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INTRODUCTION.

The year of 1940, with its incredible happenings in Europe, is half over. In June of this year, after a period of almost one hundred (100) years, (1848-1940), the thought that kingship, in France, was dead, would probably go unchallenged. However, in July, a bewildered France, "the cradle of independence," has experienced a new Bastile day, one not of glory, but of humiliation. The French, under Petain, have reverted to the old provincial system of pre-Republican days. It is said to be believed by some Frenchmen that France is closer to a return of monarchy, than at any time since 1875. The Duke de Guise as head of the House of Orleans and his son the Comte de Paris, are the active pretenders.

The great need of France at present may be the golden opportunity that the Royalists have been awaiting. The French, once more, may be ready and eager to give their consent to the reestablishment of the Monarchy. Through this kingship a grateful France may again feel that the government is for the people and the kind of government
she wants. Once more a king might be the protector of the people. A kingly King might save France from dictatorship and in so doing save her liberty, culture and traditions.

With the uncertainty of the future of France my problem seems even more vital. It has so often been stated that the French loved their kings. In the following study an attempt has been made to estimate the responsibility of the Bourbon Kings in their downfall. Had they really, "never learned anything?" What were the hopes and aspirations of the French in Government?
CHAPTER I

THE FRENCH AND THEIR GOVERNMENT.

The history of a people, it is said, may be summed up in their sayings, their songs, and in their words. This seems to be peculiarly true of the French. In the old saying, "The King is dead, Long live the King," the people are thought to be clinging to the idea of the continuity of their kings. By this, their kings were given a fictitious immortality. Kings had meant much to the French for it was their kings who had freed them from the nobles, united France, and had brought them glory as a nation. The very life blood of France was embodied in their king.¹ It was not until kingliness was forgotten that kingship as an institution in France became dishonored. "The King who wears the golden crown of France

¹ A. Galenga, "The Last Hundred Years of French History." The Contemporary Review, XXX, 661, (June - Nov. 1877)
must be prudent and a man of valour," says an ancient song. "If he is not, France loses her honour, and history says, he has been wrongly crowned."2

Kingship was a very vital factor in the History of France. The people in organizing themselves under the sceptre chose a lord not only to fight for them but one who would be a dispenser of justice as well. The fundamental principle of heredity was adopted sooner in France than in any European country and it was only in France that for eight centuries there was a single line of kings. The power of the king was augmented or decreased according to the personality of the king and he influenced greatly the condition of the nation.3

In the succession of kings which followed Hugh Capet, there were good kings, and bad kings, but the tradition of kingly characteristics was gradually being established. To Louis VI, who ascended the throne in 1108, was given the name "Wide Awake." While his was a very

2 Louis Madelin, The French Revolution, the National History of France, V, Note 5.

small kingdom yet it needed wisdom and strength to settle the disputes among the lords and to prevent his neighbor from infringing on his territory. His policy was to "govern his kingdom efficiently," rather than to add to it by conquest. On his deathbed, in giving the king's ring into his son's hands he bound him to promise an oath, "to protect the Church of God, the poor, and the orphan, to respect the rights of everybody, and to keep none prisoner in his court save such an one as should actually have transgressed in the court itself." The son of Louis, the young Philip II, made territorial expansion his life work, and the victory of all classes working and fighting with him established the unity of France. The battle of Bouvines saw France, the nation, arise triumphant.4

In Louis IX, Saint Louis, as he was affectionately called, was found a sympathetic interest in the lives of his people and earned for him the title of "Most Christian." Louis IX loved people and every year of his reign visited several of his provinces and there was only one year (1270) in which he did not hold parliament. Louis was humanly interested in the social welfare of his people

and he sought constantly to alleviate their suffering. His personal interest in dispensing justice is portrayed in the quotation from Joinville's account.

"Many a time, ... it happened in summer that the king went and sat down in the woods of Vincennes after mass, and leaned against an oak and made us sit down round about him. And all those who had business came to speak to him without restraint of usher or other folk. And then he demanded of them with his own mouth, 'Is there here any one hath a suit?' and they who had their suit rose up; and then he said, 'Keep silence all of ye, and ye shall have despatch one right after the other.'"5

Thus was evolved the tradition of French kings, the tradition of political wisdom, ability to attain national glory, and the tradition of Christianity or an understanding of the peoples needs. While her king had even one of these kingly qualifications, France seemed content. So it was when the Bourbons ascended the throne.

A new era was to develop for the monarchy with the accession of Henry of Navarre. Henry loved the peasants and loved to talk to them but before he could fulfill his ideal that each of them might have "a fowl in his pot on Sunday,"6 he had to strengthen the central government,

5 Ibidem, 83, - 90.
which had been weakened by religious wars during the reigns of Francis II, Chas. IX, and Henry III. During this turmoil, however, certain leaders began to realize, that for their own welfare, as well as for the welfare of the state, that decentralizing forces must be combated. Many of these men were liberal Catholic noblemen who realized that it was necessary to have religious toleration if France was to successfully combat its foreign foes and so save the state.\(^7\)

The nobles, assisted Henry in his work, and toleration to the minority, to which Henry had formerly belonged, was granted April 13, 1598, by the famous edict of Nantes. The edict of Nantes was registered with difficulty as people saw in it a source of danger for the future. Henry stood his ground however and insisted saying,

"I pray you register the edict,...What I have done, I have done in the interests of peace, which I have succeeded in establishing abroad and now wish to establish within my kingdom. You owe me obedience...I have scaled the walls of cities and can easily scale barricades. Do not take your stand on Catholic religion, I love it better than you. I am the eldest son of the Church which none of you are or can ever be...."\(^8\)

Parliament gave way and a compromise was reached between

---


\(^8\) Battifol, II, 321, 322.
the Huguenots and Henry IV. By this edict, the Huguenots were granted extension of liberty of worship, access to places of learning, a share of Judges in the High Court, and the right to hold several towns with their own garrisons as a guarantee of their liberty. With the signing of the treaty of Vervins and the religious wars concluded, the establishment of royal authority was simplified because of the enervated state of the country. The control maintained by the Estates General from 1560 to 1593 was no longer carefully guarded. In 1596, Henry IV called a meeting of all ranks and personages which met at Rouen. This assembly consisted of nine ecclesiastics, nineteen nobles, and fifty-two members of the third estate. The king wished to learn their opinion on the needs of the state and addressed them saying,

"I aspire to the glorious titles of the deliverer and restorer of France. I have not called you together, as my predecessors have done, to oblige you blindly to approve of my will and pleasure; I have caused you to be assembled, in order to receive your counsels, to depend upon them, and to follow them; in short, to put myself into your hands as my guardians: this is a declaration which is not very common for king, for gray beards, and

9 Ibidem, 321.
conquerors like me to make; but the love which I bear my subjects and the extreme fondness which I have to preserve my state, have made me find everything easy and everything honorable."10

Sully says that he then left them so that they could consult without constraint.

The most urgent need of the weary people was to be given a desire for work. This was accomplished by Sully by reducing the taxes which had been abused in the collecting, by forbidding the seizure of agricultural tools, by draining the marshes, by planning afforestation and agricultural experiments and by permitting a free sale of wheat and wine. Then, too, the scarcity of labor caused by the civil wars, and the increase in price of agricultural products helped stimulate prosperity. Henry also tried to awaken industry and help internal commerce with roads and canals. Henry gave more attention to the development of roads than any of his predecessors, as he realized that the development of the country depended on them to unite the provinces of France.11 Two other dis-


orders of the state which were to play an important part in its history were brigandage and factions. The bees, pictured on the medals of Henry IV, and from which the sting had been removed, were likened to the factions of the time. Henry, unlike his followers, realize the great danger in these factions and worked laboriously to compose them. He recognized in them the seeds of dangerous fruits and did everything in his power to eradicate them. As portrayed by Sully, the first of the Bourbons was a kingly king. One who was intelligently conscious of his people and who wished to serve them better by obtaining a peaceful Europe. He felt that France could not be perfectly happy while there was unrest in Europe, and that wise kings would work to preserve the peace of Europe. His death was deeply regretted (1610) by the poor as well as the rich, and his subjects liked to recall incidents of his charm, gentleness, and wit. He wore the crown of France with a proud dignity, and brought peace and toleration to his kingdom after thirty years of civil war.

After his death there came a complete change in the policy of France. The unstable character of the

---

13 Ibidem, Sully, V, 72.
14 Battifol II, 326.
monarchy soon reasserted itself under the regency of Marie de Medici who wished to unite the fortunes of Spain and France. Louis XIII was nine years of age at the death of Henry, and at sixteen did not seem any more capable of accepting the responsibility of his position. His interest was centered in music and the chase, and as he had never read a book, it is said he could neither profit by the lessons of the past or of the present. The unrest of the nobility and the Huguenots was manifesting itself when Richelieu appeared and for twenty (20) years shaped the destiny of France. Richelieu's idea was to serve his king and his nation. He thought, however, of his king as having absolute power by divine right; and his nation as a power among nations, rather than as a nation with internal social needs.

Richelieu, under the regency, saw the license of the nobles, the civil wars and the marauders who disturbed the peace of the country. The nobles at this time appeared to be a force for evil rather than for good. The era of internal disorder came to a close when the


16 Perkins, Richelieu, 14.
castles were destroyed and turbulence and unruly power was quelled. Gradually the insubordination of the Huguenots was subdued and the power of all resistance so reduced, that France in reality, became one nation under one king.\(^17\) Obedience, not as that given to one chosen as first among equals, but, of obedience to absolute power became the prerogative of kingship.

Though the nobles may have been a disintegrating force in building the nation at this time, there were other checks that might have worked for the country's good. The meeting of the States General had been an important factor in the political life of the nation and had met comparatively frequently in the sixteenth century. Richelieu believed that great results could only be obtained through the leadership of one man, and consequently, the States General was not convened during the period of his administration.\(^18\) Many of the cities and provinces also had powers which served as a check on the king. The Parliament of Paris, for example, before registering an edict to make it valid might take this as


\(^{18}\) Perkins, Richelieu, 336.
an opportunity for advising the king. Then too there were privileges granted by his predecessors, local institutions which had been preserved by provincial acts, and a number of laws that had been established through usage and tradition. Thus the king was met with many checks, and it was not possible to direct the state as a whole according to his will.

Richelieu believed that the State could best exert its influence at home and among European powers only through a highly centralized government, an absolute monarchy. He had very little faith in the multitude and did not try to conceal this contempt. "Nothing is more dangerous," he is quoted as saying, "than to pay attention to popular clamour .... The force of reason should be our only guide."20 Illustrative of the idea of the kings majesty, Perkins quotes an edict of 1641. "A monarchical state can allow no division of authority .... The power lodged in the person of the King is the source of the monarchy's greatness, the foundation on which its preservation rests." Richelieu believed that Kings were the living images of God and that royal majesty was second to

19 Ibidem, 14, 15.

20 Ibidem, 337.
Divine Majesty. Thus was the new theory of Government evolved and accepted, temporarily at least, by France.

The love of the French for their nation kept the people satisfied while the monarchy was successful in its foreign policy. When Richelieu took charge France contained about four-fifths of its present territory.

"In the south, Roussillon was still Spanish, Savoy and Nice were Italian, Alsace and Lorraine formed part of the German Empire, Franche-Comté, Artois, and Flanders at the east and north recognized the authority of the King of Spain." Action by the Government was difficult as the national resources could not easily be obtained due to confusion in administration and the irregularity by which provinces were bound together. French influence in European politics was not in proportion to her wealth and population. The policy which Richelieu inaugurated in the politics of the continent, and continued by Mazarin and Louis XIV, resulted in an influence during the seventeenth century, which was of permanent importance. His ambition to reach the Rhine as a boundary was not achieved during his lifetime but he started a work that was carried to completion, later, by

21 Ibidem, 337.
22 Ibidem, 3.
In order to prevent the growth of Austrian power, Richelieu helped the German princes against the Emperor even though it involved France in a Thirty (30) Years War. The influence of France in Germany was thus becoming as great as that of Austria, and greater than that of any other prince. Mazarin, who followed Richelieu, seemed to retain his power to such a degree that the poets are quoted as saying, "He is not dead,...he has only changed his age!" Spain, seventeen years after Richelieu's death, confessed her defeat and by the treaty of Peace of the Pyrenees, most of Artois, and parts of Hainault and Luxembourg were ceded to the French. Six years after Richelieu's death, in 1648, by the treaty of Westphalia, Alsace was ceded to France. This was important as it strengthened France where she was exposed to invasion and carried her boundary to the Rhine. While Lorraine did not become a part of France formally until 1766, in reality it had been French for a long time, and before Richelieu's death, it had been for twenty years in

23 Ibidem, 343 - 345.
24 L. Rea, 45.
25 Perkins, Richelieu, 347.
possession of France, and its acquisition had almost been attained.

Richelieu had checked the lawlessness of the nobles, and the insubordination of the Huguenots, and established France as a leader among European powers. His two ideals, the Majesty of the King, and the greatness of the kingdom had been attained. In judging Richelieu's statesmanship it is felt that the needs of the seventeenth century called for measures such as he used.26

Mazarin, during the boyhood of Louis XIV carried on Richelieu's doctrines. Once more the nobles made a last effort in the war of the Fronde, against the Crown. This effort was due to the hatred of the people and Parliament for Mazarin.27 Louis XIV, embittered by the hardships that befell him due to his enforced exile from Paris, transplanted his court to Versailles. Later he symbolized the god of Monarchy, in a statue erected before the Hotel de Ville. "Armed with a thunderbolt, one of the feet of this demi-god rests upon a slave, from whose hand drops an extinguished torch; the Parlement: the other foot steps upon an overturned ship, Paris."28

26 Ibidem, 340 – 349.
27 Boulenger, 17th Century III, 150 – 166.
28 L. Rea, 70.
At Mazarin's death when the ministers of state asked the name of the man to whom they should look for guidance, they were surprised to receive the answer of the young King, "To me!" 29 Louis XIV was exceedingly handsome. His simplest gestures seemed impregnated with majesty and he radiated an air of spendor and authority. His education, as a child, had been neglected, and he was kept in ignorance of public affairs which he should have been studying. His innate good sense, however, made him conscious of his shortcomings, and at the age of twenty-three, he set to work to study what he should have learned as a child. His spirit was always that of a master as he showed in one of his first acts as king. When the Parliament of Paris was discussing some of his edicts before registering them, he haughtily appeared before them and ordered the edicts registered and not discussed. 30

The whole business of the nation was directed from Paris by the king's council with provisional councils subordinate to it. The ship of state has been compared to a ship built in the old days, rather than one built in more modern times. If one part was damaged the whole is

29 Ibidem, 171.
30 S. Lit. Mers. 25, 403. "Gt. Monarchs of Fr."
disabled and it sinks. This system which controlled the nearest as well as the fathermost points without the power of appeal, was centralization, or bureaucracy. This bureaucracy gave rise to a machine, which when it ceased to function, collapsed.31 Louis XIV thus committed the folly of separating himself from all the support which the feudal system had afforded him. Richelieu might have changed the course of events but Louis did not seem able to perceive the use of a stable political combination.32 Had his grandson, the Dauphin lived, events might have taken a different course, for reaction was setting in, and the Dauphin expressed the idea, "a king is made for his subjects, and not his subjects for him."33 He also felt the need for the Estates General, so that he could be informed of the evils of the country, and of their remedies by the deputies. War and luxuries were odious to him, as he felt that the people were bearing too heavy a burden. He was present


at the affairs of state, and listened to councils so that he had an intelligent idea of the elements in government. 34 Very different were these ideas from those of the king, who made himself the keystone of the arch, with the nobles on one side, and the clergy on the other, dependent on him, and all, bearing their weight on the people.

Whether or not Louis XIV expressed the thought, "I am the State," his actions spoke as eloquently as the words. The nobility were made absolutely dependent on the wishes of the king. Their very identity was destroyed, and they became the slaves of the Court for pensions and places, and the very life of the nobility was centered in, and upon, the king. 35 The Dauphin thought of the abasement of the nobles as a source of grave peril to the country. He saw the degeneracy "in courage, valour, virtue, and sentiments," which poverty had brought about. The nobles had become less than the people, for the people had the liberty to work, while the nobles had no choice but that of "ruinous idleness." 36 To obtain acknowledgement, loyalty had to be shown by their presence in Court, as the King considered

34 Ibidem, III, 62.
35 S. Lit. Mess., 25, 404
     "Gt. Monarchs of Fr."
absence from his royal gatherings, as a personal slight. So the country became deserted for the glitter of the court, and as Hayes phrases it, the nobles vied "with the crystal chandeliers in providing decorative lustre for the palace." Louis XIV succeeded in drawing around him the most brilliant assemblage of the continent. All of the arts were encouraged and his court was the model for etiquette and ceremonial for the world. Paris was made the most attractive of cities, and its social intercourse, was the model of courtesy for all nations.

