzed the shops at Saint-Etienne. However, the Committee succeeded in speeding up production at Saint-Etienne. There, locksmiths and
gunsmiths were paid a bonus for each apprentice instructed. This factory produced 3,000 guns and 600 pistols each "decade." Those of Charleville produced 200-300 guns and 1,300 pistols each "decade." These represented the work of many laborers and apprentices. The shops at Tulle reported on 1 September, 1793, that they had employed 663 men, many of whom came from Liège, Ardennes, and Maubeuge. The Moulins' factories produced an average of 100 guns each "decade."

Although the Committee of Public Safety made Paris the center of arms production, it did state that in so doing it had no intention of neglecting factories already in operation. Elsewhere in the departments, there were other significant shops such as those at Périgueux, Bergerac, the Issadoun and Limoges projects, and those of Bar-le-Duc, Grenoble, and Roanne. Although insufficient and exposed to the risks of war, the old bronze foundries of Douai and Strasbourg continued to operate. Employment was also to be found in the more recent bronze foundries being developed at this time. The development of steel in this period was also sponsored by the Committee of Public Safety.

This was achieved in a large measure through the Committee's publication of "Avis aux ouvriers en fer sur la fabrication de l'acier" (Advice to ironworkers on the
manufacture of steel). Among other things this "Avis" recommended the use of sandmoldings (moulages au sable) instead of the usual common earth moldings (moulages a la terre) formerly used. The national government, through the war policy of the Committee of Public Safety, extended its operations into the field of side-arms production. Outstanding in the production of sabres, pikes, javelins, bayonets and even projectiles were the factories of Klingenthal.

As a means of aiding his almost feverish activity in building up and equipping his Revolutionary navy, Jeanbon Saint-Andre submitted to the Convention on 24 July, 1793, a report asking that an arms factory be set up at Montauban. He clearly indicated that more employment had been given to the women in the cloth factories there than to the men. In support of the suitability of this location for an arms factory, Jeanbon pointed out two important factors: (1) the natural resources needed for arms production were abundant in this region, and (2) numerous local ironworks were readily available. These two factors would offset the problem of transporting raw materials and labor, as well as relieving the local unemployment situation. Jeanbon also proposed the establishment of a naval arms factory in Toulouse. These two proposals of Saint-André were immediately adopted and put
into operation by the Convention on 24 July, 1794. There is little doubt that this favorable action on his two proposals was due in a large measure to Saint-Andre's prestige as member of the Committee of Public Safety and chairman of its naval division, and, at the same time, president of the National Convention.

The important role that Creusot plays today in French armament production had its early start here in the last quarter of the eighteenth century. This little town of Creusot in the canton of Montceenis, department of Saone-et-Loire, became an industrial city of note since the first metallurgical factories were built there in 1774. Armament factories were established there in 1781. These grew rapidly. The English agriculturalist and traveller, Arthur Young, wrote of his visit, in August, 1789, to Montceenis. Here he found an Englishman, Wilkinson, operating a cannon factory in which he had five steam engines for blasting and boring. He employed 500-600 men besides colliers and general helpers. The opening of the Central Canal (Canal du Centre) toward the end of 1793 led to an influx of laborers and an increased production of arms at Creusot.59

Although large numbers of men were employed by the government in the public workshops, private enterprise did not suffer altogether. The Committee soon learned that
the manufacture of detachable parts of guns and cannon (i.e., breeches, gunstocks, gunlocks, etc.) were more suitably adapted to home production. Carnot, in a report read to the Convention on 13 brumaire an II (3 November, 1793) pointed out that home production would aid in the perfection of these detachable parts. He assumed that the laborer would be constantly producing the same parts. In such regularity, according to Carnot, the workman would develop different methods of procedure which would render his task less difficult. "In home production (travail a domicile) the workers would be able to benefit from the help of their wives and children. They would not be deprived of the comforts of home, and in addition, they would save valuable time usually lost in going to and returning from the public workshops." As early as 31 August, 1793, The Committee of Public Safety suspended the manufacture of 40,000 pikes and javelins. This action displaced a large number of workers who were expected to report immediately for work in the Parisian gun factories. It appears that these workers were later set to work in small private shops producing bayonets, gun locks and similar parts of small weapons. This program resulted in the Committee awarding 800 contracts to over 2,000 Parisians engaged in private enterprise. The Committee had promised to purchase these products at a reasonable price.
Hand in hand with the problem of armament went that of gunpowder. Shortage of gunpowder in 1793 began to be a very agonizing problem. Oddly enough, Barere had said on 23 August, 1793, "En revolution militaire, apres le pain vient la poudre" ("In a military revolution, after bread comes powder.") The decree of 23 August, 1793, which had organized the leee en masse and created the armament factories of Paris had as its corollary that of 28 August, 1793, which expanded the activities of the Powder Administration. This Powder Administration was a carry-over from the Ancient Regime, having been organized by Turgot in 1775. The law of 28 August, 1793, briefly summarized, said that all sources of saltpeter in the entire extent of the Republic were placed at the disposition and control of the Provisional Executive Council. The Committee, which had sponsored this law as well as that of 23 August, declared very positively that the leee en masse must not disorganize the personnel, employees, and laborers engaged in the saltpeter shops and powder factories. These persons, the Committee later ruled, were to be thought of as conscripted for this work. Saltpeter workers were dispensed from National Guard duty by a decree of the Convention adopted 1 October, 1793.

Previously, the noted chemist, Lavoisier, during the early reign of Louis XVI, had undertaken the location
of saltpeter. It remained for Jacob Dupont, deputy of Indre-et-Loire to point out the rich natural resources of saltpeter. The Committee ordered a search of all caves, abandoned mines, gullies, and other places where saltpeter might probably be located. The departmental researches undertaken in Indre-et-Loire, Mont Terrible, Vaucluse, and other regions had verified the predictions of scientists consulted by the Committee to the effect that the French soil was rich in saltpeter deposits. There was soon great activity everywhere. The council of Hérault department on 29 September, 1793, ordered all its districts to establish work projects for collecting and refining all available saltpeter. Thus many unemployed found work at home or in its vicinity without having to travel to the distant arms factories.

Prieur de la Côte-d'Or, who had organized arms production with the aid of Carnot and Lindet, again displayed his engineering genius by organizing the search for saltpeter and other salts necessary in powder production. He placed Vauquelin and Jacotot at the head of this enterprise. They were assisted by other scientists including Professor Chaptal, founder of the original chair of industrial chemistry at Montpellier University, who offered to organize a saltpeter works in Montpellier. Prieur read a report to the Convention on 15 brumaire an II
(5 November, 1793) and proposed legislation on the exploitation of saltpeter. Briefly, Prieur recalled the richness of the national soil in saltpeter and the noteworthy researches of naturalists and chemists. He felt that the measures he proposed would produce thirty to forty million pounds of saltpeter. Without debate, the Convention immediately adopted his report and proposed legislation. In short the Convention ordered all persons to participate in this harvest of saltpeter. An expansion of saltpeter factories was decreed commensurate with that of armament production. All citizens were called upon to collect the dirt from cellars, stables, winepresses, sheepfolds, cattle stalls, crumbling walls, and similar places and by a simple washing process separate the saltpeter. Under the law of 28 August, they would be paid 24 sols per pound for the saltpeter thus collected.

The Committee of Public Safety provided an additional means of employment when, on 7 pluviose an II (26 January, 1794) it created an Administration of Salt-peter and Powder at Paris with an annual appropriation of 8,000 livres. The example was set by the faubourg of Montmartre. All citizens of this section were employed in this defense project. They staged an enthusiastic patriotic demonstration before the Convention marching to
its headquarters with their shovels, picks, and buckets. Similar demonstrations were made by other groups, particularly those from the Champs-Elysées who came to the Convention singing a "Marseillaise du Salpêtrier." 72a

This enthusiasm resulted in the setting up of sixty saltpeter public works in Paris furnishing approximately 800 pounds each decade to the powder factories. Each of the forty-eight sections of Paris had its saltpeter commission employing not less than fifteen employees and sixty-five laborers. 73 This new type of defense employment soon spread throughout the departments. Barray reported to the Convention that as of the 26 messidor an II (14 July, 1794) there were 6,000 in the entire republic. 74 Note the particular instance of one of such projects: the great saltpeter and powder factory at Grenelle, near Paris, which, under the direction of Chaptal, produced 30,000 pounds of gunpowder every twenty-four hours. 75 Unemployment was decreasing. So many laborers entered the saltpeter and powder factories that the Committee was forced to increase the original appropriation from 8,000 livres to 500,000 livres. 76

Not directly relevant to a study of unemployment but certainly worthy of noticing were the Revolutionary training courses for defense workers. The Committee of Public Safety, through its subordinate agency, the
Administration of Powders and Saltpeter, organized on 11 pluviose an II (30 January, 1794) a series of public conferences. These lectures and demonstrations dealt with the processing of saltpeter deposits. Under the provisions of this new training program, two citizens selected from each district of France were called to Paris and paid three livres a day while pursuing these courses.77 Similar arrangements had been made on the same date for a school of arms production. This series of lectures and demonstrations likewise were given to two citizens selected from each district. In this armament school, preference was given to cannoneers between the ages of twenty-five and thirty, men who were robust and accustomed to hard work. Very special attention was given to the molding, casting, and boring of cannon.78

These "Cours revolutionnaires" (national defense training courses) were taught by leading scientists, mathematicians, and metallurgists, assisted by a staff of technicians and demonstrators. Included among the research men and instructors were such men as Guyton-Morveau, Lavoisier, Berthollet, Chaptal, Monge, Dufourny, Perier, Carny, Pluvinet, and Hassenfratz. The majority of these, unlike the political leaders of the Terror, lived on after the 9th of Thermidor, rendering equally important administrative services to the nation under the
Directory, the Consulate, and even the Empire.78

Louis-Bernard Guyton-Morveau, eminent chemist, industrial magistrate, politician, and science professor, was born on 4 January, 1737, at Dijon. Although descended from a long line of physicians and surgeons, Guyton-Morveau entered the law school of Dijon University. Here he completed his studies in French, Roman, and Canon law and was licensed in 1756. Admitted to the bar, he followed the legal profession for six years. A member of the National Legislative Assembly, Guyton-Morveau served one term as its president. Elected thereafter a National Convention deputy by Côte-d'Or, he served faithfully on several of its committees. For example, he was a very active member of the Committee of Public Succor and formerly president of Danton's Public Safety Committee. Following the close of the National Convention, Guyton-Morveau spent some time as a representative in the Council of Five Hundred.