To distract the people, wars of aggrandizement were carried on. During his reign Louis extended his territory to the Rhine and Pyrenees and had acquired Franche Comte and other important cities in Belgian Netherlands. These wars, however, were of his making, and had been provoked by him, to add to his own glory. In the War of Devolution, Louis attempted to attain the Spanish Netherlands, under the pretext, that at the death of Philip IV, Louis' wife, (the eldest daughter of Philip) was entitled to this, as her share of the heritage. Spain retained the greater

37 H. Van Laun, French Revolutionary Epoch, I, 15.
part of the Netherlands, but gave to Louis, Charleroi, Tournai and Lille. In the Dutch war, Louis XIV gave pensions to Charles II and the Swedish government, so that Holland would be isolated. Louis alarmed the other nations, and Charles II was forced through Parliament, to an anti-France alliance. Peace by the treaty of Nimwegen made Spain, rather than Holland, the loser, and France obtained Franche Comte and several fortresses in the Belgian Netherlands. Louis then set out to see if he could attain more land through the dependencies of land already received through the treaty of Westphalia and Nimwegen. This occasioned the War of the League of Augsburg which lasted eight years. The Emperor Leopold formed a league with Spain, Sweden and several German princes to check the aggression. In the treaty of Ryswick, 1697, France had to give up her claims, but she lost no territory, and was given recognition as owner of Alsace.

Louis XIV had followed Richelieu's idea in wishing for, and trying to establish, the natural boundary lines of France, but he was led astray when the Bourbon dynasty rather than France became his concern. The commercial rivals, England and Holland did not wish the union of Spain and France as they might create a monopoly on the trade with their colonies, and in so doing, prosper to the
detriment of the other countries. Charles II, the sickly king of Spain, had no direct heir to the throne. He was related to the Austrian Hapsburgs and also related to the Bourbons, as his aunt was the mother of Louis XIV, and his half-sister was the wife of Louis XIV. Before his death Louis XIV won the favor of Charles and at his death, Philip of Angou, the grandson of Louis, was to reign, providing that Spain's possessions would not be dismembered. Louis in triumph acclaimed the fact that the Pyrenees no longer existed. This, as Louis well knew, meant war. Austria, England, Holland and other smaller groups joined, and the War of the Spanish Succession, the fourth war of Louis, lasted from 1702 to 1713. It was only through supreme sacrifice on the part of the French, and the armies of both countries, that Louis was enabled to carry on. In the treaty of Utrecht, (1713), Philip V, grandson of Louis XIV was acknowledged King of Spain and the Indies, on condition that the crowns of Spain and France should never be united. France itself, made no gain in territory and actually lost important colonies, and was also heavily burdened by taxes to carry on the war. Still, Louis had succeeded in establishing a Bourbon on the Spanish throne, and this added to his prestige.40

40 C. Hayes, A Political and Cultural History of Modern Europe, I, 306 - 311.
However, the splendor of France was not sound. France appears to have been ruined before she ceased to conquer, and the element of re-action portrayed by Fenelon had set in. The splendor of Versaille, the gathering together of wealth in Paris, the court which insisted on its attendance by Bishops and Nobles who thereby wished to attain prestige, the neglect of the people who carried the burden of taxation, all tended toward the growing decay. Judging by the writers of the time, population had decreased, towns that had flourished, no longer had use for labor, and the soil which had been productive, was producing less than it had twenty years before.41

The country under Henry IV had been much more prosperous than in the years that followed. The Government was costly not only because of the extravagance of its administration, but in a large degree, on account of the prevalence of war. During sixteen out of the eighteen years of Richelieu's administration, the state was at war, either with the Huguenots, or foreign states. Peace was almost unknown during Mazarin's ministry. The war with Spain which he inherited, lasted practically during his

whole life time, and civil wars were waged for five years of that time. When Louis XIV took charge of the affairs of State, the country was at war more "than one-half (1/2) of the sixty-four (64) remaining years of his reign." Following the reign of Henry IV, then, the nation had been distracted by wars internal or foreign for over seventy (70) years. The peoples love for their nation made them submit peacefully to the demands made upon them by their monarch while he was winning glory for them. It was towards the end of his reign that the nation began to doubt and to grow tired and began to question the kingliness of their king.

Just as the king had earned the love and esteem of the people through provision for their needs, so too, had the clergy. After the conquest of the Gauls by the Franks, the Christian Clergy became the "connecting link" between the conquered and the conquerors. They employed as their instrument of combat, enlightenment. The clergy were the benefactors of the struggling people for over twelve centuries. To the oppressed, they taught patience and resignation, which were only made possible because of

42 Perkins, Richelieu, 350, 351.
the vision of another world, an ideal Kingdom. The learning of the clergy made the warrior chief respect him, and in so doing, an intimacy was established which could be, and was used in the interests of humanity. It was the church alone that had the power and intelligence to remind the people, that justice came above strength, and heredity and feudal aristocracy could not dissolve the rights of humanity and election. The liberal tendency of the clergy in political matters had been evinced long before 1789. They believed that the nation alone had the right to make the laws and impose the taxes. They believed in free elections, and annual meetings of the States General. They insisted on the right of provincial assemblies, as for example in Berri, in 1779, when the clergy offered 68,000 livre as a free gift if the provincial administration were allowed to continue. The Clergy, unlike the nobles, continued to have a good understanding of the Third Estate. It was intensely interested in the schemes proposed by the people, and worked hard to extend

44 Henry Van Laun, French Revolutionary Epoch, I, 1, 2.
47 Tocqueville, Old Regime and the Revolution, 143, 144.
48 Ibidem, Appendix, 318.
any project undertaken by the community. It contained men of ability and extensive knowledge, and often it was an ecclesiastic who was sent to Versailles to discuss with ministers, questions that were in dispute between the State and the Crown.49 Tocqueville, who made a careful survey of conditions up to the time of the revolution, said that when he started his investigation that he was "full of prejudice against the clergy," but having ended his research he could "feel nothing but respect for them."50 He found that the Church had not taught the priests political servility, and that they did not speak of divine right in regard to political matters. In the reports on provincial assemblies that were investigated, he said that he had been amazed to find bishops and abbés on all matters pertaining to the improvement of the condition of the people, always equal, and often superior, to the other men with whom they were associated.51 Thus, the ecclesiastics kept in sympathetic contact with the people of the Third Estate.

The nobility on the other hand had changed. The intervening years seemed to widen the breach, not only

49 Ibidem, Appendix, 269.
50 Ibidem, 144.
51 Ibidem, 141 - 144.
between the people and nobility, but between the nobility and the king as well. Louis XIV, in his personal splendor, had demanded the presence of all the great families at Paris, where in order to obtain favors from the Court, they had to be in constant attendance on the sovereign. All of the men of rank had come to Paris, leaving only those who did not have the means to move. People of this rank built up an animosity, not only between themselves and the people who no longer depended on them, but among themselves, rural nobles and court nobles. When the feudal lord had lived among his tenants, their needs were understandable to him, and a sympathetic bond existed between them. When he absented himself, he cut himself off from them, and no longer served them in any way, and they became merely a source of income to him. Nowhere else was there a parallel to this system. In England, in the eighteenth century, the proprietor, made himself useful to his former vassals, and the "feudal chieftan" of old became the "social leaders" in the modern civilization. If he did not live on his property the year around, he lived there part of the year performing various services, and in so doing, remained in sympathy with the people of the community, whether of equal

52 Van Laun, The French Revolutionary Period, I, 12.
or inferior station. Another peculiarity of the French nobles was their lack of participation in the administration of public affairs. Everywhere else there had been some preservation of the feudal system in the connection of government of land and ownership of land. The chief landholders of England were its governors. While control of nobility was lessened to some extent in Germany, still in the rural districts, the seigniors governed. The nobles had lost their political significance. The wars of the Fronde had made a deep impression on the young King, and made him suspicious of Parliament, as merely a body who wished to usurp his power. This nobility, which held the government in contempt, did nothing to liberate the masses. However, at the outbreak of the Revolution, the nobility had written into their cahiers the guarantees of the rights of the subjects and the nobles demanded much more than the Third Estate. In England, the nobility, because of their ambition to rule, restrained a natural haughtiness. In the eighteenth century, the only change in the taxes that were made, were made in favor of the poor. In France, the exemptions were made only for the rich. In England, the nobility had assumed the burden of taxes, so

53 Tocqueville, The Old Regime and the Revolution, 44.
55 Tocqueville, 140.
that they might enjoy the power of governing. In France, the French nobles refused to pay taxes as their consolation for loss of political power.\footnote{Ibidem, 125.}

The barrier which separated the nobility from other classes, was always conspicuous and known by outward marks. The plan of raising the commoner to nobility for stated sums, etc., increased, rather than lessened, class hatred. The new nobles were equally despised by their old equals, and by the superior class, to which they were supposedly raised. The Third Estate objected, with good cause, to the enlargement of the class of nobility.\footnote{Ibidem, 114.} The Middle Class ceased to associate with men of rank in public life, when the meetings of the States General were no longer called. Having no contact with all classes, each class became more independent, and less understanding of its fellow men. The classes met only accidentally in private life, and by the eighteenth century they were "not only rivals but enemies."\footnote{Ibidem, 111.}

The privileges of the nobles seemed immense as they were exempt from the ever increasing burden of taxation. In spite of their exemption from taxes, the nobility, where

\footnotesize
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the old feudal system was displaced, had declined in property. In England alone the noble families had kept both wealth and power. The commoner in France was becoming wealthy. He was as well educated as the nobleman, and received his ideas from Paris; therefore, they became similar, yet separated by the caste system, which had replaced the real aristocracy which was composed originally of the chief men of the nation. England alone retained its aristocracy and abolished castes, all engaged in any profession, and intermarried with each other.59 Tocqueville in his discussion, follows the history of the word "gentleman" in England and in France. In England it follows the story of democracy, beginning with nobility and being applied each century to a lower class of people, until it reached America, where all classes may be known as "gentlemen." Not so, however, in France. "Gentilhomme" never changed its latitude. After the revolution, the word was not altered but disused.60

In the old feudal times, the people looked upon the aristocracy as they looked upon their government. Because it had afforded the peasant protection, he was willing to accept the imposition and hardships which it imposed.

60 Ibidem, 108.
It was when the nobility no longer functioned as a power, and the peasants had become land owners through sub-division of the land, that the burdens imposed became intolerable. Having all of his earnings in the land, and then not being allowed to harvest it, or to sell his produce, or have the grain ground except at the mill of a neighbor, and meeting at all times a demand upon his toil, by one who did nothing for him in return, could not help but stir up hatred. The peasants of France held among them about one-half of the landed property of the kingdom. This ownership of land was peculiar to France, for in England, and Germany, no such division of land existed. Feudal rights were recognized throughout Europe, and in fact, feudal dues were collected less rigorously in France, than in other countries of Europe. They became unbearable because of the fact, that the French peasant owned his land, and the aristocracy had ceased to give him anything in return for his labor, - not even understanding. 61

The old provincial freedom had gradually been taken away from the provinces and by 1789, Lanquedoc, which had kept her provincial liberty longer than the others, could not meet, without an express order from the king.

The people to be present, the time for calling and ad­
journing of the meeting, the business, such as imposing
taxes, etc., all had to be done with the express permission
of the king. Lanquedoc, however, did have an assembly
composed of able men whom the general government seemed
to respect.62 Even the parish business was conducted not
by a seignior, but by one appointed by the intendant or
elected by the peasantry. They presided over parish
meetings, distributed taxes, executed laws, etc.,...and
did the duties that the seignior might have done. The
intendants looked upon the seigniors only as the "first
peasants of the parish."63

In the eighteenth century the government of
the cities was controlled by a few families in favor of
their own private interests. The rich commoner went to
the city to live, and soon lost interest in the rural life
that had been his. Instead of using his capital for trade,
he immediately bought an office. This urge for places,
proved very injurious to both the commercial and agricultural
interest. Not only the nobles were exempt from taxes, but
many office holders were exempt from taxes, etc., as well.

62 Ibidem, Appendix, 259 - 266.
63 Ibidem, 43, 44.
In this lack of common interest, hatred and mistrust became the order of the day, and city and country were hostile to each other. The townspeople were very selfish and ever willing and ready to encroach upon the rights of the village and country. The middle class did not wish to be confounded with the people and did not wish to have the people control them in any way even through the means of a popular election. The middle classes also made enemies of the working classes in the city as well, as most of the local taxes fell upon them. In the cities each group was subdivided, and each was very jealous of its own power. There was a constant struggle for precedence. The cities of France were dying out, - losing their individuality; Paris had become France. All life, all ideas, all opinions were those originating in Paris. Paris had become not only the city of power and art, but an industrial, and manufacturing city as well. Whole blocks of mechanics and workmen lived together in Paris, as their taxes were lighter. The centralization of government, and the power of Paris, were two factors that played a great part in the overthrowing of the monarchy.

Close to the monarch was a body, which had absorbed most of the minor powers, called the Royal Council.

Tocqueville, 118, 119.
This council held office during good behavior. This body acted as a legislature and judicial body, and made all of the important decisions and superintended the work of all subordinate departments. Its decisions were really those of the king. 65

In the government the nobility surrounded the king and constituted his court. They led armies and commanded the fleet but held no position of real power. The intendants, despised by the nobles, were the usurpers of the real authority. They really governed France, apportioned the tax, overlooked collectors, and fixed the number of men to be furnished by each parish in time of war. The intendant controlled his province as long as his behavior was good. The Marquis d'Argenson is quoted as saying,

"I never could have believed beforehand what I saw when I was comptroller of finances. Let me tell you that this kingdom of France is governed by thirty intendants. You have neither Parliaments, nor estates, nor governors; nothing but thirty masters of requests, on whom, so far as the provinces are concerned, welfare or misery, plenty or want, entirely depend." 66

A single body, placed in the center of the kingdom, a single minister managing nearly all of the business of the interior, a single agent in each province

65 Tocqueville, 52.
66 Tocqueville, 54.
was what centralization of government meant. Every act of the provinces was supervised, and a parish could not erect a new church steeple without the consent of the government, and this often took a year. Often two or three years elapsed, before permission was granted. The Government suspected anyone who tried to organize, or work without its supervision. Because of the great number and variety of laws the people paid little attention to them - they were ruled by custom or tradition rather than by laws. Because of the independence of the Courts, the king refused to give it jurisdiction over cases where the king wanted to be sure of the decision. However, the people were allowed to discuss anything they pleased, and from this freedom other freedom was to follow.

Setting one group of society against the other in order to obtain power over all, was finally to result in ruin for kingship. From the very first establishment of the monarchy, the king was only a military chief elected by the people. During the feudal regime, the royal aristocracy robbed the people of their rights, as they themselves were later to be deprived of theirs. By the beginning of the tenth century (987), the monarchy had become hereditary. Gradually supreme authority became more
concentrated, until it became centered in one individual. 67

The theory of royal power had been attacked during the civil wars of the sixteenth century. The question as to whether obedience was due a king, who had become a tyrant, was raised after the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. The question as to whether the States General could choose its king, and in so doing, establish its superiority over the king, was raised at the time when Henry of Navarre was to be king. The idea was prevalent that kingship was based on the will of the people, and that if a king abused his power, he could be deprived of it. Nothing came of this movement however as Henry of Navarre proved a good king and the king remained the center of society. 68 At the beginning of the seventeenth century, the king was considered the head of all justice and government, for he made the laws, created offices, made decisions in regard to peace and war, coined money, and was the final judge in all judicial matters. Even during the rebellion of the Fronde, when Parliament decreed the impeachment of Mazarin, it was done in the king's name, as they expressed the idea that they were rebelling against Mazarin only,

67 Van Laun, I, 36, 37, French Revolutionary Epoch.
68 Batiffol, II, 369, 370.
"the better to serve the King." 69 Parliament which had tried to become a counterweight of the king rather than his instrument was reduced to inactivity for sixty years. At the monarch's death, the purely literary men of the seventeenth century who had sung Louis XIV praise, were followed by the philosophy of the eighteenth century, the reactionaries, - and discussion became more violent. However, "so deeply rooted in the hearts of the French people was the inclination to lavish its love upon the chief representative of royalty, that the accession of the infant monarch Louis XV, to the throne, was not only hailed with enthusiasm, but fully restored unbounded hope." 70

69 Boulenger, III, 159. 17th Century.
CHAPTER II

LOUIS XV AND LOUIS XVI.