Politics did not prevent him from developing his scientific interests to which he devoted himself almost entirely during the last twenty years of his life. He first became professor and later director of the famous Polytechnical School. Honors were conferred upon him. He was elected to the Legion of Honor, was made a chevalier of the Empire, and later created a Baron of the Empire. Among his earlier scientific contributions was the development (ca 1773) of a then powerful disinfectant which
was widely used in improving the sanitary conditions of hospitals, more especially, military hospitals and prisons. 79

Guyton-Morveau held a very high position on the instructional and research staffs of the powder and arms factories of Paris. 80 In this work he was the friend and adviser of Prieur de la Cote-d'Or. Eminent colleague and one time friend of Lavoisier, Guyton-Morveau was perhaps the first to demonstrate the practical use of military balloons. 81 He aided Berthollet, Lavoisier, and Fourcroy in drafting a method of chemical nomenclature which was edited and published in 1787 by Hassenfratz and Adet. 82 Aside from his purely chemical activities, Guyton-Morveau made significant contributions to the factories producing projectiles. He died at Paris on 2 Januray, 1816. 83

The development of the saltpeter refineries and powder factories owed much to the scientific researches of Antoine-Laurent Lavoisier who was born at Paris on 26 August, 1743. He advanced rapidly in scientific studies, being made a full member of the Academy of Sciences in 1769 at the early age of twenty-six. This Frenchman, and not the Englishman Boyle, was without doubt the "Father of Modern Chemistry." Later he was honored by all the leading scientific societies of Europe. His early chemical endeavors which later became of great national significance were begun under the Ancient Regime in the Administration of
Powder created by Turgot. Unfortunately, Lavoisier entered the business of farmer-general of taxes, which connection later led to his death. This "hang-over" of the old regime was abolished in March, 1791, by decree of the National Constituent Assembly. With the enactment of this law, Lavoisier's official connection with the ferme-generale ceased. He now devoted all his energies almost entirely to science. Among his scientific associates were the chemists Darcet, Guyton-Morveau, Berthollet, Trudaine, Fourcrroy, de Montigny, Hassenfratz; the geometricians Cousin, Laplace, Lagrange, Monge, Meusnier; and such foreign visitors as Priestly, Watt, Franklin, and Young. With Guyton-Morveau and others, he published a system of chemical nomenclature. Lavoisier was guillotined on 19 floreal an II (8 May, 1794) because of his previous connections with the discredited and now abolished ferme-generale. His scientific researches as applied to saltpeter and powder production definitely give the lie to the celebrated words often attributed to Coffinhal: "The Republic has no need for scientists; let justice take its course." That the French Revolution did not renounce science, there is no doubt. The revolution merely failed to distinguish Lavoisier, the farmer-general, from Lavoisier, the scientist. It could not convict the one without the other, nor save the one without the other.
Metallurgical developments during the late eighteenth century owe much to the scientific research of Claude-Louis Berthollet (1748-1822). During the early years of the Revolution he gave instructions on the extraction and purifying of saltpeter. As a doctor of medicine, Berthollet soon became acquainted with Lavoisier. He was elected to the Academy of Sciences in 1780. His important researches include the development of a smelting process for iron and converting iron into steel. While holding a professorship at the Ecole Normale he was selected by Napoleon for the expedition into Egypt. There Berthollet was associated with Gaspard Monge in founding the Egyptian Institute. Berthollet was named member of the Legion of Honor in 1804. Having voted for the dethronement of Napoleon in 1814, Louis XVIII named Berthollet a peer of France.

Napoleon's famous friend and Minister of the Interior, Jean-Antoine Chaptal, was another of the eighteenth century scientists who devoted their talents to the service of the nation at war. Chaptal was born at Saint-Pierre-de-Nogaret (Lozere) on 4 June, 1756. He received his doctor of medicine from Montpellier and became a member of its faculty of medicine in 1781. The Committee of Public Safety named Chaptal, in 1793, director of the saltpeter refinery and powder factory at Grenelle. This founder of the world's first chair of industrial chemistry soon organized in the
former Church of St. Germain-des-Pres (Paris) a notably large saltpeter refinery. As we have seen in the work of Lavoisier and Berthollet, so we see here the practical application of scientific research to industry. While instructor at the Ecole Polytechnique, Chaptal was made a member of the Institute. Rallying to Napoleon after 18 brumaire an VIII (9 November, 1799), Chaptal was made a member of the Council of State. In less than twelve months he was promoted by Napoleon to the position of Minister of the Interior. His administration as Interior Minister, 15 brumaire an IX-20 thermidor an XII (6 November, 1800-8 August, 1804) contributed a great deal to the industrial development of France during the Consulate. This distinguished chemist proved to be an administrator with a broad interest in every branch of industrial development.

With Monge, Berthollet and others, Chaptal founded in 1801 a Society for the Encouragement of National Industry. In order to stimulate public interest in the efforts made by French manufacturers, Chaptal organized an exposition late in the summer of 1801. It was so successful that another was held in 1802, the number of exhibitors increasing from 220 to 540. Chaptal, already a member of the Legion of Honor since 9 vendemiaire an XII (2 October, 1803), was made a member of the new nobility under the title of Count de Chanteloup on 26 April, 1808.
During the Hundred Days Chaptal served Napoleon as
director-general of commerce and manufacture as well as
Minister of State. After the fall of Napoleon, Chaptal
took an oath of allegiance to Louis XVIII and remained
in the Chamber of Peers until his death at Paris on
29 July, 1832.90

The last to be considered in this group of
eighteenth century "savants" who taught the national
defense courses is Gaspard Monge, mathematician, scientist;
and antiquarian. He was born 10 May, 1746, at Beaune
(Cote d'Or). He received his education at the Military
Engineering School at Mezieres. Not being of the nobility,
Monge was refused admission to the officers corps of this
school. However, his excellent work and high intellect
earned for him, first, an assistant professorship, and
later, a full professorship at this school. This
situation of not being good enough to belong to that which
he is considered good enough to instruct illustrates the
social "inequalities" and "inconsistencies" of the Ancient
Regime. Monge made very rapid advances. He was elected
to the Academy of Sciences along with Berthollet in 1780.
Upon the recommendation of Condorcet, the Convention in
1792 appointed Monge Minister of Marine which position he
held until 10 April, 1793. He next became a member of the
Ecole Normale faculty. Aided by Frieur de la Cote-d'Or and
others, Monge was the true guiding force in the establish-
ment of the Central School of Public Works and the great
polytechnical school. These two schools were set up as a
result of the report made on 11 March, 1794, to the
Convention by Fourcroy, another scientist-politician.91
The friendship between Monge and Berthollet began with
their Academy election and lasted more than a third of a
century. Monge, Berthollet, and many artists were sent to
Italy by the Directory in 1796 to receive and supervise the
shipment to France of the objects of art demanded by the
Directory in its treaty settlements with the Italian states.
Napoleon was attracted to Monge by the latter's display of
mathematical genius, and Monge headed the list of scientists,
artists, and writers whom Napoleon assigned to the Egyptian
expedition in 1798. When he created the Egyptian Institute,
Napoleon selected Monge as the head of the Institute;
assistants included Berthollet, Fourier, Malus, Saint-
Hilaire, Conte, and Savigny. Having returned with Napoleon
from Egypt, Monge entered the Senate in 1799. A peer of
France during the Hundred Days, Knight of the Legion of
Honor, director of the Ecole Polytechnique, Monge was
created Count of Peluse by the emperor. He died at Paris
on 28 July, 1818.

Aside from his theory of descriptive geometry,
published in 1794, Monge made other scientific and
educational contributions. There were his works dealing with physics, chemistry (especially as applied to metallurgy), and domestic economy.\textsuperscript{92} His relationship to the industrial developments that made possible more employment and winning the war is proof positive that the Revolution did not misprize the scientists. Monge, Chaptal, Guyton-Morveau, Lavoisier, Berthollet, and other scientists indirectly aided in reducing unemployment by increasing the field of labor through their application of science to industry, largely in the interest of national welfare and defense.

The production of arms, munitions, and their allied industries do not represent the only type of employment growing out of the \textit{levée en masse}. There was a demand, on the part of both the army and navy for other types of equipment. The production of materials for the manufacture of shoes, leggings, and similar equipment offered opportunities for a further distribution of the shrinking labor supply. For as the labor demands increased unemployment decreased, obviously.

Furnishing shoes to the armies of France posed a very difficult problem. Prieur de la Cote-d'\textsuperscript{O}r, on whom Lindet and Carnot were depending, became interested in the rapid tanning of leather. This new process was discovered by Armand Sequin, a scientific collaborator of Lavoisier.
This new tanning method reduced to a few days a process formerly requiring two years.93 Part of these researches were conducted at Meudon. A report on the progress of this research project was submitted to the Convention by Prieur, the secret method being withheld. This report is of interest to us because in it Prieur pointed out the possibilities of a chain of tanneries supported and directed by the Committee as public works projects. Herein we find another defense industry which would require both skilled and unskilled laborers. There can be little doubt as to the effect this new industry would have on unemployment.94 The Orne department set an example soon followed by others. The administrators in this department on 23 ventose an II (13 March, 1794) set up a factory employing women in the manufacture of army shirts.95 The Minister of War was called upon to establish, throughout the departments, factories for the manufacture of war materials, notably much needed leggings and jackets. This, in turn, provided employment for many women who were refused work in the arms and powder factories.96

Dernieau, Commissioner of Public Succor, requested on 23 March, 1795, that the two large spinning shops in Paris modify their equipment in order to produce a heavy sailcloth needed by the French navy. The Committee on Public Succor realized this would make possible more
employment. Accordingly, they recommended the purchase of new equipment for the war-time conversion of these civilian-production shops. This was ordered done so that the navy might get its sailcloth and many jobless people be given work.97
CHAPTER IV

The Thermidorean Period

The "Thermidorean" phase of the Revolution during the National Convention period is the name usually given that period of reaction from the "Red Terror." Its time was the fifteen months between the fall of Robespierre and the establishment of the Directory (9 thermidor an II to 4 brumaire an IV--27 July, 1794 to 26 October, 1795). It was marked by important political shifting which took place in the National Convention. There were still the problems of national defense and internal security. On glancing backward we have noted that the Girondins during their period of power, seemingly, had enthroned rhetoric. The Montagnards had replaced this by a dictatorship of a narrow group of "statesmen" and "workers." Now we find the Thermidoreans seemingly powerless to construct yet ready to destroy and disorganize the achievements of the Reign of Terror.

The suppression of the Revolutionary Tribunal, the revolutionary committees, and the execution of the terrorists Carrier and Fouquier-Tinville are indicative of the shift from the "Red" to the "White" Terror. This latter "Terror" embraced a series of reprisals, acts of violence, and massacres carried out against the revolutionary
government of the Committee of Public Safety as a counter-
version to the "Red Terror." New Terrorist organizations
arose. Among these were armed bands such as the Compagnie
de Jesus, the Compagnie du Soleil, and the Compagnie de
Jehu. Popular societies succumbed to this newest scourge
and gradually disappeared. The brigand-like operations of
these "new terrorists" were largely responsible for the
closing of the Jacobin clubs.¹

The younger generation took an active though not
commendable part in this counter-revolutionary demonstration.
The "Gilded Youth" (Jeunesse doree) would pour out of the
playhouses and other meeting places and attack the "blood-
drinkers," i.e. Jacobin revolutionaries. The Jeunesse
doree seemed to thrive on moral laxity. Boisterous and
destructive rowdyism was typical of their anti-Jacobin
activities. These young men could be distinguished readily
from others by their unusual mannerisms and peculiar
dress.² The Reveil du Peuple (The Awakening of the People)
was their war-song, frequently supplanting the Marseillaise
in popularity.³ These destructive and demoralizing
activities of the youthful Thermidoreans are quite similar
to the "teen-age crime wave" over which we have been
concerned in our own period of difficult postwar adjustments.
On the whole, the "White Terror" has resemblances to the
private warfare of the medieval period or to American city
gangsterism of a recent decade.