Louis XIV had bequeathed to his successor a legacy of debt and financial disorder and a throne that was surrounded by bitter jealousies. The Regent, the Duc d'Orleans, instead of conciliating the divisions as Henry of Navarre had tried to do, failed to realize that filling positions with men of opposed opinions, so that only the Council of the Regency could decide measures of national importance, was a temporary device that must at some time cause disaster. The Regent had been kept from political knowledge by Louis XIV. This ignorance, and the lack of any statesmen of note to place the country on a sound financial basis, if this were possible, placed the country in a hazardous position. Law, who was installed as Controleur General, has been evaluated as wise in some of his measures, and reckless in others, when too eager fortune hunters were disappointed. A spirit of gambling and religious scepticism among the aristocratic and middle classes was fostered by the Regent. This course of
immorality and corruption could not but lead to the ridicule of tradition and levity in questioning all established authority. This license of opinion helped in the more rapid decline of the old regime.¹

The policy of the Duc d'Orleans was a worthy prologue to the reign of Louis XV. Without any of the ability that was the Regents and lacking in any semblance of brilliancy or any of the characteristics that might appeal to his subjects, Louis XV began his reign in darkness. His only regard for his royalty was the power it gave him to gratify his low propensities and licentiousness, and the people, in him, saw royalty outraged. Madame de Prie directed his government at home and abroad. The downward trend was checked, however, for a while, by the councils of the Bishop of Frejus.²

Fleury, for seventeen years tried to follow the course of economy at home and peace abroad. He tried to conciliate Spain and make an alliance with England. The new generation, however, were impatient with his pacific policy, and this feeling of unrest was fomented by the old generals, Villais and Berwick. Economy at home,


² Ibidem, 81, 82.
which curtailed the navy, was looked upon as a poor way to save, by people who were jealous of their nation's honor. Then, too, as war was the only outlet that aristocracy had in which to participate in public affairs, they opposed the pacific councils of the minister, and France drifted into war. Material acquisition was due to Fleury's diplomacy in the treaty of Vienna. France lost her high position among nations however in the part she played in the war of the Austrian Succession. Fleury tried to stem the tide of disgrace but the king was becoming tired of the monotony of temperance. 3

Due to the home policy, calm seemed to prevail. Religious differences appeared to be conciliated. Fleury, however, seemed jealous of his own authority and was suspicious of all influence that did not emanate from him. He insisted upon the dissolution of harmless societies, and even those of merit. He suppressed the discussions by the Abbé Alary, "Abbé de Braggelone and the Abbé de Saint - Pierre, the Marquis de Saint - Contest and the Marquis d'Argenson," men who stood among the foremost promoters of social and political order. 4 The suppression

3 Ibidem, 81 - 83.
4 Ibidem, 84.
of legitimate discussion multiplied the perils to the government, as it gave rise to any wild theory which opposition always creates. voltaire, Montesquieu, Diderot, d'Alembert, Rousseau, etc., were secretly qualifying themselves to take advantage of the first signs of weakness. Yet Fleury, even with his weakness, was the last real representative of the ancient regime. At his passing, the old monarchy was assailed on all sides, and its defenders were weak and vacillating, unable to form any consistent policy. When Louis XV refused to mention a successor to Fleury, and said that he, himself, would act as prime minister, Madame Du Barry and her kind became the rulers of France. The downward trend became more ominous. 5

Louis XV showed complete lack of understanding when he insisted upon being his own prime minister, at a time when the general welfare of the state so needed real governing ability and energy. The assumption of this power by the king resulted in wrangling and jealousy among the Cabinet Council. It is said that Cardinal Tencin sought for a time to exert an indirect influence over the official proceedings, but the interdiction of the king rendered him powerless. The hopes of the people arose for a short time when the king placed himself at the head

of the army, and made three victorious campaigns. They hoped that their king was at last to be kingly, but their illusion lasted but a few months. Each year the king showed greater ineptitude and an utter failure in national guidance. The useless wars and degradation was fast making the French doubt their king, and the challenge to Royalty was forming in their subconscious minds.6

The writers of the day, were consciously or unconsciously conspiring against the government. Contempt and derision were heaped upon the government and the church, without the writers seeming to realize the whirlwind that was being sown. Louis, himself, seemed to be the only one who realized the darkness of the future when he said, "Far sooner, ...would I hear again the thunder of artillery than all the scratching of pens." In spite of this forbidding Louis could not really discern the depth to which the philosophy of the time was being imbedded in all - and especially in the royalist who supposedly served him. The qualifications, seemingly necessary to French statesmen from 1744 to 1774, was subserviency and ignorance. This was usually accompanied by vanity.7

The attitude of disregard for government and

---

6 Ibidem, 89 - 96.
7 Ibidem, 96 - 99.
religion, showed itself first in the attack upon the Jesuits. The king, who was jealous of the close alliance of the Jesuits to the Dauphin, acquiesed in the edict of 1764. Choiseul, to calm the irritation caused by the treaty at the close of the Seven Years War, used this as means of conciliation to Parliament and the philosophers. While this momentarily strengthened Choiseul, it added to the growing disrespect for authority, and thus struck at the stability of the monarchy. Du Barry disliked Parliament and Choiseul as they were a check on her power. Her choice, Terray, as Controleur General, who was unscrupulous in handling the treasury, and Maupeou had been given the distinction of being among the greatest factors in the downward trend of the monarchy.8

The Parliaments, too, had deteriorated. Even under Louis XIV these assemblies had had much power. But whether in the exercise of their power, or in the subjection of it, they had been a respected body. From the beginning of Louis XV's reign, fewer men of ability would accept a position that was as unstable and derogatory in its nature. It is said that from 1756 to 1763, there were at least twenty-five changes in the composition of the Council of

8 Ibidem, V, 99, 100 - 106.
state. Parliament began to be petty and quarrelsome - furthering its own interests rather than the interests of the nation. This loss of public spirit in the Parliament, was accompanied by a loss of confidence in them by the people. Quarrels between Parliament and King followed a definite pattern, - a refusal to register a royal edict - a bed of justice, - presence of parliament, and exile or imprisonment of the magistrates. The constant quarrels between an inconsistent Parliament and the King, resulted finally, in January 1771, of the confiscation of their appointments, and their exile executed by Chancellor Maupeou. The new Parliament was composed of men of the Grand Council and before the end of the year, all provincial Parliaments as well, had been deprived of their powers. The body of men, who for ages had fought the fight of the people, had been dissolved. The objections raised throughout the country were silenced by the Chancellor, and the foundation of a society was undermined in the violent, and abrupt dissolution, of one of the most ancient institutions of the country.9

Royalty, in trying to gain more power for itself, was planting the seed of destruction in the mind of the public. Royalty, alone, now was the factor of governing

9 Ibidem, 90 - 108.
power, and it was brought before the public at a time when it could least stand the scrutiny of a restive people. Discontent and irritation at the home and foreign policy, gave rise to condemnation in all forms. Louis XV had at last isolated himself from all parties in his government, and had lost the confidence and respect of his people. The love for Royalty, in an emotional people, had turned to hatred.\textsuperscript{10}

The people bewildered, had seen nothing but discord among those whom they had respected. The King, Parliament, and the Clergy, who had represented authority were failing them, and as a result, anarchy prevailed. A neighborhood of about sixty miles, around Paris, and Versailles, formed the heart of France where the art of living was enjoyed to its utmost. Outside of this area, poverty and discomfort were the order of the day. The gradual concentration towards Paris, was the work of one hundred fifty (150) years. The higher nobility usually had a hotel in Paris, an apartment in the Palace of Versailles, and a country house within a radius of sixty (60) miles. Personal interest in the tenantry was lost, and for one that had the luxury of the king's favour, ten

\textsuperscript{10} Ibidem, 108 - 109.
poor men toiled and sweated. A similar division was found in the Clergy. A few favored lived at the Court, losing the moral character of their office, while many stayed in the country with their people, sharing their privations with poverty as their lot.11

One of the most serious results of absentee landlordism was the stagnation of agriculture. Taine believed that probably one-third of France was as deserted and ill-cultivated as Ireland was in its worst days of English oppression. The master did not care to have the poverty and distress of his tenants brought to his attention. All he cared about was the payment of the rent. Great landed properties were often uncultivated. The proprietors had their collections made by some officer, who, in turn, was really supported by the tenants. Numerous illustrations have been given of the hardships endured by the peasants because of the sport, (the chase) of the nobles. So that the aristocracy could enjoy themselves, the poor farmer was not allowed to harm his game, even though the crops were being ruined. One instance is cited where in one parish the wild rabbits destroyed eight hundred (800) acres of

land and a harvest of twenty-four (24) setiers of wheat, the whole year's provision for eight hundred (800) persons. In the year 1751, Louis XV owned about four thousand (4,000) horses; these stables cost the nation sixty-eight millions (68,000,000), one-fourth of the whole revenue.

Droves of boars and wild deer were allowed to wander at will over the countryside, destroying the crops that meant life itself to the peasants. Even weeding and hoeing lest the young partridges be disturbed, etc., was a capital offense when practised in a district that had been granted as a capitanerie.

Crushed by financial burdens, degraded and dishonored by seven years war, her colonies taken from her, - the nation had not yet revolted. Laughing at the government which degraded them, they in turn degraded the government in any way possible. Disorganization and discontent had set in. Patronage to the writers of the day, might well have been regarded as treason. Decadent influences were at work, but the attacks were made first upon the church, which ignored them, by one who considered the people as "stupid and barbarous....for which a yoke, a good and daily provender are necessary." Yet Voltaire's

12 Ibidem, 176 - 180.
ideas, vague as they were as to democracy, helped pave the way for religious and political disruption.\textsuperscript{14} The philosophy of the day saw the absurd inequalities, and the inefficiency of traditional institution, in a changing society. If the people were still taking part in the government, they would have been conscious of the weaknesses in the plans presented by the writers of the time. The only thing, of which the people were conscious, was the constant interference in their lives, by old laws, traditions, and institution. In England political writers and statesmen were mixed. New ideas were prescribed only with a practical eye on the possibility of their being carried out. In France general laws were evolved without the slightest idea as to how they might be executed.

The writing of Rousseau, appearing in 1753, and those of Mirabeau in 1755, gave impetus to the economists who published vigorous articles on the heavy abuses which crushed the people. The tax-payer, staggering under the burden of the "taille," could not help but get excited over the idea, that all men were created equal. The nobility, as well as the lower classes, was facinated, too by these doctrines. They talked them, and preached them, without realizing what the practical application might mean.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{14} Westminster Review, V. 99, 94.

The conciliatory policy of Louis XVI held the eminent catastrophe in check for a while after the death of Louis XV in 1774. Louis XVI wished to please all, but lacked both the wisdom and energy necessary at this time. The philosophy of the day was allowed to run its full ruinous course. Louis began his reign by a poor choice of ministers - Turgot, who was so imbued with his own theories that he saw nothing serious in the fact, that in order to carry out the corn law theory, it was necessary to fire on the people, and Malesherbes, a radical, who addressed the King with so little respect, that Voltaire checked him on his lack of civility.

Turgot suggested Comte de St. Germain as Minister of War. St. Germain was a brave soldier, but did not believe in adornment. Germain had plumes and lace removed to the consternation of the army. Its old traditional brilliance had been the admiration of not only France, but of all Europe. The army was furious and these reforms or economies were looked upon as an insult, not only to the traditions of the past, but to the pride of the present, as well. The best choice of the king, was the Comte de Vergennes, who was chosen as Minister for Foreign Affairs. He believed, with the king, in rivalry with England on the continent, and in the colonies.
This idea made France an interested listener to the colonies plea for help in her War for Independence. Queen Marie Antoinette's Salon, as well as the cabinet of the king, were in harmony on this question. The sympathy of the nobility was entirely Republican, and Silas Deane, the federal agent, and Franklin, received exaggerated homage at Passy. Groups spent hours talking to Franklin about equality and fraternity.

Times and ideas had changed rapidly. Louis XV had refused Voltaire in Paris, and Louis XVI who felt nothing in common with him, had given him permission after a little persuasion. Times were strangely inconsistent, and we find men of the best blood, sanctioning open contempt for royalty. Under Calonne a magnificent disregard for resources was displayed. Roads, canals, etc., were to be easily financed by some method, which he was sure would be conceived at a meeting of the notables. He had not realized the change in the attitude of the nobles. The people were, as a whole, still loyal to the throne, but the nobles were divided into two parties. One group, among whom were La Rochefoucauld, Rochambeau, and La Fayette, believed in Republicanism and wanted a Constitution, Lords, Commons, and responsible ministers. The other section, was influenced by the Duc de Chartres, who wished for a glorious
revolution that would put the younger branch on the throne. He disliked the Court, and he and his brother spread the belief that a deficit was caused because of the Queen's extravagance. Then, too, education which had formerly been under the control of the Jesuits, was now under the influence of the radical Republican ideas.\textsuperscript{16}

Changes were sought to alleviate conditions. Every one seemed dissatisfied. Yet conditions generally were better twenty (20) or thirty (30) years before the Revolution, than they had been in years. The intendants, in collecting taxes, had become imbued with a more human attitude, and they tried to help the poor. The king himself, drafted a decree to help the peasant when damage was done to his field because of the capitanaries. There were evidences of general prosperity in France before the Revolution in spite of unequal taxes and diversity in custom. The people of the upper classes were enlightened and free to make money if they could. The king whose word was supposed to be law, was really the slave of custom and public opinion. With the increasing prosperity, men grew more and more restless and discontented with the old institutions. Evils, which were patiently endured when

it was impossible to change them, - suddenly became intolerable when a means of escape seemed available.17

The classes which declaimed most loudly against the injustices which the people had suffered for so long, were the very ones who had most to fear from an uprising. Instead of lightening the burdens of the poor, their power of rhetoric served to infuriate them. The government, itself, as well as the writers of the day were responsible. Thirteen years before the Revolution, the King in an effort to abolish corvees, pointed out in the preamble to the ordinance, that the poor were made victims so that landowners might prosper, "By compelling the poor to keep the roads in repair, to give their time and labor for nothing, we have deprived them of their only safeguard against poverty and hunger, in order to make them toil for the benefit of the rich." Feelings such as these were expressed generally even though corvees were reestablished within a few months. Each branch of the government accused the other branches of being the cause of the people's misery. These were not limited to private letters or consultations, but were found in public papers that were printed and distributed. A passionate hatred for inequality was steadily growing.18

17 Tocqueville, 207 - 218
18 Ibidem, 218 - 220.
The bourgeoisie made up of merchants, and manufacturers were the creditors of the nation. At a time when industries were developing rapidly, a stability in finance was needed. The government, which was the debtor, was affecting, more and more, the lives of the people by its poor financial management. Thus the creditors of the government, the bourgeoisie, realizing its incompetence in handling money, became very impatient with it, and it, too, sought change.

At this time, too, the laboring classes saw an outlet for their suffering. The conditions of the poor had seemed to grow steadily worse for the people of one hundred years before the Revolution. The fear of dreaded taxation made them hide their bread and wine, even in most prosperous times. In 1740, the Bishop of Clermont - Ferrand wrote to Fleury:

"Our country people live in the greatest misery, without beds or furniture. Most of them even, for six months in the year, have neither barley-bread nor oats, which is their sole nourishment, and which they are obliged to snatch from their own and their children's mouths to pay the taxes. ...It really comes to this: that the negroes on our islands are infinitely better off" etc.

Ten years later the evils were reported as more advanced.19

In 1788, a very dry year, at harvest time a fearful hailstorm

19 The Catholic World, V. 30, 186.
around Paris, occasioned the loss of a hundred millions. Later the trees froze, and could not bear fruit.\textsuperscript{20} Young, travelling through France at this time, (June 10, 1788), says:

"Everything conspires to render the present period in France critical; the want of bread is terrible; accounts arrive every moment from the provinces of riots and disturbances and calling in the militia to preserve the peace of the markets....It appears plain to me that the violent friends of the commons are not displeased at the high price of corn, which seconds their view greatly and makes an appeal to the common feeling of the people more easy and much more to their purpose than if the price was low."\textsuperscript{21}

Thus class hatred was fostered in starving people, who had to pay taxes and who saw the rich, because they could afford to pay, being exempt. It has been pointed out that under Louis XIV and Louis XV hunger and suffering had been felt, but they suppressed rioting immediately, and the peasant, facing a wall, submitted to his fate. Louis XVI's appreciation of the grievances of his people, should have been his strength, but instead, it proved to be a weakness, and subjected him to their fury.

uprisings and insubordination were quickly put down when an armed force was feared. But the soldiers,


\textsuperscript{21} Young, \textit{Travels in France and Italy}, 125.
too, had been suffering from the system of class distinction. Authority, was given only to those of a higher class, while the work, and misery, with no hope of advancement, seemed to be the lot of the mass. Anyone, who had any sort of influence, whether noble, or bourgeoisie, could be exempt from conscription. The peasant had no way of escape, and he, the most wretched in the country, might be called upon at any time until forty years of age to give his services.