With the fall of Robespierre and his quasi-socialist-democratic ideas of "soak the rich to benefit the poor," the great Committee of Public Safety fell. The final blows were dealt the Committee when the Convention, reasserting itself, adopted a policy governing retirement from and reelection to the Committee. Thus, this new policy placed the Committee on an equal footing with all the other Convention Committees. Power and prestige also were taken from the Committee by an act of the Convention which placed the armed forces of Paris under the immediate supervision of the Military Committee. Moreover the remaining functions were precisely stated pursuant to the terms of Gambon's proposal, adopted 7 fructidor an II (24 August, 1794), whereby the Committee of Public Safety retained control of diplomacy, overall military operations, trade, and the manufacturing of war supplies. It continued to possess, also, the exclusive right to requisition both persons and things.

Thus the great Committee lost its primacy. Instead of the rule of one dominant committee, the government was hereafter referred to as the "Three Committees"—Public Safety, General Security, and Legislation. When serious situations arose, the Convention now referred them to these three Committees. Additional Convention committees
were those of Finance, Public Institutions, Agriculture and Arts, Commerce and Food Supply, Public Works, Transport, Posts, and Goods-traffic, Military Affairs, Navy and Colonies, Public Succor, Public Instruction, Division, Proces-verbaux, Decrees and Archives, Inspectors of the National Palace, and Petitions, Correspondence, and Dispatches. Each of these secondary committees had an executive commission under its supervision. As to matters within its competence, each committee had the right to issue ordinances without consulting the Committee of Public Safety. Although subject to recent legislation governing retirement and re-election of its members, each of these committees had the power to suspend or discharge the agents of the government departments falling under its immediate supervision.

It appears that the Thermidoreans wished to change everything that had been secured by the revolutionary government of the Committee of Public Safety. The law of 7 fructidor an II (24 August, 1794) which remained in force up to the end of the Convention, served as a constitution for the Thermidorean regime just as the great law of 14 frimaire an II (4 December, 1793) had been used as the constitution of the terrorist regime. In order to check anarchy, the decree of 14 frimaire an II had concentrated all authority in the hands of the Committee of Public Safety,
a group re-eligible for an indefinite period and armed with formidable powers. The law of 7 fructidor an II (24 August, 1794), on the contrary, was the exact reverse. It took distrust of authority as its principle. It split up the central power and endeavored to divide it equally among all the deputies.

This changed Convention set up began at once to set aside the legislation upon which the Reign of Terror had depended for its success. The Convention, thus, on 11 thermidor an II (29 July, 1794) upset the whole organization of revolutionary government by refusing to approve the new membership list for the Revolutionary Tribunal presented by Barère. The effect was a de facto suspension of the Tribunal. Three days later, Lecointre proposed and obtained a repeal of the law of 22 prairial an II (10 June, 1793). Through this repeal, the accused were granted adequate means of defense. There followed many retributive or revengeful executions such as those of the infamous Carrier of Nantes, the public prosecutor Fouquier-Tinville, and fifteen former judges and jurors of the Tribunal. After these feeble efforts to re-establish the balance of justice, the Revolutionary Tribunal ceased to function and was soon abolished. A decree of 23 thermidor an II reorganized the Revolutionary Tribunal. This was modified later by the decree of 8 nivose an III (28 December, 1795), and the Tribunal was
definitely suppressed on 12 prairial an III (31 May, 1795). 8

The discarding of the legal supports of the Terror System continued. Throughout France, and more particularly at Paris, the number and activity of the revolutionary committees had been reduced by a decree adopted on 3 fructidor an II (20 August, 1794). 9 This action removed many terrorist henchmen from government payrolls. Added to these were the administrators, agents, and others who were in the employ of the defeated Robespierrist faction. The daily indemnity of forty sous paid by each section to the poor for regularly attending sectional assembly meetings was suppressed by another law enacted on 3 fructidor an II (20 August, 1794). There were new issues of assignats and, finally, in December, 1794, the pre-Thermidorean assignat laws were repealed. Also the law of maximum, adopted on 17 September, 1793, was abolished by a decree of 23-24 December, 1794. 10 Matters were made worse by the law of 5 ventose an III (23 February, 1795). Pursuant to this law all administrators, agents of all types, members of revolutionary committees, etc., destitute, suspended, or unemployed were ordered to return to their original homes where they were living prior to 10 thermidor an II (28 July, 1794). 11 As a result, thousands of local and national employees
soon found themselves without a job or other source of income. Climaxing this discarding of the "props" of terror was the closing of the powerful Jacobin Club on 12 November, 1795.

Other changes by, and in, the Convention can be seen in the return of former members: "men of the Marsh," Girondins, and other moderates. Those Girondin members of the Convention who had been imprisoned during the height of the "Terror," re-entered the Convention on 8 December, 1794. Others of their party who had survived the Paris insurrection of 2 June, 1793, were restored to their Convention seats on 8 March, 1795.

The liquidation of the Terror System would naturally bring about changes in problems and policies. The war perforce must go on. External defense was necessary to internal security. The new committee set-up in the Convention and the return of absent members foreshadowed ultimately a new procedure in dealing with the problems of internal security. Labor and unemployment were certainly not the least of these problems. However, before dealing with the home situation, peace abroad had to be secured; the coalition against France must be broken up.

When the Thermidorean reaction began, the War of the First Coalition was still in progress. The capture of Charleroi by the French on 25 June, 1794, and their
defeat of the Allies at Fleurus the next day marked the beginning of a change in the international situation. Eventually the brilliant successes of the French army during the winter campaign, 1794-1795, led to a general break-up of the First Coalition. The Prussians, after a second battle at Kaiserslauten in September, 1794, retired across the Rhine. Jourdan occupied Cologne, Andernach, and Coblenz in October, 1794. Pichegru then invaded Holland 27 December, 1794, and entered Amsterdam on 19 January, 1795.

By the treaty of The Hague Tuscany withdrew from the coalition and made peace with France on 9 February, 1795. Prussia, joined by Saxony, Hanover, and Hesse-Cassel, concluded on 5 April, 1795, the Peace of Basel. Holland made terms with the French on 16 May, 1795. Shortly afterward (25 June) Luxembourg capitulated. Further successes forced Spain out of the coalition as she signed the Peace of Basel on 22 July, 1795.

Only a remnant of the coalition fought on. The English with the aid of the emigrees attempted to assist the royalist Chouans by an invasion of Brittany. They landed at Quiberon on 27 June, 1795. General Hoche, after a struggle lasting 16-21 July captured Quiberon and executed over seven hundred emigrees. Jourdan crossed the Rhine on 6 September, 1795, while Pichegru occupied
Mannheim fourteen days later. The incorporation of Belgium in France on 1 October, 1795, brought to a close the series of victories followed by pacifications and territorial gains. With relative peace abroad and more internal security, France could not give consideration to her consequent changing internal economic situation.

Much of the old labor policy of 1793-1794 naturally continued on into the Thermidorean period. This policy consisted of assistance coupled with work relief. Assistance after 9 thermidor an II (27 July, 1794) was administered by the National Succor Commission in conjunction with the Public Succor Committee. The National Succor Commission, created 1 April, 1794, was granted on 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. The codification of all relief legislation dating from the National Constituent Assembly was continued and completed during this period.

The unfortunate explosion of the Grenelle powder plant on 14 fructidor an II (31 August, 1794) had injured many laborers and displaced hundreds of others. The joint Committees of Public Safety and General Security appropriated 12,000 livres on 31 August, 1794, to aid the victims of this disaster. The Committee of Public Safety ordered the Commission of Public Works to investigate
the Grenelle incident, assemble workmen, clear the wreckage, and undertake restoration of the plant to normal production. 14

While demobilizing the "Terror," the Convention was still confronted with the problem of supplying trained personnel for munitions production, and engineers for road and bridge construction. A Central School of Public Works sponsored by Prieur de la Cote-d'Or and Fourcrroy was established by a decree of 7 vendemiaire an III (28 September, 1794). 15 Among the notable instructors were Monge, Lagrange, Berthollet, Guyton-Morveau, and Chaptal. The school could accommodate four hundred young men 16-20 years of age taking courses such as engineering, bridges and highways, civil and maritime construction, cartography, and mining. This institution later became the famous Ecole Polytechnique of today. Although it did not accommodate a large number of young men, it did remove four hundred from the ranks of the unemployed and fit them to become employers. This program has resemblance in its initiation to our N.Y.A. and other government "depression vocational training aids" that salvaged our unemployed youth and with post-war developments for education of veterans in our universities.

Women's work relief projects--the textile and spinning shops--were continued. They were placed under the control of the Commission of Agriculture and the Arts on
14 fructidor an II (3 September, 1794). Berthollet’s recommendation of 12 frimaire an III (2 December, 1794) for closing the projects was refused by the Convention. Yet further dissatisfaction with the administration of these projects caused the Convention to place them, early in 1795, under the supervision of the Commission of Public Succor, subject to the jurisdiction of the Public Succor Committee. At the end of 1794 such shops were employing nearly 2,000 women. These shops were finally closed and the work shifted to private home production on 29 prairial an III (17 June, 1795).16

In order to achieve the military victories previously discussed, a continuous supply of munitions had been required. In addition to the arms and powder factories already in existence, the Committee of Public Safety ordered the Public Works Commission, on 12 frimaire an III (12 December, 1794) to set up a factory at Perreux. This factory, producing shells for rifles and cannon, would reduce the heavy demands that were now being made on the Paris arsenal.17 Formerly, it had been the work of Frieur de la Cote d’Or to set up new war works (usines de guerre). Now it became the sphere of Guyton-Marveau who made them the subject of his report on 14 pluviôse an III (2 February, 1795).18
Continuing its old policy, the Convention by an act of 21 pluviose an III (9 February, 1795) granted 10,000,000 livres to be divided among the departments for their charitable needs. By a subsequent ruling of 7 germinal an III (27 March, 1795) this appropriation was divided equally between old or infirm indigents and "useful works." As a palliative, following the bread riot of 12 germinal an III (1 April, 1795) the Public Succor Committee increased the dole on 24 floreal an III (13 May, 1795).

Here it may be well to review the points of interest in the labor policy of the Committee of Public Safety. At the height of its power the Committee had vigorously followed a so-called "democratic" policy. It had checked the depreciation of assignats by fixing "maximum" prices for commodities. Grants to soldiers' dependents and indigent relief had been increased. Artisans and manual workers had been indirectly subsidized by paying them for being regular in their attendance at the sectional assemblies. Unemployment had been reduced mainly through the large number and variety of jobs offered by the many organizations supplying the army with food, clothing, equipment, and munitions.

Naturally these policies of currying mob favor were instruments of "Terror." Now that the old "props"
(maximum, revolutionary tribunal, forty sous, etc.) had been removed and the effects of victories and pacifications had been felt, changes in the internal economic situation were inevitable. The Thermidoreans were perforce hostile towards the large government-operated arms factories of Paris. They feared an uprising of the thousands of laborers employed in them. A shut-down of four-fifths of these war-plants might rid them of many contentious workmen provided they did not build up the unemployed Paris mob. Should the Committee of Public Safety close the Paris factories, they would have to turn to the development of suburban ones. Also they would have to place those still under government operation in the hands of contractors. Yet these desired changes were not immediately feasible. Indeed there could be no let up of effort until after the winter campaign of 1794-1795.