"All the trouble," writes Turgot to Louis XVI, "is caused by the fact that France has no constitution." 22

In 1789, France really had no rational organization, or anything, that might even be called system, at all. Young marveled at a country, supposedly despotic, in which laws were made without the King's consent, and in which laws were ignored and disobeyed. Parliaments, in every part of the Kingdom, made laws without the knowledge or consent of the King, and stopped the carrying-out of other laws. He wrote of the arresting of many ordinances as for example, the

"arrets against the export of corn out of the provinces subject to their jurisdiction into neighboring provinces, at the same time that the King, through the organ of so popular a minister as Monsieur Necker, was decreeing an absolutely free transport of corn throughout the kingdom, and even at the requisition of the National Assembly itself....The Parliament

of Houen passed an arret against the killing of calves; it was a preposterous one, and opposed by the administration, but it had its full force, and had a butcher dared to offend against it, he would have found, by the rigour of his punishment, who was his master."23

Madelin, in writing about this lack of system in government, quoted a report of one of the privileged class who had served as Minister for two years, Comte de Gallones,

"France,...is a kingdom composed of separate states and countries, with mixed administrations, the provinces of which know nothing of each other, where certain districts are completely free from burdens the whole weight of which is borne by others, where the richest class is the most lightly taxed, where privilege has upset all equilibrium, where it is impossible to have any constant rule or common will; necessarily it is a most imperfect kingdom very full of abuses, and in its present condition, impossible to govern."24

Another habit, which made arbitrary government impossible, was the principle, that all edicts should be preceded by long preambles giving reasons for the ordinance, and the old habit of transacting business publicly.25 At this critical time, this imperfect kingdom was in the hands of a king, who allowed all power to be taken from him.

The king had written Turgot, "There is none but you and I who love the people."26 The king and Turgot had

23 Young, Travels in France and Italy, 334, 335.
24 Madelin, 11, 12.
25 Tocqueville, The Old Regime and the Revolution, 147.
26 H. Van Laun, I, 42.
loved the people, and Turgot brought forth plans, that had included everything that the Revolution later effected. Maurepas could not understand these plans, the nobles refused to listen to him, and the King was shocked at the idea of innovations and asked for more time, and in the interim amused himself with a little locksmith work. 27 Necker, the chosen friend of the Court, followed Turgot, and he turned to the building of ships and guns, as a means to bolster up the government. In the meantime, America's cry for help was received, and the king, who represented royalty and despotism, encouraged democracy and equality of man, as expressed by Benjamin Franklin at a king's Court (Versailles). At the end of our war the French crises had not abated but had been accelerated by the enthusiasm of American democracy. Necker got the king's approval of the publication on the administration of finances, and for the first time, the income and outlay of the state, which was always kept secret, was laid before the people. The Court objected and the king dismissed Necker, as Turgot was dismissed. As Necker, had fallen through the Courtiers, Calonne decided against economy and retrenchment, to gain their favor. However, the deficit was increasing greatly, and something had to be done. A meeting of the Notables,
the first that had taken place since 1626, under Richelieu, was called for February 22. Calonne suggested assemblies, and a new land tax, from which no one would be exempt. The privileged classes could not understand this kind of proposition, from one, who had encouraged extravagance, so Calonne retired and Cardinal Lomenie de Brienne took his place. De Brienne presented portions of his plan at a time, so that the Notables accepted some of the essentials, which were really part of the plans of Calonne, Turgot, and Necker combined. De Brienne adjourned the meeting on May 26, when six propositions had been decided upon. The Parliament of Paris refused to accept these measures however, and in the heat of the discussion, Lafayette proposed convoking the National Assembly. Louis XVI banished parliament to Troyes in Champagne. Lomenie de Brienne entered into negotiations with the banished legislators, and tried to compromise, including an agreement to convoke the States General in five years time.28

The king at this critical time, again showed his lack of firmness, and his lack of judgment. He had pledged himself through his minister, to the convocation of the States General, and instead of profiting by this appeasment to the public, he proceeded to nullify its effect, and

alienate his parliament, whom he needed badly. He insisted, on November 19, 1787, that the fixing of this meeting, be left solely to his judgment, as he was the chief of the family, and consequently, the arbiter of their complaints. He then had read two edicts, which opened wounds, that should have been healing. One was for a loan, which should go on borrowing year after year whatever it needed until 1792; the other, was the reinstating of Protestants in their civil rights. The latter seemed to be a bribe for the passing of the edict.

It was at this difficult time, that the people became conscious that the Government was planning to put an end to Parliament altogether (May 1788). This caused an uproar in the capital. On the 8th of May, the king, in a bed of justice, made every possible concession to reform. The reforms, in themselves were good, but they had come too late to satisfy. The Parliament of Paris received its oath of resistance, and was followed by really all of the provincial assemblies. However, a month after a hailstorm had laid waste the fruits of the year, on August 8, 1788, the king definitely arranged the meeting of the States General, and asked the people of the provinces to forward any subjects which they wished to have discussed. In the meantime, as ready money was scarce, Paris was again startled
by the announcement, on August 16, that the payments at the royal treasury, would be made three-fifths in cash, and the remaining two-fifths in paper. The people became so indignant, that Brienne was obliged to tender his resignation, and advised the king to recall Necker. 29

The people felt that the recall of Necker, and the assembling of the States General, would be a cure for all evils. Young felt, that the fate of the nation, and that of the Bourbons, was in the hands of Necker, and that he could at this time, have directed in any way in which he chose, the future of the nation for, "he had the greatest opportunity of political architecture that ever was in the power of man, the greatest legislators of antiquity never possessed such a moment." 30 Even the recall of Necker, however, could not remove the contempt in which the King was held for his vacillation. Necker was dazzled by his popularity. To check the rise in prices, he had to spend lavishly, for the members of the Famine Pact, had bought up the corn, and caused a scarcity, which was increased by a failure of crops that year. Amidst disease and starvation, the States General was looked to, as a guiding star, to light the way. De Brienne had invited public discussion, and journalism sprang to life with such a flood of pamphlets,

29 Van Laun, 72, 78.
30 A. Young, Travels in France and Italy, 170.
that Paris became a torch that would soon inflame the country. At the doorway of the book seller, Chevalier, the ragged populace listened eagerly for the news. At first, the two great questions were, "Shall the Third Estate be equal in representation to that of the nobility and the Clergy? Shall the votes be taken according to the different orders or per head?"31

The excitement caused by this discussion, did not seem to make the court realize the need for unity among themselves, or even the necessity for an attempt at presenting their own viewpoint. On June 9, 1788, Young wrote in his Journal,

"The business going forward at present in the pamphlet shops of Paris, is incredible....Every hour produces something new. Thirteen came out today, sixteen yesterday, and ninety-two last week....The spirit of reading political tracts they say, spreads into provinces so that all the presses of France are equally employed. 19/20 of these productions are in favor of liberty and commonly violent against the Clergy and nobility; I have today bespoke many of this description that have reputation; but inquiring for such as has appeared on the other side of the question, to my astonishment I found there are but two or three that have merit enough to be known. Is it not wonderful, that while the press teems with the most levelling and even seditious principles, that if put in execution would over-turn the monarchy, nothing in reply appears, and not the

31 Van Laun, I, 78 - 82.
least step is taken by the Court to restrain this extreme licentiousness of publication? It is easy to conceive the spirit that must thus be raised among the people."32

It was little wonder that Young felt that it was nothing short of madness for the government to allow the propagation of such principles of sedition and revolt.

The calling of the States General, the "New Year's gift to France," was received with universal rejoicing, for every one considered himself burdened, and felt, that with a Constitution, the worn out machinery of the old institutions would no longer oppress the people. The elections had brought together 1139 deputies; 291 belonging to the Clergy, 270 belonging to the nobility, and 578 composing the Third Estate, among which were two priests, 12 nobles and 120 magistrates.33 Paris was in a ferment and nothing else was talked of. The question of whether the representatives were to be called the Tiers Etat, or Commons, was debated violently, the lords objecting to the latter. The feeling was tense and the question of whether they should sit in one chamber, or separately, became an issue.34

One of the inflammatory brochures, was that of

32 Young, Travels in France and Italy, 124, 125.
33 H. Van Laun, I, 81.
34 Young, 123 - 124.
Abbé Sieyes, (1748-1836) entitled, "What Is The Third Estate?"

"The Third Estate according to his showing, ought to be, or at the very least might be, everything, whereas in France it had hitherto been nothing. 'It is', a complete nation in itself, providing the whole rank and file of the army, of the church, of the law, of the administration of every profession and trade and branch of industry.' It was only from the privileged position of all these spheres that it had been excluded, but it was capable of supplying worthy candidates for any and every post, however exalted. It could dispense with the rest of the nation but the rest of the nation could not exist without it. Hence it followed that the lofty position from which it was excluded belonged to it by the highest right, whilst the privileged orders were merely usurpers. Doubtless, Sieyes admits, there had been exceptions but they were so few that he might overlook them. What, are not the effects of monopoly well known? If it discourages those whom it repels, do not we know that it deteriorates those whom it favours?" etc.

Under the influence of these ideas we see the cry for equality and social reform rather than one for political change. The feeling had grown that the noble's pretension to high place had no foundation for he was no longer superior in education, greater ability, or experienced with government or moral authority. The middle class had been making great strides in education. It was the Third Estate who made money, and it was the Third Estate who had loaned Capital to the King's government, and the creditors wanted an accounting.

35 Van Laun, I, 84 - 86.
Had not the king in his message to the people told them to meet and write down their grievances, - not realizing that talking about them, would augment them. "It is the desire of his Majesty,...that from the extremities of his kingdom and the least known of its dwellings, every individual should feel assured of his desires and claims reaching the ear of the King." The hope for sudden relief became uppermost, and it is little wonder that after bearing in mind the enormous amount of taxes paid by themselves alone, and starving conditions upon which they had dwelt, that when that hope was dimmed, desperation and distrust took its place.37 At the royal session, the deputies were introduced according to the order established in 1614. One difference, however, was manifested, - the Third Estate remained covered, instead of kneeling down bareheaded, when they spoke. The crowded assembly listened eagerly for the King's words and were disappointed, when instead of leading them along a constructive course, he spoke of the urgent need for money, making them feel that the crisis lay in the finances, rather than in the institutions, and that they were tax payers, rather than legislators.38


38 Van Laun, I, 89 - 91.
kind of government was France, at this crisis, dependent upon?

Louis XVI seemed to inherit very few of the Bourbon characteristics. "Labour, love, war, politics, had no charm for him." His love of the chase, and huge appetite were the only Bourbon characteristics which he possessed. Even in the time of greatest crisis he was cheerful, and his appetite was hearty. Heavy and clumsy in appearance, but not dull-witted as many thought, he was liberal and generous minded but his good nature hindered action. He believed in forgiving those who had injured him, and he believed, in his kindly way, that man was fundamentally good. France in her hope that Louis XVI might be a kingly king, had written the word "Resurrexit" on the statue of Henry IV. He had for many years tried to remedy conditions for his people, and was economical in his own spending. His lack of decisive thinking, and failure to act unless under strong pressure, were his greatest faults as he was swayed from side to side. This made for a feeling of lack of confidence in him among both subject and ministers. He disliked his duties as king, and the crown was always to "hurt him." He had expressed this sentiment when the crown was placed on his head when he became king saying, "It hurts me." Louis had not been born a king. The Queen, proud and
beautiful, was distrusted because of her Austrian blood, and haughtiness; and many false tales were circulated about her.

The king's brothers were of no assistance to him. The Comte de Provence, who was later to be king was not as kindly as the king, but had greater intelligence. Less sincere, he believed in the innovation of the time, until he was asked to have his own pension reduced. The other brother, the Comte d'Artois, was opposed to the revolutionary ideas, and did much to harm the king. The king who listened to everybody, found it impossible because of his great weakness, to cast a decisive vote. The government and nobles as far as sentiment for the people were concerned, were the finest that France had had, but lack of action had enervated them. The King and Court were paying, at this time, for the despotic centralization begun during time of Louis XIV.

Anarchy and fear reigned, for the king had professed no political policy for over half a century, and had no knowledge of his definite rights. The nobility and upper Clergy depended on the king, but the king had no class on which he could depend. As first nobleman in his kingdom, he should have depended on the nobles, but the policy

39 L. Madelin, 31 - 36.
engendered by Louis XIV, had made this party impotent. Preference had been given in the function of the government to the middle class which it had despised. Here we see the elements which made up the revolutionary forces, a weak king, privileged classes divided among themselves, and weakened through long inactivity, the Bourgeoisie, eager, intelligent, and greedy for the real power which was long denied them, and a populace, maddened by starvation, and swayed, and inflamed by able leaders.40

The king, who had opposed the feudal system all of his life, compromised himself in his speech at the Royal Session of June 24. The people, who the night before, were heard to say that the will of the king was law, were now grievously hurt and indignant.41 The dismissal of Necker, July 12, was another move which became a pretext for violence. The guards made no attempt to stop the mobs. The taking of the Bastille, which on the 14th had been brigandage, on the 15th was glorified by the bourgeoisie, - for the assembly encouraged the legend.42

The king became acquainted with the act after a day of hunting. When he went to Paris to see what had happened, the populace saw that he wore the tri-colored

41 Ibidem, 64.
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cockade. Paris saw that they were exonerated and approved by the king and the Court. Anarchy prevailed.

The king's power was lessening gradually. He might have demanded that the third order sit apart on May 5th, but by June 20th, it was too late. Encouraged by the overthrow of the Bastille, anarchy reigned, and the Assembly was gripped with fear, - at first with fear of the Court, and later, with fear of the populace. The Assembly had nothing to fear from the Court, as many of the nobles felt the need for change, but the populace and the Assembly soon came under the influence of the Jacobin Club, which formulated its policy from 1790 on. Leaders, such as Mirabeau and Lafayette, who were friendly to the Court, and might have saved it, were distrusted and given no opportunity to serve. Tocqueville quotes a letter to the king from Mirabeau which was written less than a year after the Revolution had begun.

"Compare the present state of things with the old regime, and console yourself and take hope. A part - the greater part of the acts of the national Assembly, were decidedly favorable to a monarchical government. Is it nothing to have got rid of Parliament, separate states, the clerical body, the privileged classes, and the nobility? Richelieu would have liked the idea of forming but one class of citizens; so level a surface assists the exercise of power. A series of absolute reigns would have done less for royal authority than one year of Revolution."43

43 Tocqueville, The Old Regime and the Revolution, 21.
Mirabeau certainly understood the Revolution, and might have been a leader, but his violence and thirst for power, made both the Assembly and the Court fear him, and caused the Assembly to vote for a motion which prevented any deputy to hold ministerial office. Thus the Assembly was to make way for newer and less experienced people, who were to be ruled by passions instigated by the Jacobin Clubs. - It has been said that Mirabeau, Talleyrand and Lafayette might have stemmed the tide, but they, too, were driven out by the King's indecision. If the king had known what he wanted, the leaders of the troops might have been given moral stamina to lead, and the Court would at least have felt the support or backbone of armed force in case of need. But the troops, too, had been affected by the spirit of unrest. The king could not depend on them, and this was one of the most important factors in the failure of the government. Officers of inferior quality who held their positions because of birth, rather than because of merit, could not influence the reckless recruits which made up the army. The sentimental spirit of the age had not given leaders that could handle men who needed a "yoke of iron." Early in the period, October 1, when the troops from Flanders arrived at Versailles, to protect it from the dangers of Paris, a troop, excited and emotional, cheered the king and said that they would die
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only for him, that they served him and not the assembly. This outburst was all that Paris needed to stir and inflame the populace, and they demanded the presence of the King and Queen at the Tuileries.

That the Assembly was being pushed by the Jacobin Club, and Paris, was seen in the effort made in the Provinces for a Confederation that was begun in October 1787. It was a movement for self preservation. When the king which had been the tie that bound them together had weakened, and their public offices destroyed by the assembly, they instinctively felt the need of each other, and they wished to unite as they were citizens, not of separate provinces, but of one empire. The Assembly, quick to see the danger to themselves, invited the Delegates from the National Guards, representing the various federations, to a festival in Paris.

As these delegates began to arrive in July 1790, the real feeling of the provinces became apparent. "When those from Touraine were received by Louis XVI, they offered him a ring that had been worn by Henry IV."