By the spring of 1795 the victories of the armies, the plunder taken from the enemy, and the growing discord among the allies of the First Coalition—all combined to make intensive French arms production no longer necessary. This viewpoint was further strengthened particularly by the peace treaties of The Hague (9 February, 1795) and of Basel (5 April and 22 July, 1795).

Work in the foundries and other metallurgical factories declined. There was a corresponding chomage in
the saltpeter and powder factories.\textsuperscript{23} The exhaustion of the saltpeter supply as well as the mediocre quality of that which was being collected contributed to this new chomage. Those communes in which the saltpeter works were still functioning in the spring of 1795 began to close them one after another. Military successes rendered intensive saltpeter and powder production unnecessary and revolutionary enthusiasm no longer sustained it.\textsuperscript{24}

Related to this altered public morale was perhaps the Thermidorean adjustment of the religious question. This also affected those defense industries which had been set up in the confiscated churches. After 9 thermidor an II (27 July, 1794), the Convention regulated the religious question somewhat as follows:

(1) Separated church and state (2nd sans-culottide an II--18 September, 1794).\textsuperscript{25}

(2) Established a partial religious liberty (3 ventose an III--21 February, 1795).\textsuperscript{26}

(3) Restored churches to the worshippers on condition that their ministers submit to the laws of the state (11 prairial an III--30 May, 1795).\textsuperscript{27}

(4) Enlarged the scope of its previous laws on religious freedom (6-7 vendemlaire an IV--28-29 September, 1795).\textsuperscript{28}

Restoration of church buildings to religious worship forced Paris and the other communes to install their saltpeter and powder factories elsewhere.\textsuperscript{29} As a consequence of all this, the Committee of Public Safety
encouraged private professional jobbers to take over the saltpeter production. Since by a decree of 17 germinal an III (6 April, 1795) it was decided not to re-establish their former monopoly of this industry, they attempted to make it attractive to private enterprise by raising the price of saltpeter. 30

The Committee of Public Safety had decided on 16 frimaire an III (6 December, 1794) that production and repair of armaments would be placed under private contract. 31 Committee members were of the opinion that arms production on a daily wage basis was too expensive for continued government operation. 32 These policies must have tied in with the relaxing of high pressure arms production during the spring of 1795; the climax of which demobilization was suppression of the Commission of Arms and Powders on 10 vendemmbire an IV (2 October, 1795) by decree of the National Convention. 33 Efforts coincidently were being made, as a feature of the war factory demobilization of 1795, to shift the enormous crowd of munitions laborers from Paris to other localities. The relocation of saltpeter and powder factories after 30 May, 1795, had presented an opportunity to rid Paris of a large number of laborers. Also in line with this same objective was the construction of a new munitions plant at Perreux. The suspension of government contracts and monopoly and the shifting toward private contracts also helped to relieve
the pressure at Paris.

However, the immediate effectiveness of this new policy was hardly noticeable. Arms workers gathered in groups protesting the shut-down of arms factories. Complaints of misery and want were sent to the Committee by the displaced laborers. Additional complaints stated that the ateliers d'habillement (work-relief-clothing factories) were not giving them enough work to earn a living wage. To aggravate this growing unemployment a shortage of grain and other food stuffs led to famine. Such scarcity was no doubt due in a large measure to the early effectiveness of the English starvation blockade. By means of this blockade England crippled French commerce and had hopes of starving France into submission. The normal industrial outlook was gloomy. The French had lost colonies which had been overseas markets. This general unrest led to the October Paris uprising and attack on the Convention then in session at the Tuileries. This 13 vendemiaire uprising climaxed a series of flareups dating from the spring insurrections of 1795.

The war-production problems of the National Convention in 1793 and its readjustment problems after the treaties of Basel and The Hague are pertinent in our times. The analogies are many. They merit attention even though this study will mention only a few of them.
The critical problem of obtaining saltpeter which confronted the Committee of Public Safety was similar to our "rubber problem" after Pearl Harbor and Singapore. As Revolutionary France in utilizing her scientists, subsidized the saltpeter industry; so did the United States call upon scientific research, backed by federal funds, in the development of the synthetic rubber industry. Metal shortages present other analogies. Voluntary contributions of utensils, ornaments, grill works, etc. (made of iron, brass, copper, bronze, silver, and gold) were made by the French to aid the war effort of the Committee of Public Safety. Similar patriotic appeals made during our many "drives" brought in numerous voluntary contributions of rubber, fats, furs, aluminum ware, binoculars, and scores of other much needed scarce items.

Again, the United States faced a problem following World Wars I and II similar to that of the French Republic consequent upon the victories and pacifications of 1794-1795. In the case of World War II, demobilization and reconversion were in the making far in advance of V-E Day. The French problems of reduced production and increased unemployment were more acute than ours because they had not planned a readjustment program. The work of our War Production Board, the War Manpower Commission, the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, together with other federal agencies had worked out plans for gradual cut-backs
and termination of contracts and transition from war-time production to peace-time civilian production. Some war-plants were retained on a stand-by status. Some were given over to other types of production, while others were returned to purely civilian production.

The French had not devised a system for handling the increased unemployment following the cessation of hostilities. We, too, bungled the job after World War I. On the contrary, the gradual World War II demobilization and transition of labor from war to civilian production and the return of many war workers to their households do represent a definite advance over the bungling which followed the close of World War I. It is true that many World War II workers were displaced, but these had time to get out of the way before full demobilization set in. Thus our over-all post-war planning did not find us, when hostilities ceased, with so great a problem of unemployment, as France had during the Thermidorean period.

The shifting of surplus labor from Paris in 1794-95 was taking place all too slowly. Groups of vagrants, beggars, and idle laborers foregathered daily in its streets. In less than two months the National Convention was twice attacked by the Paris mob. The insurrection of 12 germinal an III (1 April, 1795) was led against the Convention by Jacobin survivors with cries of "Bread and the Constitution
of 1793." These hangers-on resented the demobilization of
the "Terror" set-up which had brought on the arrest and
deportation of Billaud, Collot, Vadier, and Barere, the
last of the old terrorist faction. This uprising was soon
put down by the National Guard. The Convention, no doubt,
sought to appease the populace by increasing the dole on
24 Floreal an III (13 May, 1795).

Still the mob was not satisfied. Once again they
tried to force their demands on the Convention in a more
serious assault on 1 prairial an III (20 June, 1795).
There were bread riots, murdering, and widespread looting.
This time the mob was assisted by several Montagnard
deputies. Boissy d'Anglas, Convention president, was firm
in refusing their demands. As soon as the insurrectionists
were suppressed, the Convention tried the deputies
involved and executed six of them. These six were spoken
of as the "Last of the Montagnards."

Now it seemed high time for the Convention to
provide France with a constitution. The insurrections of
April and May made such action imperative. Then, too, the
political importance of the Paris populace must be reduced.
Already its military power had been lessened by removing
its armed forces from the control of the Committee of
Public Safety.
This new objective was achieved by abandoning universal suffrage. The constitutional debates fixed qualifications for voting. These were substantially what they had been in 1791. Control now went back to the property owners. Especially was this true in the electoral assemblies. The Constitution of the Year III, adopted by the Convention 5 fructidor an III (22 August, 1795) introduced a new plan of local administrative government. Instead of preserving all of the large communes set up in 1789, the new local governments consisted of cantonal municipalities of almost uniform size. This new government was to consist of a national executive composed of five members and two legislative councils. The Convention on 13 fructidor an III (30 August, 1795) adopted a supplementary decree requiring that two-thirds of the members of the legislative councils must be elected from the present membership of the Convention. This decree along with other supplementary decrees and the new constitution was submitted to a plebiscite based on universal suffrage. The royalists, including many repatriated emigres and the Paris Commune opposed this "two-thirds" decree. The disgruntled, displaced laborers formed no small part of this mob.

Thus the "empty bellies" turned upon the "rotten bellies" of the Convention. This attack, which took place
on 13 vendemiaire an IV (5 October, 1795) was repulsed by a "whiff of grapeshot" fired under the direction of the young general, Bonaparte. This event is historic because it marks the beginning of the rise of Napoleon. Other immediate consequences were the strengthening of the radical element in the Convention and excluding all returned emigrees and their relatives from any legislative, judicial, or administrative office. Finally, after the 13 vendemiaire incident, the Constitution was put into effect and the new Directorial government organized 26 October, 1795.

Our consideration of the Thermidorean reaction has brought us to the close of the National Convention, the last of three great revolutionary assemblies. It is well, therefore, to summarize here its handling of the unemployment problems.

When the Convention began its leadership of the revolutionary government under the direction of the high-handed and dictatorial Committee of Public Safety, it had had to confront two pressing crises. On one hand France faced a great problem of unpreparedness for the approaching external conflict and increased internal strife. On the other hand there was an inherited situation of unemployment. The National Convention attempted to go forward with the work of unemployment relief begun by the Legislative
Assembly's Committee on Public Succor. In the National
Convention's program, which resulted in the nationalization
of this social-responsibility, the problems of unemployment
received much attention.

Under this newer attitude, relief was no longer
looked upon as a duty of the rich. It had now become a
legally or constitutionally recognized obligation of society.
In fulfilling this obligation, society, through its deputies
in the Convention, recognized the right of every man to
subsistence. They were well aware of the commensurate duty
of every man to labor.

The "war years" of 1793-1795 saw many interesting
developments. Through the levée en masse, of 23 August,
1793, the Committee solved its problem of unpreparedness.
The war policy of the Committee of Public Safety, there-
fore, indirectly reduced the urgent social problem of un-
employment. At the same time, French industry made a
notable advance through use of the scientific developments
of Lavoisier, Guyton-Morveau, Monge, Chaptal, and other
savants of this period.

The military successes, the cooling of revolutionary
enthusiasm, and the high cost of government operation of
war-time industries all combined brought about a reversal of
the employment situation. Thus, the Convention period saw
a shift from an over supply of labor to a shortage of labor
followed, after Thermidor, by renewed unemployment. This new labor crisis was due, as we have noted, to victorious armies, shut down of arms factories, and purging of the revolutionary government.

Riots, famine, insurrections, and cries of "Bread and the Constitution of 1793"—all indicated that the time was now ripe for closing the activities of the National Convention. This body was now as unpopular with the left as with the right and was able to maintain its position only through the aid of the army. The Constitution, which it adopted before its dissolution on 4 brumaire an IV (26 October, 1795), set up the regime of the Directory, an oligarchic limited Republic to replace the Convention's unlimited powers. How was the Directory to face the fresh labor crisis?
PART IV

THE DIRECTORY: 1795-1799/1800
PART IV
CHAPTER I
DIRECTORAL DEVELOPMENTS AND UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF

Before assuming any of the responsibilities and problems left it by the National Convention, a new government had to be set up as provided for by the recently adopted Constitution of the Year III. The National Directory, accordingly was installed on 4 brumaire an IV (26 October, 1795). Now we enter upon the retroactive phase of the revolution. This oligarchic limited republic ruled France during the period of 26 October–10 November, 1799. This period represents a gradual shifting from anarchy by militarism to autocracy. It can be said that the role of the Directory was characterized chiefly by coups d'état. We have seen how party domination marked the three periods of Convention rule; namely, "Girondin rule in," "Montagnard rule over," and "Thermidorean rule by" the Convention. Now we find the Directory divided into three periods; not by party domination but by coups d'état. These periods were as follows:

(1) From 13 vendemiaire an IV (6 October, 1795) to 18 fructidor an V (3 September, 1797).

(2) From then to 30 prairial an VII (18 June, 1799).
(3) From then to 18-19 brumaire an VIII (9-10 November, 1799).

The nature of this Directoral regime was one of internal demoralization, economic and commercial stagnation, and intrigues and illegal rule. However, this period cannot be bypassed because it does mark a vital step in the development of our particular problem. This becomes very evident when we show how the Directory, through its encouragements to industry, did help to relieve the labor situation.1

The chief features of this new government were its legislative and executive branches. The legislature or corps legislatif was composed of two houses—the Council of Ancients and the Council of Five Hundred. The retiring men of the Convention, still desiring an upperhand in the new government, had required that two-thirds of the new corps legislatif be from Conventionnels. This chicanery was accomplished by means of a supplementary decree adopted along with the Constitution of the Year III. The "pentarchy" or executive branch of the Directory consisted of five Directors chosen by the Council of Ancients from a list of fifty names submitted to it by the Council of Five Hundred. Barras, La Revelliere-Lepeaux, Reubell, Letourneur, and Sieyes were elected as the original Executive Directors. In a letter sent to the Council of Five Hundred on 11 brumaire an IV (2 November, 1795), Sieyes declined the
office on the plea that he was unfitted for the job and was unpopular with every party. We shall find later on that he was to have a role to play. Now, at this time, his refusal was accepted by the corps législatif, whereasupon the Council of Five Hundred submitted the name of Carnot, who was being held in reserve for the Ministry of War. This election of Carnot on 13 brumaire an IV (4 November, 1795) thus completed the initial directory set-up.2

Perhaps the most notorious of these Directors was the ex-noble and former terrorist, Paul Barras (13 June, 1755 to 29 January, 1829). His early life had been spent as a soldier in the colonial army. Accepting the revolution with enthusiasm, Barras even went further by taking a seat as a War department deputy in the National Convention, where he became leading member of the great General Security Committee and so eventually an instrument in Robespierre's downfall. He had been, in 1793, a deputy on mission in the southwest Alpine region (Hautes, Bases and Maritimes Alps departments) and also on mission to the Army of Toulon and the Army of Italy. Later he was appointed as general-in-chief of the army. This military rank and experience account in large measure for his selecting Bonaparte to protect the Convention on 13 vendémiaire. Like Barère de Vieuzac, Barras had no political principles. His contemporaries painted him in the vilest colors, as
corrupt in his politics as in his morals, and his own Memoirs are his strongest indictment. He was the leading figure in the Directory from its beginning to its fall; which ended Barras's political career.3

Closely associated with Barras was Jean Francois Reubell (6 October, 1747--24 November, 1807). He was one of a small group of lawyers who began their political careers as deputies to the Estates-General. In addition to his services in the National Constituent Assembly and the Convention, Reubell took an active part in foreign affairs, assisting Merlin de Douai and Sieyes in the Basel treaty negotiations.4 Elected one of the five initial Directors, Reubell served as their first president. Although capable, Reubell was corrupt. While a Director, he was constantly surrounded by speculators and army contractors whom he aided and protected. His ideal system of government was a despotism of the type which existed under the Committee of Public Safety. His political activities came to an end with the advent of Napoleon and the brumaire coup d'etat of 1799.5

Louis-Marie La Revelliere-Lepeaux (24 August, 1753--27 March, 1824) was an old Girondin who had barely escaped the Revolutionary Tribunal. Like Reubell, he had given service in the Constituent Assembly and the Convention. His election to the Directory was practically unanimous,
receiving 216 of the 216 votes cast. La Revelliére-Lepeaux resigned, under pressure, on 30 prairial an VII (18 June, 1799) after having served the Directory nearly four years. He had been the spokesman of thephilanthropy, a new cult marked by the absence of elaborate rites, of ordained clergy, and a loosely knit organization. Slightly deformed physically, La Revelliére-Lepeaux was ill-tempered, vain, and platitudinous, with a dominant intense hatred for Christianity and its clergy.7

Perhaps less corrupt than Barras and Reubell, and certainly less emotional than La Revelliére-Lepeaux, was the fairly capable former army engineer and marine officer Étienne François Letourneur (15 March, 1751—4 October, 1817). He was an ardent supporter of the revolution, having been active in the National Legislative Assembly.8 Having served on the National Convention's War Committee, Letourneur was found, by Carnot, to be a remarkable and sympathetic assistant. Letourneur served as Director from 1 November, 1795, until 19 May, 1797, when he was replaced by Barthelemy.9

Like Letourneur and Barras, a professional soldier, and, since 1792, a specialist in military affairs, Carnot was no doubt selected for the Directory on his popularity as the "organisateur de la victoire" and more especially in anticipation of his valuable services in preparing the forth-
coming military campaign. Fatefully, he was one of the first victims of the army's interference in politics during the coup d'état of 13 Fructidor an V (4 September, 1797) which eliminated him from the Directory. However, Carnot escaped the full wrath of the "fructidorizers" by fleeing into exile.

Although its administration did become one of much disorganization and corruption, the Directory, nevertheless, did begin its work with a more or less planned procedure by assigning each member geographical spheres of influence. In addition, supervisory duties were given each director. Barras was assigned the southeastern departments and supervision over police and certain subdivisions of the Ministry of the Interior. Reubell, being an Alsatian, was given the northeastern departments and administrative supervision of the Ministries of Justice, Finance, and Foreign Affairs. The southwestern departments were passed out to La Revelliere-Lepeaux along with supervision of public instruction, sciences, and the arts. Because of his previous marine service, Letourneur was assigned supervision of the Ministry of Marine and Colonies as well as the extreme western and a few central departments. The military genius, Carnot, as one might well expect, was given supervision of the Ministry of War along with the northern and north central departments. Thus we see that
not only were administrative functions divided among the Directors, but each was also assigned a zone of responsibility.

Assisting the Executive Directory and the corps législatif were the ministries. At first the following six ministries were established: Foreign Affairs (Delacroix), Justice (Merlin de Douai), War (Aubert-Dubayet), Finances (Faipoult), Marine and Colonies (Truguet), Interior (Benezech). About two months later, 12 nivose an IV (2 January, 1796), a seventh ministry, that of General Police, was established with Cochon as its head.

Much later, but of particular pertinence to our special problem of adjusting surplus labor, came up the proposed Ministry of Public Works. A message from the Directory to the Council of Fine Hundred dated 19 vendemiaire an VI (10 October, 1797) asked that an eighth ministry be set up. On 11 frimaire an VI (4 December, 1797), Duport submitted a project for such a ministry to be called the Ministry of Public Works and National Domain. This proposal was rejected by the Five Hundred on 28 nivose an VI (17 January, 1793). Part of the work that would have been administered by this new department was given to the Ministry of the Interior. Its functions now embraced also the divisions of agriculture, public works, and public instruction.
Once the Directory had been installed, the question arose: How would this government meet the social problems facing it—and in particular the issue of a fresh labor crisis?

The labor problems of the Convention period, it has been seen, were very perplexing at the outset. Beginning with the palliatives left it by the National Legislative Assembly, the Convention was forced to develop more positive means of reducing its labor surplus. An opportune solution suggested itself when the questions of national defense demanded immediate attention. This temporary solution consisted of work projects developed during the "all-out" war effort which followed the levée en masse—National Draft Act—of 1793. A large-scale development of munitions industries and related defense productions then reduced for a time the oversupply of labor. Much want had been alleviated by the dole. Unemployed dependents of armed forces personnel had been helped through pensions and other forms of aid. Finally towards the end of the Convention significant military successes and a fear of over-nationalization of production had resulted in a greatly reduced program of government-sponsored work projects.

Yet, misery, the companion of unemployment, was widespread. A return to a program of public succor seemed inevitable. Assistance again became the order of
the day. Complaints accumulated as misery was augmented. The Directory accepted the lessons of experience and appeared to be content with reestablishing an organization of public succor analogous, in almost every way, to that of 1789-90.

Hospitals played a prominent part in relieving the suffering due to unemployment. It is well to note here that the word "hospital" as used in eighteenth-century France had a broader significance than it has in America today. In the eighteenth century the term "hospital" meant a state-recognized charitable institution existing for the benefit of the needy, whether sick, disabled, or dependent.12 These institutions were to a considerable degree self-sustaining institutions offering a variety of jobs to outsiders as well as inmates, for they provided their own linen and clothing, bakeries and kitchens, grain storage, and laundries. In addition, they had their own slaughterhouses and made their own candles.13

Under the National Convention the Minister of Finance had proposed the adoption of a law transferring all hospital property to the state, declaring that it was necessary in order to meet the expenses of the war. This proposal was adopted on 23 messidor an II (11 July, 1794). Such legislation would have been adopted in any case; since it was the logical result of the philosophy then
prevalent. For, after 1789, as we have already pointed out, it was the almost unanimous opinion in France that the problems of charity, beneficence, and of unemployment relief were obligations of the state.\textsuperscript{14}

This experiment in state ownership of hospital property unhappily was not successful. By the laws of 3 brumaire and 28 germinal an IV (25 October, 1795 and 17 April, 1796) the decree of 11 July, 1794, was suspended.\textsuperscript{15} Sales of hospital property were stopped and the revenues of hospital property were temporarily returned to them. Finally a decree of 16 vendemiaire an V (7 October, 1796) restored to the hospitals their unsold property and investments, with the right of enjoying all proceeds from them. Moreover, the hospitals were to be compensated for all property sold.\textsuperscript{16}

Another early measure of expediency resorted to by the Directory was its resolution of 11 nivose an IV (1 January, 1796) inviting theater directors to give a monthly performance for the benefit of the poor. Funds collected from such performances could be used for direct relief or for initiating relief work projects.\textsuperscript{17} Benezech, Minister of the Interior, now sent a circular to the administrators in each département urging the support of this arrêt of the Directory and suggesting how these funds might be used. There is no doubt that this circular letter of 24 pluviose an IV (13 February, 1796) bore fruit, for,
by 24 April, 1796, these benefit performances had produced slightly more than 445,000 livres for relief work. 18

Again, Benezech sent out instructions to the department administrative bodies concerning the general organization of relief services with particular stress on work relief. In this communication of 25 pluviose an IV (14 February, 1796) he discussed hospitals, home-relief, and work-relief for the able-bodied poor. For the unemployed, Benezech did not recommend charity nor direct relief. Instead he said, "Work and wages, these are the types of relief agreeable to them." 19 Such relief funds had been used previously in relief projects in the large cities. A considerable amount had been used in the communes in "ouvrages de terrassement." Benezech now proposed to give these funds a more general utility, i.e., have them serve a larger group of indigent unemployed. In order to do this he recommended using relief appropriations for the construction of neighboring local roads and even in repairing main highways. 20 Later, 7 frimaire an V (27 November, 1796) a luxury tax was placed on admission to all types of entertainments for a period of six months. The effectiveness of this tax as a source of relief income can be seen in the case of Seine department. In one year (1797-1798) this department collected 367,345 francs from this tax. 21
The Directory took other steps in combating the so prevalent misery and unemployment. Welfare bureaus and committees were again set up. After having heard a report of Benezech on the distribution of relief in Paris, the Executive Directory decided to provide for a more equitable and useful distribution of relief funds. They adopted on 16 floréal an IV (5 May, 1796) a new ruling relative to welfare bureaus and committees. This regulation set up a welfare committee in each section of Paris. It also created a general welfare bureau made up of one member from each section of Paris. Meeting quarterly, this general welfare bureau was to consider the work of its committees, the status of the poor, and above all, what measures were being taken to combat indolence and forced idleness. A portion of these funds was to be given to unemployed laborers with the intention of "reviving their industry and raising their morale." (The word "industry" as used here implies their native desire to be self-supporting.) Children of destitute parents were to be given, according to their age and competence, apprenticeship jobs.