"The Bretons, who had been described as fervent revolutionaries, threw themselves weeping at their Sovereign's feet. Their leader offered his sword to the King, with the words: 'It will never be stained with any blood but that of your enemies, Sire!' Louis embraced him; 'I have never doubted the affection, and
fidelity of my dear Bretons,' he said. 'Tell them all that I am their father, their brother, and their friend.' 45

At the ceremony, the shouts of, "Long Live the King," were said to be much louder than those of "Long Live the Nation," and when the king said, "I swear to use all the power delegated to me by the constitutional act of the state to maintain the Constitution decreed by the National Assembly and accepted by me," the frenzied joy of the people had reached new heights and even the queen was acclaimed. Madelin quotes, "Generally speaking, everybody is drunk with love for the King and the Royal Family!" Blind again, the Court did not see its advantage, but the Club made the most of the military delegates, making much of them, and instilling distrust of their officers in them. The festival poisoned the troops, as was evident on the next morning, when the Queen's troops mutinied. This destruction of discipline, could be traced across France from January to July. 46

The king had resisted the plea made by the Queen and some members of the Court, to seek aid abroad, but his scruples were finally cast off when he was forced to accept the Oath of the Clergy. He said, I would rather
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be king of Metz than continue to be King of France in such a position as at the present, but it will soon be over." His appeal, which was not unusual, but rather traditional, for help from a foreigner, now seemed the only way to solve the problem. Many of the nobles had emigrated outside of France, and the king was without their support.

The people of the country by 1791 were worn out. Many no longer desired to vote, business had fallen off, and discontent was rife. Many wanted to turn back, but others forced the country on. Mirabeau and Lafayette still might have done something, but the Court distrusted them. The night before he died, Mirabeau advised the king against flight. The king was but the "Chief Slave" of the Assembly, as he could not use his veto power, and could not dissolve the Assembly. The king's family was allowed no freedom. In his eagerness for flight, he did not realize that the whole populace would regard it as a move against the Revolution and the Nation, and so unite, - backing the Assembly, as it had not done before. When he was arrested at Varennes he said in bitterness, "There is no longer a King of France." In truth the Monarchy had died at Varennes. The King was suspended and placed behind guarded doors. The people, who were hysterical with fear at first, soon
decided that a nation could exist without a king. Still the Assembly had not dethroned him.\textsuperscript{47}
CHAPTER III

"RADICALS" and "REACTIONARIES."

The chaotic times during the work of the Assembly need not be described here. The people had expected great changes to take place with the meeting of the Estates General, and consequently, refused to pay the customary taxes and imposts. The local officials did not know whether they were to obey the King or the Assembly and anarchy resulted. The rioting of the city spread to the country, and the "chateaux" of the nobles, and in some places the monasteries, were destroyed. The provinces in 1789 were without any government. The system of centralization had broken down completely.

The new government could not function without money, so the property of the church was attacked. As partial indemnity for the confiscation of church property, the state was to pay the clergy a stated salary. In 1790, the bishops and clergy were made a civil body and were to be elected by the people. This act on the part of the Assembly served to alienate some of its most sincere
supporters. The priests who were in sympathy with the peasants could not conscientiously live up to these terms. Many of the French Catholics, too, saw the weakness in such administration and objected to it. The effect on the king has already been stated.

The bourgeoisie, or the middle class had profited most from the changes, but still felt that the Constitutional Monarchy was not radical enough. Up to 1791, when most of the constructive work had been done, the "Third Estate," with the nobles and Clergymen had been working for the peasants and the middle class. After that time, the radical leaders of the middle class united with the revolutionary movement.

The prospect of war was received favorably by many factions in France. The Court, which had asked help from the Queen's brother in Austria, thought that war would be beneficial to the throne whether France or the Allies won. The bourgeoisie, or constitutionalists, led by Lafayette wanted war, thinking, too, that war would unite the nation. The majority of radicals felt that war would stir up a general feeling against all monarchs, and thus, not only France but other Monarchies, as well, would have to change.¹

¹ Carlton Hayes, I, 624.
With the advance of the enemy armies, Danton became a Dictator. He believed that the way to stop the loyalists was through terror. Therefore, he began to put to death any loyalist that could be found in the French Capital. When it came time for Louis XVI, in December, 1792, to be put to death, Louis faced the guillotine unflinchingly.

In the days that followed, war and chaos made it possible for Napoleon to take possession of the French government, and make of it a military dictatorship. Within ten years, France, defeated, willingly accepted a strong leader. From 1799 to 1814, Napoleon Bonaparte was France. The respite of peace given France from 1799 to 1804, was soon broken by continuous warfare which did not end until 1814, with Napoleon's downfall.

With the sudden collapse of the Napoleonic Empire in 1814, the Allies, as well as the French, were unprepared for an alternative. The Czar and his Allies showed their respect to the nation and compelled their armies to act with moderation. Uncertain as to the people's will, the Allies seemed relieved when a manifestation for the restoration of the Bourbons was staged, in a noisy street demonstration, by Talleyrand, Vitrolles, and Comte d'Artois. Without the public having had a real opportunity
to express themselves, the Senate was asked to appoint a provisional Government, which in turn wrote the decree of the downfall of Napoleon (April 2).

Thus, in its conception, the Restoration was breeding trouble for itself. It was to begin with fear as its keystone, - fear on the part of the restored because it was not sure of the support of the people, and fear, amongst the people, that the years through which they had lived, and the equality for which they had fought, might have been in vain. Who were these Bourbons whose names had been excluded from the press for so many years? It has been said that it was the group that followed the King, rather than Louis XVIII, that, "had learned nothing and forgotten nothing." The Comte d'Artois, the king's brother, with all of the old time bitterness, wanted to start a counter-revolution. With a bitter party, and distrust as a handicap, the experiment of restoring the monarchy was hazardous from the outset. Louis XVIII had a fairly good idea of what the events of 1799 to 1814 had meant and he seemed sincere in his desire to carry out the nation's will. But even in the very beginning, when he admits the people's sovereignty, an inconsistency could be seen. For it was still the belief of the king, that the throne was his by Divine Right. In his Saint Quen Manifesto, (May 3), he
agreed to the writing of a Constitution which would have for its basis the following guarantees:

"representative government in two bodies, taxation voted by a nation; public and individual liberty; freedom of the press of worship; the inviolability and sacredness of property; irrevocability of the judges, and independence of the judicial power; the guarantee of the public debt; the maintenance of the Legion of Honour; every Frenchman admissible to all employments; in fine, no interference with any individual for his opinions and his votes."

When the Charter based on these promises was drawn up, Louis XVIII added a preamble expressing the sentiment that he still had, of the Divine Right of Kings. In speaking of the Charter as a concession and grant of the king, who was following in the footsteps of his ancestors, he said,

"the communes had owed their freedom to Louis XVI, and the extension of their rights to Saint Louis and Philip the Fair, as the judicial order had been established and developed by the laws of Louis XI, Henry II, and Charles IX, and finally as Louis XIV had regulated all parts of the public administration, so he, Louis XVIII, now granted new institutions to France."

The fundamental ideas of the French for equality and liberty were adamant among all classes, but their ideas of the method in which this was to be obtained were as yet, wavering and uncertain. Their Charter was the most liberal
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found on the European Continent, outside of that of Poland. Yet its many contradictions have been pointed out:— the preamble, which was,

"based on the divine right of monarchs; the Charter itself which recognized the sovereignty of the people; freedom of worship but recognized Catholicism as the religion of the state; liberty of the press was promised but laws could be introduced to correct its abuses; and the Chambers were supposed to be law making bodies but only the King could initiate the laws," etc.

Thus we have a king with a hard, clear, brain, who was conscious of the stream of democracy, yet, who was proud of his lineage and anxious to re-establish all of the ceremony and stately pomp of his ancestors. To synchronize the two was his problem.

The king, as head of the state, hoped to heal the wounds made by the Revolution. He believed that he could steer a middle course, but, before long, he was beset by factions and difficulties. The new monarchy was disliked, not only by Bonapartists and Liberals, but by the Ultras as well, who felt that the King's ideas were too conciliatory and tried in every way possible to harass him. The councillors, who Louis gathered around him, were ignorant of the necessities of Constitutional government. Through a serious of blunders, on the part of Fouché and Talleyrand,  
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the elections were so mismanaged that power soon became concentrated in the hands of the Royalist party.5

The Comte d'Artois set to work to re-organize the public service and placed these positions under the emigres, who started to pour back into the country. The army was still feeling humiliated because the Allies had insisted that the boundary be pushed back to where it was before 1792. The army was greatly reduced and the white flag replaced the tricolour. Then, too, they were put on half pay, and scattered through their native towns. As a result they became more dissatisfied and became another very real source of annoyance and opposition to the government.

The Chamber of Peers were chosen by the king and received a fixed salary of thirty thousand (30,000) francs a year. It was customary to make fun of the Peers as they were referred to, as, "those old men, the dried up debris of the Old Monarchy," etc. However, the Upper House really represented the real views of the country and had many liberal ideas, as it was made up of many generals and officials of the Empire. One great weakness, though, was that its discussions were not printed, as the debates of the Chamber of Deputies were, and again France lost out

on the more seasoned arguments and intelligent presentation of the country's problems. The House of Deputies was an elective body, but it was not truly representative, as many deputies were public officials. Often the excitement, or flurry of the time, was the deciding factor in their elections. Their speeches were published in the Moniteur and the public followed them carefully.\(^6\)

More difficulties arose when Napoleon appeared again. The army, who remembered his victories and the glory of France, flocked to him. The soldiers, who were from the peasant class, remembered that he honored them. The Bourbons were still on trial and only influenced those of high station. The middle class wavered and became indifferent as they felt that neither the king, nor Napoleon, really understood or appreciated what they wanted, - freedom in trade and full social and educational opportunities. When Louis XVIII heard of Napoleon's return, he came to the Chamber of Deputies in person, saying that he came into the midst of them to draw the bonds of State closer. In a kingly way he makes his appeal,...

"I have seen my country again; I have reconciled it with all foreign Powers, and they will, I have no doubt, show themselves faithful to those treaties which insured peace. I have laboured for the happi-

\(^6\) F. Artz, 43 - 45.
ness of my people, and every day receive the most
touching marks of their love. Can I, at sixty (60),
better terminate my career than in dying for its
defense. I fear nothing for myself, all for France.
he who seeks to light up amongst us the torch of
civil war, brings at the same time the scourge of
foreign war. He comes to replace the country under
his yoke of iron; to destroy the Constitutional
Charter which I gave, my noblest title in the eyes
of posterity, which all Frenchmen cherish, and which
I here swear to maintain. Let us rally round a
standard so sacred. The descendant of Henry IV
will be the first to do so. Let the concurrence
of the two Chambers lend to authority all the powers
necessary to it; and this truly national war will
prove, by its happy result, what a great people can
do, animated by the love of its King, and the
fundamental law of the State."

It has been said that even the most bitter enemies
of the Bourbons admit that the address moved the people
deeply, and that his listeners were willing to die with
their king and put down the Usurper. His courage was soon
changed to fear, however, when he heard that his garrison
was not to be relied upon, and he had to flee across the
Belgian frontier.

The ease with which Napoleon returned, infuriated
the Ultras, who insisted on the instigation of the White
Terror, in 1815. Once more one-half of France was spying
on the other half. Count Artois and his party ignored the
feelings of the nation, and instead of giving them something
for which they might be grateful, they assumed the belief,
that as nobles, they were born to be worshipped. Napoleon had reigned because he had brought glory to the nation and the army admired him. The Republic, ruled first through its principles, and later, through fear. The restored monarchy, insulted the intelligence of the French by refusing liberty of speech and of the press, ignored the equality of the middle class which was highly prized, and showed no respect for the army.

As early as August and September of 1814, the freedom of the press was curtailed. By this enactment, the liberty given by the Charter was confined only to publications, that in books, containing a minimum of three hundred thirty six (336) pages. The loss of the freedom of the press and new regulations about religious services caused much discontent and made Napoleon's return heralded with delight. However, even Napoleon found France changed and the men in charge insisted on Napoleon's recognition of the old Constitution.

During the time of the second Restoration, July 8, 1815, the Allies were no longer afraid to hurt the feelings of the French. They demanded the dissolution of the army and one million two hundred thousand (1,200,000), foreign troops occupied the soil of France up to the month of October. France was made to feel humiliation for Napoleon's
hundred days. The generals and officers, who had betrayed their king, were arrested. The old Chambers were dissolved and a new Cabinet formed under the Duke de Richelieu. Horrible massacres took place in the South of France without any effectual interference. The debate, caused by the Bill of Amnesty which was introduced by the Duke de Richelieu, showed that the Government would have strong opposition. The law of amnesty, as it was carried out, proved to be a law of vengeance. Even this did not satisfy the Ultras and a secret agent of Count d'Artois drew up a note to send to the sovereigns of Europe. Monseigneur de Vitrolles in this "Note Secrete," embodied all of the complaints of the Ultras against the Government of Decazes and of the King. They asked the foreign powers to insist on a change of ministry and policy, as public opinion would not do it, and asked them to keep their armies in France. 8

The Ultra-Royalists did nothing to alleviate the burdens under which the country was groaning but did everything in their power to exasperate the minister that was working. They incited two revolutionary outbreaks, one at Lyons and one at Paris, to frighten Louis XVIII. The sessions of the Chambers became more bitter each year and the public followed the parliamentary war with interest. The Right

8 Ibidem, 410.
Center was defended by de Serre, a loyal friend of Louis and of monarchy, but an enemy of the Ultras. The Left Center had able Royer-Collard. Lively sessions were held with the Ultra, La Bourdonnaye, and radicals like Manuel, who on the slightest provocation, rose to refight the Revolution.

From 1816 to 1820 the situation was in the hands of the Center who believed in supporting the king and the Charter. This group, under Richelieu, passed a more liberal electoral law (1817), which was to give more power to the middle class. They also reorganized the army on a more democratic basis and passed a more reasonable press law. It was largely the work of Richelieu that the indemnity was paid, the territory of France liberated, and that France was received into the Court of Powers at the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle. The Ultras did everything they could to block progress and finally Richelieu resigned in 1818 and the king reformed the ministry under Decazes. (1818-1820).9

The program of moderation ceased in 1820. At this time more Liberals were brought to the Chamber of Deputies, and one, Abbe Gregorie, had been famed for his remark, "kings are in the moral order, what monsters are in the physical."10 His election seemed like a direct affront to the king and

9 F. Artz, 19 - 22.
10 F. Artz, Note, 22.
frightened him over to the side of the Ultras. Opposition was strong however, but Decazes offered no compromise. He finally dissolved a "Society of Friends of the Press," a body, which represented the most moderate, yet the most constant of the free advocates. Decazes, acting in accordance with the will of the king, now decided to change the electoral law so that, as the king put it, "protecting the Chamber from the annual influence of parties by assuring it a duration more in conformity with the interests of public order."\textsuperscript{11}

It has been pointed out that safety and security of Constitutional Government lies in its oscillation, and that a political current will flow in one direction for a certain length of time, but must then reverse and ebb in the opposite direction. For that reason parties do not despair but wait and bide their time. This makes for the true philosophy of Constitutional Government which begets patience and obedience to the law and the feeling of trust in the system. Unfortunately the Constitutional system in France had not yet won the confidence of either people or king. The liberties of the people had not been safeguarded by the Constitution, and the Royalists, from the lesson of the Revolution, felt that it was the concessions granted

\textsuperscript{11} Van Laun, II, 223.
that had caused their downfall and the revolution.12

On the evening of the day on which the new electoral law was to be brought before the Chambers, the Duke de Berry, the son of Comte d’Artois, was assassinated as he was leaving the opera. Even though the assassin, an old soldier, denied having any accomplices in his act, and said that his only motive was to save France from the rule of the Bourbons, the ultra-Royalists were inflamed and insisted that Decazes be dismissed. The king tried to defend Decazes but Richelieu was recalled, and on the 15th, in addition to the bill amending the electoral franchise, two other laws were brought forward. One, suspended the free publication of journals and periodicals for a term of five (5) years, while the other, renewed the law of 1817, by which the police, or the President of the Ministry, could arrest any suspected person.

Louis had tried to keep a middle course but many forces were working against him. The Liberals were constantly holding up an idealized picture of the Revolution and the Empire. The rage of Count d’Artois and all of the Royal family at the murder of one of their family was natural and a decided force in influencing the King, - for might not the hostility of the opposing party be carried to extremes

12 E. E. Crowe, 416.
any day. Another influence, was that of other European nations. Outbursts in Germany, Italy and Spain, etc., had served to worry those countries, and they, as well as England, advised Louis to become reconciled to the Royalists rather than the Liberals. 13

The course, from this time on, was one of open antagonism to the Liberal feeling in the country. The new electoral law placed the power in the hands of the landowners and the holders of office under the government. Louis, in becoming reconciled with the ultras, abandoned all personal interference in politics and contented himself with being a king in matters of etiquette only, - the Court etiquette of Louis XIV.