The welfare committees were ordered to confer with local factory managements and contractors as to their labor needs, both with respect to skilled workmen and apprentices. The most important provisions of this regulation are Articles 7 and 8 of Title Five.22 This
general welfare bureau and its committees were specifically charged with the responsibility of procuring work for those unemployed who were seeking relief aid. All able-bodied unemployed who refused the work thus procured for them would be dropped from the relief rolls. Current practices in the United States are not too different from those followed in France during the late eighteenth century. Our unemployed who are receiving unemployment compensation may be refused such aid if they do not accept the jobs secured for them by the government unemployment agencies.23

Although these temporary measures of the Directory did accomplish something in counteracting unemployment and consequent misery, it appears that only a small percentage of the labor surplus was affected. At the same time there was a continued reduction in the number of war plants. The attitude of the late Convention period against government production of arms and munitions continued. The Directory questioned the Minister of War concerning the advantages to the Republic that might be gained by suppressing the Paris arsenal and foundry and discharging the artillery commission connected with them. On the same day, 3 nivose an IV (24 December, 1795), the Directory requested that a report on these matters be submitted to it.24

Soon thereafter, the Directory, on 14 nivose an IV (4 January, 1796), did suppress the Paris arsenal and
passed other resolutions affecting the laborers employed there. The unanimous opinion of the Directors in this matter is indicated by all five of them signing these laws. Another arrêt of the same date, signed by Letourneur, Revelliere-Lepeaux, and Carnot, provided that such equipment of the arsenal as was not needed by either the Ministry of War or the Ministry of Marine would be placed on public sale.25

Available records do not clearly indicate what disposition was made by the Directory of the laborers it had forced out of jobs. A similar situation of increased unemployment due to retrenchment in government production was the shutting down of the national proving grounds at Meudon. On 27 pluviose an IV (16 February, 1796) the Directory closed the atelier known as the "Epreuves nationales de Meudon." Attached to the order suppressing the project was a statement that said since its founding this workshop had produced a quantity of shells and incendiary bullets "sufficient for supplying all the ports during a considerable lapse of time" and that its operation was costing enormous sums.26 The materials and equipment of the proving grounds were, by Directory regulation of 29 germinal an IV (18 April, 1796), distributed among five schools, the greater portion being given to the Ecole Polytechnique.27
Further withdrawal of government-subsidized war industries was successfully attempted by the Directory. It was to curb expenditures that the Directory proceeded to pass the laws of 10, 12 germinal an IV (30 March, 1 April, 1796). The first law closed down, in Paris, all ateliers and other workshops involved in the production of arms. The second law regulated the production of powder, thereby reducing the amount to 4,000,000 livres for the year IV. In suppressing the arms factories in Paris, the Directory had taken into consideration the stock-piling of arms as a result of the over-production decreed by the National Convention. The new government had hoped to realize much financial gain from the sale of all surplus equipment. On the other hand, let us note that these laws made no provision for the care of these laborers who would be displaced by the shutdown of these war plants. 

The government, by decree of 1 April, 1796, again aimed at repairing its finances by the sale of war surplus property, implements, machines and other objects used in the production of saltpeter. This decree regulating the production of powder reduced the powder plants and saltpeter refineries to half their number. Details were given in this regulation governing the disposition, transfer, and public sale of all surplus involved.
Of particular interest to us are Articles 23 and 24. We have noted that the arret which shutdown the arms factories of Paris had made no provision for the displaced workmen. On the contrary, this arret of 1 April, 1796, did take some interest in trying to help the ousted laborer to adjust himself. Article 23 provided that the Minister of Finance would proceed to reduce the number of employees in proportion to the actual needs of the remaining factories (i.e., powder plants and saltpeter refineries). Article 24 specifically stated that the Minister of Finance would furnish the Directory information as to the living conditions of the discharged workmen. Furthermore, the minister was instructed to recommend some sort of indemnification to which each of them would have the right. 

Herein we find some recognition of the obligation of the state to provide for the unemployed, particularly when such unemployment has been caused directly by the government.

The powder and saltpeter industries were finally reestablished under a degree of state control through the work of Fourcroy and Frieur de la Cote-d'Or. Finding the present reserve supply sufficient for the needs of the army, and, in the interest of internal security and tranquility, the Directory voted the decrees of 13 and 27 fructidor an V (30 August and 13 September, 1797). Moreover, these new regulations struck at the illicit production and sale of
powder which made possible supplies for insurrectionary groups.\textsuperscript{31}

Workmen were still complaining of the closing down of a large number of ateliers and factories. They said it was a new ruse invented by the rich to wipe out the poor who already were experiencing great difficulty in making a living, even when working. Others complained that workshops were being closed by their owners under pretext of necessity because of the forced loan. Indeed, many factories undoubtedly did shut down due to the stagnation of commerce.\textsuperscript{32}

In its proclamation to the people, dated 1\textsuperscript{1} brumaire an IV (5 November, 1795), the Directory announced its program which included the following points:

1. To fight royalism
2. To revive patriotism
3. To repress vigorously all factions
4. To extinguish all party spirit
5. To wipe out all desire for vengeance
6. To bring in a reign of concord
7. To bring back peace
8. To reopen the sources of production
9. To reanimate industry and commerce
10. To give new life to the arts and sciences.\textsuperscript{33}

The declaration closed with a reference to the disorders of
the "six years of revolution" which had further discredited
the nation and retarded prosperity. The Directory made
clear its desires to restore tranquility and bring back
prosperity. This was the first time that the disorders of
the revolution were acknowledged by the government. It was
also the first time that the failure or even the decline
of manners, work, credit, industry, commerce, arts, and
letters was presented as the consequence of agitation,
insurrection, and disturbance.34 In pledging itself to do
something about reopening the sources of production and the
reanimation of industry and commerce, the Directory appeared
ready to assume its responsibility toward relieving the
problems of surplus labor.

The problem of vast numbers of idle laborers had
become so alarming that certain of the Directors felt they
had to do something to ease the growing tendency toward
brigandage and other types of lawlessness to which thousands
of jobless men turned for their existence. The Directors
insisted that government funds be allotted to encourage
manufacturing and commerce. Especially were they interested
in the linen, cotton, and silk industries.35

Jacques Michel Coupe, a cure and legislator from
Sermaize, had expressed his humanitarian interest in many
ways over a period of years. He had, as the deputy from
Oise, served in both the National Legislative Assembly and
the Convention. A decree on the culture and use of the potato was submitted by Coupe in connection with his association with the agricultural committee.\textsuperscript{36} Another instance of Coupe's interest in household economy was his proposal for the manufacture of edible oils from beechnuts and grape-seeds.\textsuperscript{37} He fostered legislation dealing with the expansion of the Bibliothèque Nationale.\textsuperscript{38} Coupe felt that inventors in both the artists and scientists groups should be encouraged; hence, he proposed awards be given them.\textsuperscript{39}

To the Council of Five Hundred, on 2 floreal an IV (21 April, 1796), Coupe presented a report in which he requested government encouragement of linen, canvas (i.e., sail cloth), and silk production. He concluded this report on 3 floreal an IV (27 April, 1796) by offering a resolution that 4,000,000 livres be placed at the disposition of the Minister of the Interior for the encouragement of these industries.\textsuperscript{40} Tabled for the time being, the matter was again brought to the attention of the Council on 18 prairial an IV (6 June, 1796) by none other than Joseph Eschasseriaux, the Elder.

Humanitarian and early proponent of universal peace, Eschasseriaux was born 29 July, 1753. Like Coupe, he had been a member of the National Convention and was now serving in the Council of Five Hundred as deputy from
Charente-Inférieure. His interest in the welfare of the laboring classes at this time came as a forerunner of his interest in universal peace later set forth in his Tableau politique de l'Europe au commencement du XIXe siècle et des moyens d'assurer la durée de la paix générale (1802). He died 24 February, 1823.\(^1\)

Eschasseraux deeming Coupé's proposal insufficient presented a new project of several articles. The Council decided, in principle, that funds would be given the Minister of the Interior for encouragements to commerce and the arts. The whole matter was dropped for a while, but it was reopened on 3 messidor an IV (21 June, 1796). After a short discussion, the resolution of Eschasseraux was adopted by the Council of Five Hundred. Three days later, 24 June, 1796, the Council of Ancients approved the resolution and the Executive Directory promulgated it as law.\(^2\)

Article 1 of the resolution as adopted specifically stated that 4,000,000 livres would be given to the Minister of the Interior to foster national factories and industries, especially those producing linen, canvas or sail cloth, and silk. The second article ordered that 1,000,000 livres of this appropriation should be sent to Lyons immediately.\(^3\)

As to this special provision for Lyons, there seemed to be a double motive. First, rehabilitating Lyons
would serve as a government reparation to the city in payment for its Terrorist destruction. For the old insurrection had nearly wiped out the city and virtually destroyed all of its principal industries. Second, this special favor would encourage the silk industry which would then be able to supply the demand of the "nouveaux riches." The rise of a new "society group" was leading to demands for finery in dress, and such materials had to be sought outside Paris. \(^*\) In addition the silk industry and its allied jobs paid better wages. The silk industry would call for agrarian production of raw silk. This, in turn, would necessitate dyeworks which would have to employ chemists and their helpers. Laborers had to be brought into Lyons because following the insurrection many jobless men either had left Lyons or entered the army or been imprisoned. With the influx of new and old laborers the Lyons population now increased. This increase in population in turn raised the demand for more farm products. Thus, in rehabilitating Lyons and in reviving its chief industry, the whole of south France was benefitted. Evidently this program of aiding industry in Lyons was deemed a success for on 22 pluviose an VI (10 February, 1793) the Executive Directory insisted that an additional 2,000,000 livres be given to the industries in Lyons. The Council of Five Hundred tabled the request, and present available resources
do not indicate whether the request was ever granted.45

The Directory welcomed foreigners who desired
to bring a new industry into France or to improve
production in the existing factories. Such cases seem
to have been rare, but mention must be made of the two
enterprising Americans--Raynaud and Ford. The French
minister at Philadelphia recommended these two men to the
Directory and sent them to France during the month of
Truictidor an IV (August-September, 1796). The Directory
gave Raynaud and Ford 6,000 livres to aid in establishing
a sheet factory with machinery for carding and spinning.
Yet this venture seems not to have succeeded very well
for, after some little time, the Americans complained of
having been made victims of intrigues formed against them
by the commercial bureaus. This, they claimed, had reduced
them to misery.46

Fabre (de l'Aude), deputy in the Council of Five
Hundred, called their attention to the large number of
artists, artisans, and laborers who were unemployed. He
pleaded on 26 September, 1799, that some type of work
project be created to aid them. The Council referred his
plea to a special commission.47

The war had helped the situation somewhat by
draining off some surplus laborers into the military forces.
In the country areas there was a great deal of land clear-
ing and wheat planting. Wages of agricultural laborers
increased slightly as did city wages. The Directory continued subsidizing industry. It stimulated the production of iron and steel which the armies used in great quantities. In this, the Directory was following the pattern laid down by the Committee of Public Safety when it appointed Vandermonde, Monge, and Berthollet to draw up instructions for the production of various types of steel. The old steel foundry at Amboise was aided on several occasions by the Directory. Gousse, a manufacturer of sheet-copper and tin-plate wanted to set up a second factory in Pas-de-Calais but the local administration did not appear particularly interested. Meanwhile, Gousse presented his plan to the Directory which eventually sent out a commission to investigate the matter. The commission refused to recommend government aid because Gousse's other factory had been idle for a long time.

Evidently Gousse renewed his application, for in the year VI (1796-1797) the authorization for government aid was granted. Powell, another factory owner of Calais had a similar experience, the Ministry of the Interior finally authorizing aid. Thus we have seen how the inherited problems of labor surplus were somewhat eased by government subsidizing and stimulating industry, inventions, and commerce. The initial steps of the Directory created some new jobs, reopened some old ones, and directly or indirectly
did adjust temporarily the problem of surplus labor.

The problems of finance, sagging industry, and an over-supply of labor were not the only ones which faced the directorial regime. It was besieged by internal difficulties, chiefly political. The two outstanding examples of this internal strife were the Babeuf and Brottier conspiracies. The former represented a more or less communistic appeal to the depressed poor and the disgruntled laborers, both the employed and unemployed, to overthrow the government. The latter, on the other hand, sought through the royalists to overthrow the government and re-establish the ancient regime.

Thus, such action to close the clubs did not put an end to the Society of Equals meeting at the Pantheon Club. This group continued to meet in cafes and private homes under the leadership of Francis Noel Babeuf. Under the name of Caius Gracchus, Babeuf founded the journal *Tribun du Peuple* for the purpose of spreading his doctrine of absolute equality. His secret committee of the Pantheon, organized in 1796, planned the overthrow of the Directory. Babeuf's movement began at first as a reform, according to the more or less established eighteenth century pattern of first government reform, then social and economic reforms. However, Babeuf soon shifted into ideas of extreme equalitarianism. His supporters were found among discontented
bourgeois artisan groups that sought revenge against the anti-thermidoreans. Moreover, many unemployed and
shiftless beggars thought they saw in this movement a
chance to strike at those whom they considered responsible
for loss of jobs and destitute circumstances. Babeuf
advanced his ideas of socialism and communism in the
Manifesto of the Equals.53 Had it not been for the quick
action of Carnot and the new police minister, Cochon, This
anarchist plot might have wiped out the government. The
laboring classes, contrary to expectations, did not profit
from this projected communistic scheme.54

While the Babouvist conspirators were in prison
awaiting trial, a second conspiracy struck at the Directory.
This was a royalist movement whose objective was to restore
the monarchy under the pretender, Louis XVIII, with
promises to reform abuses yet maintain the Ancient Regime,
in general, unaltered. The leader of this conspiracy was
the Abbe Andre-Charles Brottier (Brotier or Brothier), the
royalist agent in Paris. The plot was uncovered on
30/31 January, 1797, at which time Brottier and his
confederates were arrested.55

The Directory had no sooner crushed these plots
than it was faced with the first renewal of the Executive
Directory and the corps legislatif. The results of the
spring elections of 1797 gave the "constitutionalists" a
working majority in both councils. Taking their seats on 20 May, 1797, the *corps législatif*, one week later, elected Barthelemy as a Director. He succeeded Letourneur who had been retired by constitutional ballot.

Barthelemy had previously been in the diplomatic service under the Duc de Choiseul.56 Later, as minister plenipotentiary (at Berne) Barthelemy successfully negotiated the Treaties of Basel.57 Yet, although he had been in the diplomatic service for many years, he had too little practical experience of the actual state of internal affairs. He was rather an excellent than a strong man. He could not cope with the situation in which the Directory found itself in conflict with the *corps législatif*. So he followed the lead of Carnot, thus replacing Letourneur politically as well as officially, and like Carnot, he was a victim of the "fructidorizers" who put across the coup d'état of 18-19 fructidor an V (4-5 September, 1797).58

Barras and his two colleagues declared themselves in permanent session and determined to purge the *corps législatif* and force Carnot and Barthelemy out of the Executive Directory. By the evening of 18 fructidor an V (4 September, 1797) the coup d'état had been virtually accomplished. About half of the departmental elections were annulled and more than fifty persons ordered transported.59 More stringent restrictions were placed on the
emigres; liberty of religious worship was repealed; and all newspapers and their presses were placed under police inspection for one year.60 Thus, Barras and his political "gangsters" crushed their opponents and erected a new despotism not too different from that of the old Committee of Public Safety.61

In reorganizing the Executive Directory, two new members were elected. These new Directors—Merlin de Douai and Francois de Neufchateau—were not men of great political activity but possessed other capabilities worthy of consideration for purposes of this study. Philippe Antoine, Count Merlin de Douai, was born at Arleux 30 October, 1754, and died at Paris 21 December, 1838.62 He had served in the National Convention and was widely known as the author of the "Law of Suspects."63 Moreover, much of the legislation enacted in the Constituent Assembly against the Ancient Regime had been his work. Eventually, under the Napoleonic regime, Merlin became an eminent jurist and legal consultant.64

Entering the Executive Directory with Merlin de Douai was the poet-agronomist, Nicolas-Louis, Francois de Neufchateau. This literary man of very humble beginnings later became a count and one of Napoleon's outstanding ministers of state. Born at Saffais on 17 April, 1750, he died in Paris 10 January, 1828.65 He was known quite
early as an "enfant celebre" or child prodigy because of his unusual literary production at the age of fourteen years.

After a period of foreign service in San Domingo (1792-1788), he returned to France, settled in the Country and devoted himself to farming and writing. Shortly thereafter Francois drafted the cahier of Toul for the Estates-General. His political career embraced service in the National Legislative Assembly, Minister of the Interior, Executive Director, member and later president of the imperial Senate. We shall presently see that Francois did much to aid industry. As the Directory's most capable Minister of the Interior, he organized the first industrial exposition in September, 1793.66

When Francois de Neufchateau entered the Ministry of the Interior in June-July, 1793, he was well aware of the increasing plight of the poor. He showed his interest in agriculture and farm labor through his projects of establishing nurseries in the departments, clearing wastelands, draining marshes and reclaiming swampland.67 Thus, he readily gave himself to projects for the welfare of the unfortunate.

During his first term as Minister of the Interior, Francois de Neufchateau issued many circulars and instructions to the administrative organizations in the
departments. In these he sponsored projects for aid to the deaf and dumb, aid for Acadians, Canadian French, and other displaced persons.68 Combatting idleness and providing useful occupations were the chief points in his "Instructions" sent to the departments on 5 fructidor an VI (22 August, 1797). His objective was the fullest and most immediate execution of the law of 17 fructidor an VI which had ordered that actual jobs were to be provided in the depots of mendicancy.69 He felt that there should be a re-evaluation of society's duty towards relief. This he emphasized in his circular sent to the departments on 30 fructidor an VI (16 September, 1798). The unemployed, having been without work for so long a time, had fallen into the class of beggars.

Francois suggested that the books, pamphlets, and other writings already published on this matter be studied anew. Of particular interest is the special reference this circular made to a study of the "Reports" submitted by the Committee on Mendicancy of the Constituent Assembly. He also called attention to an essay on aiding the poor which had been written by Du Pont de Nemours.70

Another interesting circular of Francois de Neufchâteau was the one sent to the departments on 22 brumaire an VII (12 November, 1798). This dealt with the distribution of 800,000 francs previously granted the
Minister of the Interior on 11 brumaire an VII (1 November, 1798). This appropriation was to be used in aiding those who had suffered losses due to tornadoes, fires, floods, and epizootics. These examples are representative of much of his other administrative correspondence treating of this and similar problems.

Destitution, pillaging, and brigandage nevertheless continued to increase due to strikes, closed factories, and an impoverished working class. New methods for encouraging industry and commerce seemed to be the best solution. Perhaps the Minister of the Interior, Francois de Neufchateau, had this idea in mind when, on 9 fructidor an VI (26 August, 1798), he distributed to the departments and to the commissaires of the Executive Directory a circular letter proposing an industrial exposition. This letter received wide distribution for it appeared two days later, 11 fructidor an VI (28 August, 1798), in the Moniteur. His plans called for a showing of the chief products of French industry. He considered this display project an excellent means of stimulating industrial development and expansion.

The "Exposition" opened on 17 September, 1798 at the Champs de Mars, lasted about fifteen days, and closed on 1 October, 1798. There were one hundred and ten entries. Twelve of these were awarded medals and nineteen were given honorable mention. Among the exhibitors were Clouet, with a new method for making steel and as demonstration some
razors made from his steel; Desarnod with iron smoke stacks, stoves, and furnaces; Firmin, Didot, and Herhan presenting a new ink, a new type, and their printed edition of Virgil; and Berthier with his new steel processing and such sample by-products as watch-chains, files, and small planes. There were other displays of steel products, cottons, linens, leathers, silks, and new machinery for producing these. Special mention was made of the fine crystal ware of Greuzot and Gros Gaillou.75

A jury of nine persons, one of whom was Chaptal, made the awards. The jury regretted that the short time between the announcement of the exposition and its opening prevented certain industrialists from displaying their new machinery and products. Above all, they wished to see exhibitions from Boyer-Fonfrede, Didot, the Younger, Larocheffoucauld-Liancourt, and Delaitre. Boyer-Fonfrede's cotton materials rivalled the best of English products. Didot, the Younger, was well known for his superb editions and the fine vellum paper which he manufactured. Liancourt had also produced excellent cotton goods in his factories. Some of the newer spinning devices owed much to the developmental work of Delaitre.76

This exposition was a success and might have had a more immediate and important stimulating effect on industrial expansion if more time had elapsed between its
announcement and its opening. On the other hand, much importance is attached to this first industrial exposition because these initial efforts were responsible for a series of expositions that followed.

However, the public welfare interests of the Ministers of the Interior (Benezech and Francois de Neufchateau) and the attempts of the Directory to relieve the labor surplus by encouraging industrial expansion were to be brought to a half by the events of 18/19 brumaire an VIII (9-10 November, 1799). This political change was the last in a series of coups d'etat that seemed to have characterized this limited Republic and the oligarchic rule of the Directory. Next to Napoleon, Sieyes was the most striking figure. In finally overturning this government whose existence depended upon corruption, crooked elections, bankruptcy, intrigues, and illegal rule, Sieyes was to contribute decisively; therefore, a biographical sketch may give a better understanding of the role played by Sieyes in the overthrow of the Directory.

Emmanuel Joseph Sieyes, the prime mover in the Brumaire coup d'etat was born 3 May, 1748, at Frejus and died at Paris on 2 June, 1836. In his early youth, he devoted himself to science, and above all to philosophy and political economy. He entered political life in 1787 as a member of the Orleans provincial Assembly, working
with its Bureau of Public Welfare and Agriculture. Just preceding the opening of the Estates-General, Sieyes turned his attention to pamphleteering. Among his early pamphlets the most notable was "Qu'est-ce que le Tiers Etat?" (What is the Third Estate?) which appeared in January, 1789. Because of this pamphlet, Sieyes was considered the champion of the rights of the masses. In the next decade his political activity had included participation in the Estates-General, the National Constituent Assembly, and the National Convention where he served as member of the Committees on Constitution and Public Safety. Despite his original refusal of October, 1795, and having been again elected to the Executive Directory on 27 floréal an VII (16 May, 1799), he remained with it until its overthrow which he partially engineered. His later life saw service in the Provisional Consulate and the Imperial Senate.