From the beginning of 1821, a majority in the Chamber had urged the king to strengthen the authority of religion. They thought to strengthen their own power by campaigning for the welfare of souls against atheism and immorality. The chief instrument used for this was a society of the Congregation, which was said to be more Royalists than Religious. The Church was given control over instruction in 1821 and many new Bishoprics were to be added. By June 1822, a circular issued by Bishop Frayssinous demanded that all the French youth be educated on religious and monarchial principles.

ples. No teacher could hold an appointment who did not accept this idea. Guizot and Cousin, at this time, had to relinquish their professional chairs at the Sorbonne. The Medical School was closed November, 1822, and were not reopened until two of the heredical lecturers was excluded. The extremists still felt that these measures were too mild.

Newspapers could not appear without royal sanction. Journalistic misdemeanours were to be tried, not by juries, but by the magistrates of the Royal Courts, who took orders from the Government. The author of any writing or illustration, which ridiculed the religion of the State or any class, could be punished with great severity; - he might be fined or imprisoned for five (5) years. Thus, the crown was armed in favor of aristocracy and the Church, against the leveling spirit of freedom of expression by the nation. 14

A revenue law was passed in July 1822, which favored the landowners and large manufacturers, and placed heavy duties on imported goods. The Comte de Villele planned a slow, sure campaign. He, too, was an ardent Royalist, but he wished to accomplish the restoration of the old order, a little at a time, so as not to cause alarm. Villele, who

was conscious of the fact that the power of his party lay in the fear that had been instilled at the time of the murder of the Duke de Berry, constantly fed this fear and routed out the leaders of the secret societies, which the Liberals were forced to organize. Any one connected in any way with any political plot was pitilessly executed. So Villele, under the pretense of protecting society was making despotism more secure through fear only of anarchy.\textsuperscript{15}

Chateaubriand, a believer in the monarchy, urged war so that the French might again be united through military glory. The Duke of Angouleme and his army defeated the revolution in Spain in six months and was hailed on his return by a series of banquets and national feasts. The French again manifested their love of glory. The Parisians seemed to forget that this campaign had been against Spanish liberty and remembered only the military glory. Thus Royalty was entrenched more sympathetically in the hearts of the people, by this encounter than it had been through the real work of reparation that had been accomplished in its earlier years. Thus sentiment often displaces value and real service is overshadowed by emotion. The Chamber of Peers, which possessed men such as Count Mole, the Duc de Broglie, the Baron de Barante, had opposed the legislation against the

\textsuperscript{15} \textit{Ibidem}, 76 - 77.
press, and also, intervention against the people in Spain. Villele, in December, 1823, advised Louis XVIII to nominate twenty-seven peers chosen from among his most faithful friends. This helped break the opposition in the Upper Chamber. At the same time, Villele dissolved the Chamber of Deputies so that he would make sure of his power.

Louis XVIII had not been successful in his middle course policy even though, as he said in his last words to his brother, that he had achieved no small thing, when as a king and a Bourbon, he had died in bed and in the palace of his ancestors. He had accomplished this, but he, too, seemed lacking in the qualities that were essential in a monarch during this grave crisis. He distrusted the idea of representative government. While he, unlike the ultra-Royalists, realized the country was different and that a change in policy was essential, he had failed to get the necessary support to carry out a middle course. In a letter to his brother, the Comte d'Artois, written January 29, 1818, Louis expressed the ideal which he would like to have carried out:-

"The system that I have adopted, and that my ministers resolutely follow, is founded on the maxim, that one should not be king of two people; and all the efforts of my Government had been directed towards blending these two distinct nations into one. You may remember with what force, in a council held at Cambrai, a certain person depicted the difficulties of such an aim,
and how he recommended my flinging myself to that side which he considered the most numerous. I did not adopt his advise, no more than I could adopt the contrary one. Both lead to the dreadful infliction of a civil war. I do not conceal from myself the difficulty even now, of the task at my age, when I dare not hope to see the term of such effort. I know I must often offend legitimate hopes; that it is impossible to please everybody. ...If to succeed is difficult for me, who follow the middle line, how much more difficult it will be for you, who have pronounced for one side of the question! I do not ask you to approve of the invariable resolution that I have taken. Time and reflection will bring you to it; and the last months of my life now surrounded by such somber prospects may yet expand into happy days."

Louis alone, was not to blame for his failure. The Liberal party made use of its liberty to depreciate the dynasty and glorified the Bonapartes, who were less friendly to Constitutional liberty. This forced the king to the side of the Ultras, and through a wavering policy, and lack of interference, the downward trend was again started. As Crowe points out, after trying to give concessions to the people, as did Louis XVI, he finally resigned himself to the part of Louis XIV, with the pretensions and grandeur of state.

When Louis XVIII died on the 16th of September, 1824, the reign of Charles X had really been in progress for at least four years, for he and his party were at the head of the Ultras. As the Comte d'Artois he had always looked upon the Charter as a temporary concession. Charles

16 E. E. Crowe, I, Appendix, 486.
X, at sixty-seven years of age, was majestic in stature. Lamartine had said of him, "It is the labour of thought which makes a man old, and Charles X had never thought."17 His kingly bearing inspired him to act graciously, as he felt that as he was the source of all power, and so, all favors must emanate from him. His unpopular acts, he thought, could be shouldered by the Chamber of Deputies. His tastes and tendencies were definitely those of four centuries back. He even addressed his son as Dauphin. As this title implied youth, and his son was passed fifty, the title could not help but create a smile. Very good naturedly, he conferred the title of Royal Highness on the Duke of Orleans. Louis had distrusted the Duke, as he had stayed in England for some time after the Restoration, but Charles gave him the appanage of the House of Orleans, which consisted of large crown forests, and made him one of the wealthiest proprietors. During the first Restoration, the Comte d'Artois had surrounded himself by men, who had been living outside of France for a quarter of a century, and, who had never served any of the Revolutionary regimes. They soon proved how little they understood or sympathized with the ideas of the nation during that period.

Charles began his reign with moderation, saying,

17 E. E. Crowe, II, 250.
"As a subject I promised to maintain the Charter and the institutions which we owe to the King of whom Heaven has just deprived us. Today, when by virtue of my birth, power has been placed in my hands, I will employ it to the utmost in consolidating for the happiness of my people, the great Act which I have promised to maintain."18

When the strict law, of censorship of the press, was abolished, and amnesty granted to those who had taken part in the conspiracies of 1822, the people were encouraged. However, the Villele Ministry was retained and the majority of the people were not favorable to it. At the opening of the session of 1824-25, Charles spoke to his brother, of the conciliatory sentiments of foreign courts, of religion, of reparation of losses of emigrants, etc. His presence, seemed to make the speech acceptable, but when he was no longer present men began to doubt his policy.

His real feelings were shown in the enforced retirement of the whole body of general officers of the Old Army and the promotion of three Bishops, of Bourges, Amiens, and Evreau, to the House of Peers. The bill for the indemnity for the emigres was presented skillfully by Villele, who pointed out that the holders of confiscated estates would be more secure, if the emigres were satisfied. To satisfy these aristocrats, twenty-eight million (28,000,000) dollars, were to be taken from the stockholders;

18 H. Van Laun, II, 237.
- this profit to the nobles, was, in reality, a blow at the whole nation. General Foy and Benjamin Constant opposed it, and the Chamber of Peers, Broglie and Chateaubriand, were eloquent in their opposition. It was passed, however, and this success encouraged the Crown to ask for concessions for the Church. One law which was really never enforced, but which was brought forward, was the Law of Sacrilege, - a bill that made certain thefts in a church, punishable with death. This bill caused a great furor as it had been rejected the year before.

Liberal sentiment, from this time forward, seemed to recover and found censorship of the press, irksome. Two papers, the Constitutional, and the Courier Francais, were prosecuted for the freedom of their criticism on public affairs. Whilst passing through the country, Perier, Foy, and Lafayette received thunderous ovations, and at the death of General Foy, the coffin was lifted from the hearse, in Paris, and borne by students to the cemetery. When, the next day, a subscription for his family was suggested, - four hundred thousand francs, was contributed in less than a week. Among those who contributed was the Duke of Orleans. Another demonstration of the sympathy of the time, was seen when the two newspapers, named above, were on trial. The magistrates acquitted them and everyone was jubilant. The
Royalist Press and Court showed its displeasure at this procedure at the Court reception which took place in 1826. The High Court of Justice instead of receiving a gracious response, were dismissed with a harsh reply, "Pass on, gentlemen." The public knew from this that the king was holding a grudge because of the Courts leniency in the press persecutions. 19

The position of Villele was becoming more difficult daily. He had the support of the king, but the courtiers disliked him. The most influential member of the king's party was Polignac, who was one of the most hated Ultras in France. He had joined the Count d'Artois in 1813 after a two years imprisonment. Villele, to get rid of him, had sent him to England as Ambassador. While there, he became impressed with the English aristocracy, not bothering to understand its origin. He admired its great fortunes, and thought that by introducing the law of primogeniture into France, great estates would again be created. When this bill of primogeniture was introduced, it met with great opposition, for the people felt that it was an attempt to revive the ancient regime, as well as to place a check on democratic tendencies. The opposition press attacked it with hundreds of pamphlets, objecting because of the

principle. It was felt that it was a bill against the free 
state of society. The bill was hailed joyously throughout 
France and especially at Paris. They felt that they had 
checked the opening wedge for more legislation of this kind. 
Illuminations and peaceful gatherings in the streets, 
manifested the peoples enthusiasm. The Government, made the 
mistake of dispersing these groups, by charges of cavalry. 
The illuminations continued, however, until the 11th. On 
the 12th which was the anniversary of the king's entry into 
Paris, and which might be regarded as a monarchial feast, 
not a light was seen. The Royalists could not have mistaken 
this displeasure, and might have done well to have heeded 
the warning. The House of Peers were very popular because 
of the rejection of the bill. This question was just settled 
when other causes for agitation arose; predominance of the 
Clerical Party, disbanding of the National Guard, (April 30), 
the day after it had enthusiastically received the king, etc. 

The session of 1827 closed with much agitation, 
and Villele was attacked on all sides. Shortly after the 
close of the session, Lafayette, who had returned from 
America, was received enthusiastically and made deputy of 
Meaux. Villele, felt this proof of ill feeling for himself 
and induced the king to re-establish the decree for censor-
ship of newspapers and periodical publications (June 24).
The same year, Manuel, the French orator died, - the death of Manuel was accompanied by demonstrations. Villele foolishly advised the king to select his Cabinet from Royalists, without giving the Opposition a seat in the ministry. The hated Polignac was head of Foreign Affairs and the people were indignant. There was no president appointed but the public called it the Polignac Ministry. Both sides opposed his Cabinet, - the Bourbon advocates, as well as the Liberals. One paper only, an ultra-Royalist journal, the Drapeau Blanc, appealed to the lower classes, setting them against the middle class and promising them work and food.

The New Year's reception, in 1830, was looked forward to, anxiously. The king, this time, was not content to remain silent but advised the first president of the Court of Justice, as to what was expected. At a private reception, the Duchess d'Angoulême, - motioned them to pass on without a word. The question arose as to what the government would do if the Legislature refused to vote the budget. Royalist papers defied the Chamber to do this, saying, that if they did, the king would be justified in appealing to arms.

Everyone became ready for a conflict. A new paper, the National, edited by M. M. Thiers, Mignet, and Armand Carrel, propounded the doctrine, "the King reigns, but does
not govern." The Polignac ministry tried to avoid the measures connected with liberty and the Constitution by proposing many industrial projects. The king, however, at the opening of the Chambers, declared that in the event of opposition of his will, that he would know how to deal with it. Against the advice of his ministers, Charles X, insisted upon adjourning the Chambers on the 19th of March till the 3rd of September. The elections, resulted in great gains by the Liberals, showing clearly that the Ministry was distasteful. The king, now transgressed his Constitutional rights, pretending that the 14th Article of the Charter gave him the power, because of the clause, "the decrees and ordinances necessary for the execution of the laws and the surety of the State." On July 25, 1830, the king and his minister signed some fateful ordinances. The freedom of the press was taken away, and every newspaper or periodical had to have the permission of the authorities; - this permission had to be renewed every three months. The Chamber that had never met, was dissolved and its composition was changed radically.20

When the ordinances were published the next day, Paris was thrown into a state of turmoil. Thiers, and the

Chief journalists, met and signed a declaration, saying that they would not obey any edict which broke the pledge of the Charter. The Court decided that the ordinances were illegal, so when the police came to break the presses, the owners warned the men that they could be imprisoned under the Criminal Code. Lafayette, scenting a Revolution, came to Paris and gave a nucleus to the resisting parties. All business was at a standstill and the workmen poured into the streets, an angry multitude. The students of the Polytechnic School offered to lead the people. A shot went off near the Theatre Francois and the tempest of Civil War was loosed. For three days a terrible conflict raged and the tricolor flapped in the wind.

Charles had no sooner signed the ordinance than he had gone to hunt at Rambouillet. The troops that were left at the Capital were not sufficient to down the armed boys, old men, artisans, shop keepers, barristers, students, etc., of Paris. The best friends of the throne, realized that nothing could save the government but the instant withdrawal of the ordinances, and the dismissal of the ministry. They tried to get in touch with the king at St. Cloud. Brave men were dying in defense of the throne, and the messengers, half dead from the siege that they had been through, found
his Majesty playing "Whist," - truly a Bourbon.\textsuperscript{21}

No name had been suggested as a successor to Charles X, as his deposition had not been hinted at, on July 30, 1830. The editors of the \textit{National}, distributed a placard stating the impossibility of Charles X returning to France, and recommended that the Duke of Orleans be offered the Crown, as it would be difficult to re-establish a republic. The messengers revoking the decrees, arrived too late for Charles X had ceased to reign, and a great dynasty passed away.

Even in leaving France, Charles acted with his customary stateliness. From Hambouillet to Cherbourg, a distance of approximately one hundred seventy miles, the ex-King went with royal slowness and ceremony. The populace did not try to injure him, as they undoubtedly would have the Prince de Polignac. It was said, that Charles was saved by the maxim that he had denounced; - the population really believed that the king reigned, but did not govern. An instance of the pomp is given, when at Laigle at the hotel where he stayed there were only round tables. Therefore, as his Majesty could not take the head, Royalist saws, cut away the curves so that the king could dine at the head of

a rectangle without loss of dignity. The little children in the party, had been taught to bow and smile at the people in state processions, and their charming, childish gesture, caused tears to start to the eyes of many of the folks they passed. Another pathetic figure was the Duchess d'Angouleme, who went with austere and silent grief to her third exile. She, the daughter of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette, had been imprisoned with them and had seen them and an aunt gullotined, and her brother die of cruel treatment while in prison. Tragic indeed had been her life.\textsuperscript{22}

Thus finished the period of the Bourbon Restoration. The obstinacy of the Bourbons, as well as the natural course of events, produced the conflicts which resulted in the fall of the dynasty. With the accession of Charles X, in 1824, the ancient Regime was triumphant. Louis XVIII had showed an understanding of his brother, Comte d'Artois, when he said that the fate of the monarchy depended on whether he survived his brother. It has been well said by Sorel, - "Charles X, had all the qualities required for gaily losing a battle or for gracefully ruining a dynasty, but none needed for managing a party or reconquering a country."\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{22} Ibidem, 918 - 933.
\textsuperscript{23} F. Artz, 25.
Charles X, showed his complete lack of understanding when he said, "I know all the threads of the conspiracy which has been woven. I could name the banker who has paid for the whole popular movement." As though Lafitte, with a handful of gold could have accomplished his fall. He truly had learned nothing and forgotten nothing from his exile. This lover of pleasure had no taste for the studies which had softened his elder brother. He despised the Revolution at the outset, and truly believed that the Bourbons were an essential part of the universe. He believed that Louis XVI might have died in bed if he had locked up the talkers of his day. He knew of the beheading of the King and Queen, the Reign of Terror and Napoleon, without comprehending their significance. 24 Upon his return to France, he outwardly was the charming gracious, lively being, who had been at the Court of Marie Antoinette. He still loved applause, believed in good breeding and courtesy, and followed the chase. From the first, he did not believe in Louis XVI's temporizing. He said that he would govern as well as reign and expressed the sentiment, "I would rather saw wood than be a King, on the same basis as the King of England." 25

The people of France felt bitterly the loss of

25 Ibidem, XXV, 916, 917.
prestige, and territory in 1815, when the Bourbons returned. They felt that that was the price the Bourbons had paid to the Allies for their assistance. The Bourbons had been restored, not because the French had wanted them especially, but because the Allies did not know what other king of government to give them. The proud French did not like to feel that their King had been given his crown by foreigners. The popular expression was, - "The Allies gave us the Bourbons, but it was the Frenchmen who gave us the Bonapartes." The majority of the populace was agricultural and cared little for the franchise or the press. They placed their faith in the Charter, because to them it was a guarantee against the return of the economic and social abuses of the ancient Regime. They wanted a government that would assure stability and prosperity, and, hoping for this they accepted Louis XVIII. 26

Then, too, religion serving political ends was not relished by the people.