Shortly after Sieyes was made a Director, political complexities increased. Events were trending towards a final coup d'état that would put an end to the Directory. On the morning of 18 brumaire an VIII (9 November, 1799), according to a pre-arranged plot, the Council of Ancients passed decrees removing the corps législatif to St. Cloud and appointing General Bonaparte commander of troops. Sieyes, Ducos, and Barras resigned the Executive Directory. Directors Gohier and Moulins soon followed them in this.
Thus, by means of parliamentary manoeuvering and the presence of threatening military forces, the opposition was beaten and the plot succeeded. On 19 brumaire an VIII (10 November, 1799) the "rump" corps legislatif adopted decrees appointing Napoleon, Sieyes, and Roger-Ducos as provisional consuls and naming two commissioners of the legislative councils to form a new government. 82

The men who overthrew the Directory were now faced with many perplexing constitutional, financial, and social problems as well as the threatening Second Coalition. Men of every type, either through secret wishing, personal ambition, writing, or overt acts, participated in this coup d'etat. Such types included soldiers from the Armies of the Rhine and of Italy, Montagnards and men of the Plain, academic theorists and Institute philosophers, atheistic and non-atheistic groups, royalists, laborers, diplomats and "privateering" bankers and industrialists.

Over-much unnecessary legislation, continuous financial failure, deepening social and economic instability—all had combined in discrediting the Directory. This corrupt and very unstable character of the directorial regime had prevented it from dealing successfully with the unemployment crisis. At first this regime had attempted to handle the problem as one of assistance, i.e., charitable relief. Such beneficent institutions as hospices, hospitals,
welfare bureaus and welfare committees, both local and national, were again called into service. For these means of aiding the unemployed had fallen somewhat into disuse during the Convention period when the national defense program provided many types of relief work jobs. However, with the continued military successes, the Directory had rapidly reduced the number of defense jobs. The resulting labor crisis called for new methods of adjustment. The Directory then attempted to encourage industry by granting subsidies to factories. In reopening some factories and fostering new ones they had hopes of relieving the unemployed. Significant work was done along these lines by the ministers of the Interior, particularly Francois de Neufchateau. Although a great deal was not accomplished by the directorial regime, it did, however, make a start towards recovering the nation's economy.

The critical situation, however, demanded much more—a great and popular leader was needed; one who would revive the retarded and often neglected program of public works; one who would reanimate industry. Above all, a leader was needed who would restore order and reduce, or wipe out, religious and political (i.e., factional) discords. The reports on the state of the nation, as ordered by the consular government, will reveal, to some extent, the initial tasks confronting the new government in restoring the nation's economy.
CONCLUSION
CONCLUSION

The development of our problem--Unemployment Relief in France during the Revolutionary Eighteenth Century--as we have seen, was a gradual one. As we proceeded, we became aware of the application of the principle of popular solidarity. The principle of charity, as we have noted, made assistance a moral and religious obligation. When the broader concepts of the law of solidarity of the French nation are applied to assistance, whether direct relief or work relief, assistance became a social duty and was no longer a moral or religious obligation. Social legislation ought to be founded upon the concept of human solidarity rather than upon charity alone. We saw the operation of such a belief by noting the manner in which the Revolutionary era dealt with the problems of assistance and work relief. The work of the Revolutionary period shows the gradual shift from charity legislation to legislation based upon this broader concept with its implication of the right to labor. This new philosophy of caring for the social ills of society continued into the post-Revolutionary era.

The revolutionary problem of unemployment relief naturally continued through the Napoleonic period. The need for revamping the national economy and reviving industry became imperative if France were to withstand the attacks of
England and her Allies. Under the leadership of Napoleon, and his capable statesmen assistants, including his scientific and industrial leaders, the government turned to the development of industry, agriculture, and public works as means of revamping the national economy.

The coup d'état of 18/19 brumaire an VIII (9/10 November, 1799) brought an end to the Directoral regime. The Provisional Consulate, composed of three consuls—Napoleon, Sieyes and Ducos—working with two legislative commissions, administered the government during the period of 10 November — 1 January, 1800, while the Constitution of the Year VIII was being drafted. When completed, this constitution was submitted to a plebiscite and adopted by an overwhelming vote (3,011,007 to 1,562). Thus the provisional government ended on 1 January, 1800, when Bonaparte, as first consul began organizing the decennial consulate.

After a brief period marked by successes in the financial, social, and economic problems, as well as in the defense of national interests abroad, Napoleon was named, in May, 1802, consul for life with the right to select his successor. The life-consulate lasted only a short time for in May, 1804, Napoleon was chosen emperor of the French, the coronation taking place on 2 December, 1804, in Notre Dame Cathedral. The empire passed through three stages: the "Rising Empire" 1804-7/8, the "High or Grand Empire" 1807/8-
1810/11, and the "Falling Empire" 1811/12-1814/15. In his address to the people after Brumaire Napoleon had declared: "Citizens the revolution is finished; it has returned to the principles from which it set out." This was a striking phrase because the language was significant. The situation was similar at the end of 1799 to what it was at the opening of 1789.

At the beginning of the Napoleonic period, France was suffering from political disorders; social, economic, and religious discords; and work abandonment. The Directory, by its faults and crimes, aggravated the moral and material disorder. Barbe-Marbois, state-councilor complained of the increase in brigandage. Many unemployed shipyard workers, army deserters, and falsely denounced emigres had taken refuge in these outlaw bands. Many factories remained closed and thousands of ateliers were deserted.¹

The economic situation is well illustrated in the reports (analogous to the cahiers which we studied carefully in an early chapter) submitted to the Council of State by its representatives. These had been assigned to the numerous military districts which had been set up throughout France. Each representative was to make a complete survey of conditions in his district. When submitted to the Council, these combined surveys formed a report on the
state of the nation at this time. Two examples will be
given here as being typical of the majority of these
"stats" (or new cahiers). Duchatel, speaking for the 7th
military district noted that manufacturing there had
fallen off. He closed his report with a plea for financial
aid and government encouragement to industry.² Francais
de Nantes, representative in the 8th military district,
submitted requests for new ateliers, for draining of
marshes and improvements of waterways by means of such
work projects as canal building and port repairs, especially
the improvement of the old port of Frejus.³ Other reports
dwelt at length on the necessity of good roads as an aid to
transportation.⁴

One of the principal concerns of Napoleon was
the revitalization and restoration of work. Unemployment
must be reduced. There is no doubt that in his mind was
the idea that industry and agriculture were as necessary in
conquering Europe as soldiers and arms. He is reported to
have said that the operator of a factory or the inventor
who improves spinning and weaving of cotton was conducting
a better war against England than he. All efforts had to
be coordinated. Special training institutions: School of
Mines, School of Dyeworks, Schools for Various Arts and
 Trades, were established to train young men and create a
group of producers of small useful articles.⁵
The climaxing endeavor at this time was the creation of the Société d'encouragement pour l'Industrie nationale on 20 fructidor an IX (7 September, 1801). The purposes of this society were to aid the government in the improvement of industry, encourage new inventions, new discoveries, aid inventors and discoverers, award prizes for such work and make information concerning these new things available throughout the empire. Chaptal, the scholar-statesman and founder of industrial chemistry at Montpellier was the Society's first president. The application of chemistry to industry by men such as Monge, Guyton-Morveau, Chaptal, Conte, Berthollet, Fourcroy, resulted in the further development and expansion of the metallurgical industries. These in turn produced more and improved machinery. This machinery, together with industrial chemistry, stimulated the textile industries, especially cotton. Napoleon's personal contact with the developments led to increased government support and subsidies were readily granted to aid this program which aimed at the commercial and economic independence of France.

Napoleon was very much concerned about agriculture and did much to encourage it. Chaptal, in Mes Souvenirs sur Napoleon, said that the Emperor feared nothing else so much as he did the possibility of an agrarian disturbance. Prizes were given for improved
methods of cultivation and new crops. Subsidies were granted to the sugar interests. Some government land was set aside for the cultivation of the sugar beet. Cotton plantations were aided, especially those in the Kingdom of Naples.8

Expositions were planned. In order to encourage participation in these expositions, Napoleon commissioned Chaptal, Minister of the Interior, to issue a decree to the effect that in all government works, at festivals, furniture, decorations for public buildings, etc., only French products should be used. Accordingly, such a decree is reported in the Moniteur of 15 August, 1801. Many expositions were held, but the one ordered by a decree of 15 February, 1806, in honor of the victorious army returning from the battle of Austerlitz, eclipsed all previous ones.9 This exposition opened on 26 September, 1806, with 1,422 exhibits from 104 departments and closed on 19 October, 1806. Prizes were awarded to Richard-Lenoir for dimity, to Didot for typography and Brequet for his clocks. Other notable prize winning exhibits included the cast-iron of Creusot (the first to be made in France using coke), steel wire, bronze, new muslins and other clothing materials, and new machinery for the textile factories.10 Napoleon was so well pleased with the success of this exposition that he said "Le moment de la prosperite est venue; qui oserait
en fixer les limites?"11 This nation-wide stimulation of industrial advancement caused an increase in the number of factories, and brought as a consequence, a drop in unemployment figures.

The Continental System from 1806 stimulated industrial and agricultural development. It served as one of the chief means of encouraging industry. This is readily inferred when due consideration is given to the broad program of investigations, information, and rewards made by the Society for the Encouragement of National Industry as unfolded in the Moniteur (27 March to 2 July, 1808).12 Some of the most interesting of these developments in French industry may be found in a complementary study covering this period made in 1935 by Allan Maag (M.A. thesis for Dr. F. E. Melvin).13

Much employment was created and numerous laborers put to work in the emperor's huge program of public works. He set about to improve the means of communication and trade within France. This in turn promoted the economic welfare of a large class of its inhabitants. The splendid highways which modern France now possesses are in large part due to Napoleon's zealous interest in public works and improvements. Broad military roads radiated from Paris to the extremities of the French territory. New Alpine roads brought Paris in touch with Turin, Milan,
Rome, and Naples. Substantial bridges were built and the network of canals and waterways improved. Marshes were drained and dikes built. The coastline was improved by means of construction hindering the spreading of sand dunes. The principal seaports, both naval and commercial, especially those of Toulon and Cherbourg, were enlarged and fortified. Many state palaces were restored and enlarged. Under Napoleon the palaces of Saint-Cloud, Fontainebleau, and Rambouillet came to rank with imposing Versailles. Embellishment of the city of Paris was outstanding. Wide avenues were projected for it. The Louvre was completed and adorned with works of art. Napoleon's program seemed well on the way to success when it was checked by the economic crisis of 1811 and the military reverses of 1812/13. These circumstances greatly contributed to the fall of the first French empire early in 1814.

Throughout this study attention has been called to present-day applications of the unemployment problem and experience of the French Revolution. The same may be said of the analogy between the public works developments of the Napoleonic period and the American experiences after the depression of 1932 and during the recent World War. It is true also of English developments under the Atlee Labor Government and efforts for continental European recovery under the stimulus of the Marshall Plan.
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