"'The great error of the Bourbons,' wrote Cournot, the economist, 'as well as of the Royalist party and the clergy during the Restoration, was to compromise both the monarchy and religion. Each communicated to the other, not its force, as it supposed, but its weakness. The French have loved and still love Catholicism and royalty, but that which they have never liked has been religion put to the service of politics, or politics put to the service of religion.'"

26 F. Artz, 97, 98.
The Church had unusual advantages from 1815 to 1830, as there was a religious reaction against the cynicism of the eighteenth century. It had power, intelligence, and devotion, but it failed because it tried to resurrect the old social regime. The period of the Revolution was still considered a great age in French history, and the people did not like to have their religious leaders insult its memory and to take up the cause of a bigoted monarchy. All of the best leaders of the day, Lamenais, Constant, Cousin, and Beranger, realized the need of a religious basis for society. Artz believes that the failure of the Restoration was even more religious than political.27

CHAPTER IV

KING OF THE BOURGEOISIE.

Louis Philippe, was entitled King of the French but he has been more characterically described, as King of the French bourgeoisie. He was born in the Palais Royal, Paris, and was the oldest son of Philippe Egalite, Duke of Orleans, who had voted for the death of Louis XVI. Louis Philippe had favored democratic principles, and at the outbreak of the French Revolution had entered the national guard, where he rose to the rank of lieutenant general. He had been a member of the Jacobin Club, had been present during the capture of the Bastille, and had, generally, made himself popular with the middle class. During the Reign of terror, he had fled from its vengeance and led a life of privation and adventure. He had taught mathematics under an assumed name in a Swiss boarding school, he had visited America, and had lived at Twickenham before the fall of the Empire had permitted his return to France. Back in France, he did not attack or denounce Charles X, but he
allowed his visitors and court to say what they liked about his folly. He did warn the King, however, that he was courting exile by over-riding parliamentary majorities. He was determined, that whatever happened to anyone else, he, himself, would stay in France. His doors at the Palais Royal were always open to members of the constitutional opposition and to many of the clever men of the day. If the chief judges of Paris were offended by a curt reception at the Tuileries, they could be assured of a warm welcome at the home of a Liberal cousin. Here, Benjamin Constant, a parliamentary teacher, Manuel, the debater, Lafitte, Thiers, Guizot, and many others were soothed when they had been scoffed at in the Chamber. Thus, he paved the way for his own popularity. 1

The Chamber of Deputies, in voting on the transfer of the crown, adopted the measure by a vote of 219 against 33. The only dissenting vote in the House of Peers was that of Chateaubriand who fought for the recognition of young Henry V. Louis Philippe agreed to the demands of the Constitutional Monarchy, and accepted the terms that he was to "reign but not rule." His early training had made him adjustable to circumstances, as he saw them, and had trained him in patience.

At the age of fifty-seven, he had had a large experience with conflicting parties in France and with governments of every free country. When chosen King of the French, he divested himself of the crown and sceptre and assumed a tall, white hat, and a green umbrella, so that he would appear more like the bourgeoisie whom he represented.

The French bourgeoisie, as a class, consisted of the large and small capitalists in France and of all those enjoying a decree of independence. It is so distinguished from the laboring classes, dependent on daily wages and from the old nobility. The working classes and the Republicans had contributed largely in accomplishing the three day Revolution, but they were not to reap any benefits under Philippe. The system of state economy adopted by Napoleon, strengthened the basis of the bourgeoisie by favoring the laissez-faire policy in trade and commerce. Charles X had refused to promote their industrial interests, so he had been rejected, and one, who seemed more promising was put in his place. The chief characteristic of this group was a love of labor, economy, obedience to the laws, and a hatred of extremes. The principal use of the government, in their eyes, was to keep the peace and Louis Philippe had pledged himself, to a peaceful regime at home and abroad, to non-intervention in economic development, to the mainte-
nance of order, and the avoidance of extremes. 2

Because of his determination and with the aid of his sister Adelaide, he was able, at first, to consolidate his precarious position. That he was at first conscious that his was a throne of barricades, was evident in the tone of a jest that he made in speaking with a very distinguished nobleman. In the course of the conversation, his Majesty remarked that he was the only sovereign now in Europe fit to fill a throne. His guest, somewhat staggered by this piece of egotism, muttered out some trite compliments upon the great talent for government which his royal entertainer had displayed, etc., when the king burst out into a fit of laughter and exclaimed,

"No, no, that is not what I mean; but kings are at such a discount in our days, there is no saying what may happen; and I am the only monarch who has cleaned his own boots and could do it again." 3

He soon forgot that kings were at a discount, however, or his jest might not have proven so prophetic.

Soon after August 8th, when the vote had assigned the crown to him, Louis Philippe realized the need for the good will of Europe. His natural ally was Great Britain and Louis Philippe looked to her to direct his foreign policy.


3 The Independent, Jan. 18, 1849, N. Y., "A Prophetic Jest by Louis Philippe."
Unfortunately for France, however, Lord Aberdeen, who was liked cordially by Guizot, was only in the foreign office, five out of the eighteen years of Louis Philippe's reign. Lord Palmerston directed the affairs of England for the balance of the time and Thiers and Louis Philippe were both mistrusted by Palmerston. Their first collision came in regard to the revolt of Belgium.4

In 1814 Belgium had been merged in the kingdom of the Netherlands under the House of Orange. The Belgians and the Dutch were traditionally different in religion, language, and occupation, and were outraged at the idea that they should be put under Dutch law, Dutch language and Dutch officials. Matters came to a crisis in 1830, and, encouraged by the French insurrection, the Belgians demanded of William I, complete independence. Palmerston, being interested in the furtherance of commercial treaties with small nations, recognized this independence. In February, 1831, Belgium offered its crown to the Duc de Nemours, the second son of Louis Philippe. The French, because of Palmerston, were denied the satisfaction of having the Duc de Nemours as king of Belgium, and an anglicized Coburg reigned at Brussels instead. The King's anxiety to keep out

of war at this time is expressed by his sister Adelaide in her letters to Talleyrand. She wrote,

"You know how fond of, and how attached we are to the Prince of Coburg, and the King would certainly in every way prefer him to any one else, but unfortunately here he is only looked upon as a tool of England and it must be admitted, is exceedingly unpopular."

In referring to Belgium's offer, Adelaide said,

"What she wants is, either the Due de Nemours, or to be united to France; the latter would inevitably bring on war and must not, therefore, be thought of; Nemours, the Powers would likewise not accept, and besides, even if they did consent, there are so many difficulties in the way, that the King is far from wishing it."5

Louis Philippe seemed relieved when the treaty separating Holland and Belgium was signed and again expresses his idea of war in congratulating Talleyrand,

"Now at last it is terminated, in a manner both durable and honourable, for I regard the treaty that you have just signed, as putting an end to the hopes of those who think they can overthrow everything by war, and who only proclaim it as inevitable, in order to give themselves a greater chance of bringing it about. It is very remarkable that this has been the language both of the Absolutionists and of the Propagandists in all countries; keep therefore in mind, that to succeed in paralyzing their efforts, we must obtain the King of Holland's signature and execution of the treaty with least possible delay."

Palmerston interfered again in Louis Philippe's policy with Mehemet Ali. Thiers had committed France to the

6 Ibidem, IV, 228, 229, Letter of Louis Philippe to Talleyrand, Nov. 19, 1831.
support of Mehemet Ali, pasha of Egypt, who had rebelled against the Turkish sultan. Lord Palmerston did not wish to see a powerful ruler at Constantinople or an increase of French influence in Egypt, so in a treaty of London (July 15, 1840), he secured the adhesion of Russia, Prussia and Austria. France stood alone and when she found that Great Britain was again interpreting the policy of Europe she weakly accepted. Thiers resigned and was succeeded by Guizot who greatly admired everything English. Again the prestige of France and the Orleans monarchy had been damaged.

Realizing that something must be done to re-establish his credit in Europe, Louis Philippe began to gravitate towards the absolutist courts of the continent which were at this time dominated by Prince Metternick. In order to promote the supposed interest of his family he embarks upon an intrigue in Spain which involved a great breach of faith with England. In announcing on October 10, 1846, the marriage of his son, the Duc de Montpensier, to Marie-Louisa, the younger sister of the young Queen Isabella of Spain, he hoped to "erase the Pyrenees from the map of Europe."

In an agreement with Great Britain, in 1845, it had been arranged that this marriage should not take place until an heir had been born to the Queen of Spain. The
violation of this promise, which he said circumstances made him change, not only aroused the indignation of Queen Victoria and the English people but also the French as well. This Spanish marriage was looked upon in France as another indication of Louis Philippe's preference to dynastic interests rather than national interests. The traditional interest of France in Cracow was nullified when Metternick, profiting by the final break of France with England, extinguished her independence. France, isolated, as the entente cordial was severed, saw herself, committed by the action of her king to keep the good will of Austria, supporting the reactionary cantons, while Britain encouraged their successful opponents. Thus the foreign policy of France became one of humiliation, and France, which had been accustomed to prestige, found dismay rather than inspiration.

At home Louis Philippe proved to be a clever politician without imagination. He managed the affairs of State with adroitness but his appeal was felt to be material. At first the bourgeoisie were well pleased with their king. It was a time when the shop keepers of Paris made their

7 London Times, April 13, 1848, Letter of Louis Philippe to Queen of Belgians, Neuilly, September 14, 1846.

fortunes, and throughout the country, a thirst for wealth rather than fame had sprung up. With the help of Casimir Perier, the legitimists and republicans were checked in their attempts to destroy the king's power. During the Carlist insurrection in 1832, the troops of the National Guard were very enthusiastic when Philippe appeared among them. Enthusiastic shouts of, "Vive le roi, A bas les Carlists! A bas les Republicans!" were heard among the whole population. His prompt and courageous action at this time placed the country under his control. After Perier's death, Louis' cabinet included the doctrinaires, Duc de Broglie, as Minister of Foreign Affairs, Thiers, as Minister of the Interior, Guizot, Minister of Public Education, and Humann, Minister of Finance. A law of primary education was passed on June 28, 1833. This law invited the Catholics in their own schools, which were thenceforward to be free, and even in the State Schools, which were superintended by the parish priest to associate themselves with the officers of the state to establish internal and social peace. They hoped that religion, together with enlightenment, would

9 Memoirs of Talleyrand, IV, 312, Letter from Madame Adelaide d'Orleans to the Prince De Talleyrand, Tuileries, France, June 28, 1832.
be the best means to arrest moral degeneration and the dangers from the revolutionary classes.

Thiers urged a great program of public works at great expense, to spread over five years in order to give employment to the people and so alienate them from their leaders. Early in 1833, whether due to Thiers suggestion to fortify Paris, or because of the anniversary of the July revolution, the Republicans were gaining influence. The sections which had declared for the rights of Man were being encouraged by promise of social reform. Twenty seven men of socialistic tendencies were brought to trial before the court of Assizes (Dec. 22, 1833) and the jury acquitted them all, - Raspail, Kersausil, d'Argenson, Charles Teste, etc. Cavaignac, de Puyraveau, Guinard and Vignerte, leaders of a Republican society, wished to precipitate matters, but Carrel, in the National, warned them of a premature attack. Supported by the claims of the recollections of the convention and of the rule of Robespierre, other papers, The Tribune, of Mariast, and the Populaire of Cabet, set forth their hopes. These audacious acts startled the conservatives to energetic measures of repression. Strikes at Caen and Le Manz, were suppressed and treated as revolts. Laws were made to reassure and protect the mass of the population. A law, making it a criminal offense to join any society,
carried with it heavy penalties and imprisonment. This caused great agitation among the Republicans, the editors of the Tribune, etc. The workmen of Lyons, went on a strike in defense of their trade unions and took up arms in defense of comrades indicted April 9, 1834. Military force was needed to bring about the triumph of the Government, over this mob, in a struggle which lasted four days. One hundred Republicans were arrested in Paris, on April 12, in order to stop an insurrection in Paris. This rising was restricted to the Saint-Merri quarter and was crushed rapidly.10

Both Guizot and Thiers depended on the Center, the bourgeoisie, for their support but they needed reinforcement. One, began to look to the Legitimists while the other, sought support from the Republicans. The result showed itself in 1848 in a discontented National Guard. The war between Guizot and Thiers was weakening the Monarchy. To satisfy the greedy money spirit, Guizot presented a plan for a railway to link up Paris with outlying points as Lylle, Strassburg, Lyons, Marseille, Bordeaux, Nantes and Cherbourg. The land was granted to large companies and this created a scandal of which Thiers availed himself. The accident which cost the life of the Duke of Orleans, July 13, 1842, was a shock which showed the weakness of the system. The possi-

10 Cambridge Modern History, X, 490 - 491.
bility of the crown falling into the hands of a child had not been given serious thought and the question arose as to whether the charter with its Constitutional system, dated from 1814 or from 1830. Was it a compromise between the rights of the king and the equal rights of the people. The problem shook the public. Alphonse de Lamartine was in favor of the principles of 1830 as he felt that those of 1814 tended to a return of the tradition of the ancient regime. Thiers and Guizot was compelled to unite as they feared the Left. The Duchess of Orleans was very popular and inclined towards Liberal concessions which were hateful in the eyes of the middle class. By 1845, both Thiers and Guizot were worn out by the narrow dictation of the Center. Guizot had come to an understanding with the English Tories so Thiers immediately sought to get into closer touch with the Whigs and Palmerston. Thiers formed an alliance with the Parliamentary radicals through Odillon Barrot and said that he would support electoral reform backed by the National. At the same time, Thiers attacked not only Parliamentary corruption, but at the same time discussed the "personal power of a King, who had betrayed the parliamentary system."\textsuperscript{11}

The king, as a leader, lacked the characteristics which might have enthroned him in the hearts of the people.

\textsuperscript{11} Ibidem, XI, 31 - 36.
He had never really comprehended democracy in its entirety.

He had limited democracy to an "elected dynasty, two chambers, and three hundred thousand electors," - the rest of the nation was left without the political right to action. There was, then, no appeal to the inherent rights of democracy and he had deprived himself of the appeal of the divine Right of Monarchy. Thus his appeal was limited to a class of large tax payers who alone formed the legal country.

This so called democracy consisted of a population of about thirty-six (36) millions. Of these millions, another writer says, that less than two hundred fifty thousand (250,000) were voters.

"Considerably more than half a million of officers were held at the pleasure of the government and it is said that more than 150 thousand, yielding a hundred millions of dollars were shared among deputies and electors! These last gave their votes for places, and other advantages, chiefly to the ministerial candidates."12

Before 1848, consequently, not less than one third (1/3) of the Deputies had become place holders under the Government.13 Thus the representative system had been portrayed as a pyramid, standing upon its apex, having no real foundation, and representing nothing but the King's personal interests.

12 The Weekly Union, April 8, 1848, Richie & Hess, Washington, D. C. Letter March 6, 1848, from an American Gentleman in Paris to a Senator, 142.
13 J. A. R. Marriott, V - XVI.
The king himself was blamed for appealing exclusively to man's meaner and more selfish impulses and has been said to worship the cash box and the ledger. The government's one recommendation to the middle class was, "that revolutions and riots are bad for trade." The honors of the state were bought and sold, and all privileges, commercial, manufacturing, or theatrical, could be bought for a price. Corruption descended into every department of public service, ministers sold concessions, and clerks followed their example. So enormous were the sums spent in buying support for the government both at home and abroad, that the government was always in debt.

In a speech of M. de Tocqueville, delivered in the Chamber of Deputies on the 27th of January, 1848, he publicly denounced this spirit of materialism. He pointed out that public morality was declining, and that public interests were being supplanted by personal interest, and also the tendency of Louis Philippe towards despotism. He tried to arouse his listeners by saying, -


"The sentiment, the instinct of instability, that sentiment the precursor of revolutions, which often presages them, and sometimes causes them to take place - already exists to a most serious degree in this country....Is there not a breeze of revolution in the air? This breeze, no one knows where it rises, whence it comes, nor (believe me) whom it sweeps away....It is my deep and deliberate conviction, that public morals will lead you in a short, perhaps a very short time, to new revolutions....Have you at this very hour the certainty of a tomorrow? Do you know what may happen in France in a year, in a month, perhaps even in a day? You do not, but this you do know, that the tempest is in the horizon, that it is marching towards you; will you suffer yourselves to be overtaken by it?

Several changes in legislation has been talked of. I am much inclined to believe that such changes are not only useful but necessary. I believe in the utility of electoral reform, in the urgency of excluding placemen from parliament. But I am not so senseless as to be unaware, that it is not the laws, in themselves, which make the destiny of peoples; no, it is not the mechanism of the laws, which produces the great events of the world, it is the spirit of the government. Keep your laws if you will, though I think it a great error; keep them - keep even the men, if you like, I for my part will be no obstacle; but, in heaven's name, change the spirit of the government, for I say it again, that spirit is hurrying you to the abyss."16

It was not in the nature of the French to be content with a government which ignored their importance as a nation. It is true that the country seemed to prosper and was at peace and in its earlier years two very important measures of legislation had been passed. One, the law of Primary Education and the other, for Local Roads, had been most

16 Mill, Dissertations and Discussions, 347, 349.
beneficial. But the spirit of improvement soon changed to that of conservatism and the progress that had been hoped for had found a barrier in the government.

It has been said that Charles X was never so intent upon securing the interest of the Bourbons, as was Louis Philippe in enriching and exalting the family of Orleans. That France was farmed by the king as a great estate for the benefit of the royal house, and not governed as a great kingdom, seemed very true. The king was constantly demanding money for a dowry, or an allowance for a prince or princess.

"One of the royal sons was to be a future regent; another held a high position in the navy; a third, though a mere boy, was Viceroy of Algiers; the Duke of Montpensier was to be created Grand Master of Artillery."

Against this very despotic and selfish policy, not only the republican and legitimist parties but also many of the bourgeoisie objected, and the feeling of the great majority could not help but be offended. To this sentiment had been added the degradation of most inglorious foreign policy.

The degradation found in the governing forces in France were also present in a changing standard in the middle class. This group were not true to the ideals for which they had stood. It was pointed out by one writer that their downfall was assured from the moment that they

17 The American Whig Review, 302.
became untrue to their ideals and tradition, as shown in their interest in writers such as Balzac, George Sand, Victor Hugo, and Eugene Sue. These writers ridiculed the things for which the middle class had stood. The sanctity of marriage was ridiculed, the convict was portrayed as a prodigy of natural goodness made bad by artificial laws, the trader and noble was represented as a knave, the priest, a hypocrite, and the "ouvrier" as a hero. The working class was poeticized and idealized and,

"It was now no longer the vague cry of the Rights of Man, but the distinct intelligible appeal to the man who works for wages - the specific proclamation of the Rights of Labour. The enemy of the working class was not now the aristocracy. Aristocracy was no more. It was the Bourgeoisie."18

Thus, this time, the Bourgeoisie was fostering a revolution against itself.

There was a growing uneasiness in the public mind, for France, though seemingly prosperous, felt that she was being betrayed. The feeling that this order of things could not last seemed prevalent. The king was living too much for his family and not enough for his people. The July Monarchy had not taken root in the soil. The people felt no personal loyalty or instinctive sympathy for the king and the only

sentiment that did exist was the dread of an upheaval which a change in the throne might make. The general discontent was expressed almost unanimously in the journals of the day and the spirit of opposition was set forth, in them by men of great talent.¹⁹

Corruption had reached such a great height that contempt was beginning to fill the minds of a large number of the Middle Class. Their property was safe but their national honor was clouded and a revival of religion was beginning to be felt. To the lower middle class who appeared to have been deprived of political importance because of their small resources, the Government, after 1830, gave the opportunity to fill the functions of the police and to assist the army work of national defense. The National Guard had become an institution of the Monarchy. Its opinions were divided, as were its functions. It was half military and half police, and half conservative and half revolutionary. Its recruits were half from the populace and half from the middle class. Its discontent was shown by the middle class when hostile cries were uttered by the National Guard during reviews.²⁰

A number of government scandals, at this time,

proved to the people that what they felt about the government was true. Reverend William Arthur expresses the loathing felt for the peerage by a water-carrier, a man of the lowest class in Paris, when he had been called a "canaille." He replied, "You may call me anything you like but a peer of France."21 Thus the feeling grew. At the same time that the governing body of France was being unfavorably criticized, men whose reputations had been black were being whitewashed. Lamartine's, Histoire de Girondis, was acclaimed by a colossal banquet. When the Middle Class which had profited by the acting regime were dissatisfied, how much greater the discontent of the lower class must have been.

Three parties were struggling around the throne; the Republican party which had, through Lafayette's desire for peace, been won over to idea of a Constitutional Monarchy; the Legitimists who felt that Charles grandson, the Count Chambord was the rightful heir to the throne; and the Liberal and Constitutional party who were the majority of the nation. The ruling class, denied the satisfaction of glory, had sought compensation in commercial success. The unenfranchised peasants sought satisfaction in thinking of Napoleon. The

artisans as a class were more dissatisfied and wished only for economic amelioration. They looked not to the Napoleonic legend but to the social teaching of Louis Blanc. 22

After 1840, the Catholic Legitimists and the Republicans, both subordinated the importance of social questions, to all other problems though each acted very differently. The Republican organ, Le National, formerly in the hands of Armand Carrell, allowed Marrast, who had returned from exile in 1840, to bring over its supporters, Garnier, Pages, Jr., Arago, Carnot, Pagverre, Goudchaux, Marie, and others, to a new viewpoint. This change, only transferred their opposition to legal grounds. The Catholics, henceforth, occupied themselves only with the cause of religion, as association with the Legitimists had gained nothing for them. They wished only liberty with regard to secondary education. The Comte de Montalembert, proprietor of the Catholic newspaper, "The Universe," was their friend. Both Catholics and Republicans, by 1847, were ready to demand more action, as Thiers and Guizot seemed vacillating and weak using both parties to serve their own end. When the Chamber rejected the proposal for liberty in education (May, 1847) the Catholics were disposed to listen to the Republicans, as it could not possibly be worse to persuade

22 Marriott, XVI.
an electorate, based on universal suffrage, than it was to induce a group of small property owners. The moderate Republicans too, decided that Thiers had evaded long enough and began to insist on harder conditions.23

The Socialism that had been generally discussed in France for many years now became a part of French politics. The followers of Blanc, with his theory of, "Right to Work," might be called Social Democrats, and it was this group that became a potent factor in the revolution of 1848. Had the Ministry and Louis Philippe been as alert from 1840 on, as they had been in the early years of his reign, he might have been conscious of the disillusion and discontent of the working classes. The government, which had no real reason for existing, might have been given new life in the real problems of the working class. Socialism was too theoretical to make any immediate appeal to the workers. Proudhon preached, - "Property is theft," Cabet and Pierre Leroux, communism, while Louis Blanc preached a system of temporary workshops.

Admist this state of things arose a cry for parliamentary reform. Nothing in conditions abroad justified Louis Philippe or Guizot in their threats of counter-revolution. Constitutional governments that had been erected at Naples,

Florence, and Turin were encouraged by Pope Pius IX, and the Monarchy was forced to face facts. The nation had changed greatly since 1830. Permission had been granted to hold reform banquets in the different parts of France. These banquets were held as a means of pressure, - to precipitate electoral reform. Thiers took no part in these banquets and hoped to strengthen the July institutions. However, Barrot was not dictator of his own terms. At first the banquets, originated in Paris with the view to enlarging suffrage, began with a toast to the king. Gradually the toast to the king was omitted and man-hood suffrage was the glorified goal which Ledru Rollin demanded. Thiers and Guizot, who could see no need for change, and both blinded by their own plans, failed to see the danger signs ahead. A visitor in France, on December 28, 1848, saw a file of guards shivering and discontented looking, standing on duty. When asked about what was taking place, the indifference with which the answer, "The King is going to open parliament," was uttered, gave the listener a chilly presentiment of the outcome of the session.\(^{24}\)

The session of 1847-48 opened amidst a feeling of anxiety. All were awaiting the king's message, - the message

\[^{24}\text{Rev. Wm. Arthur, 234.}\]
that should have been conciliatory in tone. Lamartine describes Louis Philippe's complete indifference, as an indifference bred of material things, rather than that of intelligence. He said that the king viewed Barrot, as an eloquent man without a purpose, Rollin, as noisy, and the press and banquets, as organs of impatience by ambition. The speech with which Louis Philippe addressed the people seemed harmless enough even though he made no conciliatory movement toward reform. He spoke of some of the domestic problems, of foreign affairs, and then said,

"Gentlemen, the more I advance in life, the more I dedicate with devotedness to the service of France, to the care of her interests, dignity, and happiness, all the activity and strength which God has given and still vouchsafes me. Amid the agitation that hostile blind passions foment, a conviction animates and supports me, which is, that we possess in the constitutional monarchy - the union of the great powers of the State - sure means of overcoming all those obstacles, and of satisfying all interests, moral and material. Let us firmly maintain according to the charter, social order and all its conditions. Let us guaranty, according to the charter, the public liberties and all their developments. They shall transmit unimpaired to the generations that may come after us the trust confided to us, and they will bless us for having founded and defended the edifice under shelter of which they will live happy and free."26

In a few hours from the moment of the speech, the

25 Lamartine, 26.

26 National Intelligencer, (Am.) Jan. 21, 1848, translation of the speech of the "King of the French on the opening of the Chambers, December 28."
report spread that the king has stigmatized every man who had attended the reform banquets as "blind and hostile."

It is said that in England a hard word hurts, but in France a hard word burns. The phrase became creative for it called forth passions that were surely blind and hostile.

In the midst of his excitement word came that the banquet that had been planned in the 12th arrondissement had been prohibited by the Government. The crisis had come. Should Louis Philippe be able to prohibit the liberty of speech as Charles X had prohibited it in the press? When the Minister of Justice, Herbert, claimed the right to prohibit the banquet, - the Opposition decided that the banquet would take place. However, suddenly both sides took fright as the Government was not sure of the National Guards and Thiers was not sure of the Republicans or the populace. The agreement that was arrived at was that the banquet was to be announced for February 22, the demonstrations were to be present but without a display of military force, and at the request of a police order they were to disperse. Le National, however, had drawn up a plan of a huge procession including the National Guard. The Ministry threatened to mobilize armed force and the Opposition decided that Le Reforme and Le National, should countermand the order of the procession.

Once more peace seemed to reign.

On Tuesday, February 22, no precautions had been taken by the Government, and the people, who had not read the papers and had not been told of the change in plans, appeared in great numbers. They gathered, not as rebels, but rather in curiosity and to protest against the policy of the Government. The Third Legion of the National Guard declared for Reform and the Municipal Guard were ordered to disarm them. When they advanced toward each other and bayonets crossed, the Colonel of the National Guards, Monsieur Textorix, cried, "Hold soldiers! These are the people, respect the people." The effect was electric. The Municipal Guards shouldered their arms and marched off. This incident had a powerful effect on the rest of the National Guards of that legion, and before long almost all of them joined their comrades. 28 When the Government on the morning of the 23rd, appealed to the National Guard, the appeal was met with unfriendliness. The people, the National Guard, which represented the Middle Class, and the army had reached a sympathetic understanding.

The sentiment of the people, gradually, through the preceding eight years, had reached this climax. Reform

and the dismissal of Guizot was as important at this time to them, as that for which they fought in Polignac's Ministry. They felt that the Government, unjust and dishonourable, was working only for the benefit and profit of a few, and that France and the French people as a whole, were being betrayed. The most serious symptom on the 23rd was that of the attitude of the National Guard which invaded the Chamber with petitions and actually interfered with the forcible dispersal of the mob. Louis Philippe realized that the dismissal of his minister could no longer be postponed.

During the meeting of the Chamber of Deputies on Wednesday, February 23, a deputy from Paris arose to call the Minister of the Interior to account for the scenes taking place in the Capital without the presence of the National Guard. If from the beginning the National Guard had been called out much could have been avoided. Guizot refused to reply saying that he did not deem it expedient. When the deputy sat down Odillon Barrot arose and said that he had a petition for the impeachment of the ministers but under the circumstances he would adjourn his proposal. It read as follows:

"We propose to impeach the Ministry of being guilty,-
1. Of having betrayed abroad the honour and interests of France.
2. Of having falsified the principles of the
Constitution, violated the guarantee of liberty, and attacked the rights of citizens.

3. Of having, by a systematic course of corruption, attempted to substitute for the free expression of public opinion the calculations of private interest, and of having thus prevented the representative Government.

4. Of having in a Ministerial interest trafficked in public situations, as well as in all the attributes and privileges of power.

5. Of having, for the same interest undermined the finances of the state, and so compromised the national strength and greatness.

6. Of having violently despoiled the citizens of a right inherent in every free constitution, and the exercise of which had been guaranteed by the charter, by the law, and by precedents.

7. Finally, of having, by a policy openly counter-revolutionary, thrown into doubt the conquests of our two revolutions, and thrown the country into a profound perturbation."^{29}

The king sent for Count Molié to form a new Cabinet and at three o'clock Wednesday February 23, Guizot accepted his dismissal. The deputies who were with the ministry expressed their disapproval. Before Molié could succeed in forming a new ministry, a collision between the mobs, who had become emboldened by the fall of the ministry, and some of the loyalist troops, gave rise to general disturbance in the city. Molié abandoned an attempt to form a ministry with the men who had shared the Government with Guizot. Louis Philippe sent for Thiers who agreed, only on condition that the Chamber be dismissed, the Odillon Barrot be associated with him, and that the franchise be extended. Louis Philippe

^{29} Ibidem.
could not help but dislike a change which seemed to be a blow to his whole system. Those close to him felt his hesitation and dejection. His hesitancy came from the idea that he was right and the country was wrong; the force should be employed; yet the cost of a struggle with the nation held him in check. He could not yield gracefully but while accepting Thiers, he forced General Bugeaud upon him as Minister of War, - thus surrendering and threatening simultaneously.30

The Revolution seemed at an end. The parliamentary Opposition was satisfied with the surrender of Guizot, and the boulevards were illuminated to celebrate the downfall of the ministry. The National Guards and shopkeepers were in high good humor.

Not so the workmen of Paris, - the bourgeoisie were satisfied, but they had enlisted, in their quarrel, the aid of the lower classes. This group were not satisfied with changing one group of place hunters for another. The Republicans then began their work as they wished to profit by the barricades and the excitement of the insurgents. A crowd collected in front of Guizot's hotel. A pistol shot killed the officer in charge of troops guarding the foreign office and the troops fired. About eighty (80) people were

killed or wounded. In a few minutes the bleeding corpses were placed on tumbrels and paraded through the streets of Paris. The tumbrels could not have been extemporized; the pistol shot was obviously prearranged to provoke reprisals from the troops and to generate excitement among the mob.

"In twenty minutes after, a procession appeared, chanting a death song, in awful and imposing chorus, followed by the dead bodies on a cart, surrounded by torchbearers. Upon reaching the corner of the street, the whole party halted and burst into an unanimous shriek of vengeance. The night was an awful one. The noise of workmen appeared to break on the stillness. Barricades...were in the progress of construction. Every tree on the whole line of Boulevard was felled. Everyone of the superb lamp posts thrown down, and all converted into barricades.

At the corner of every street was a barricade; gentlemen, shopkeepers, clerks, workmen, all labouring at the work with an eagerness beyond description."

The bystanders thought that the illumination to celebrate the change of ministry, had been a trick to deceive them in order that they might be massacred. The cry, "Long live reform," that had been heard on the 22nd and 23rd, was changed, on the 24th, to "Long live the Republic."

The effect of Louis Philippe's shortsightedness in appointing General Bugeaud was felt immediately. It counteracted the effect of his other concessions. The secret societies made capital of this and aroused the people by reminding them of former massacres and repressive measures.

31 The Liberator, "The Revolution in France," Boston, Friday, March 24, 1848, 47.
which might be taken against them. Bugeaud's soldiers halted before a crowd on the boulevard, the soldiers were either exhausted or demoralized, and the government recalled them. Odillon Barrot had traversed the boulevard hoping to inspire confidence but he was met only with the cries of "Down with Bugeaud," "Down with Thiers," "Down with Louis Philippe." The red flag was displayed in some sections. It was during this fight that Louis Philippe appeared, and hearing the shouts, realized that his reign was over. Placards were appearing, posted by the editors of the paper, Reform, with the words, "Louis Philippe massacres us as Charles X did; let him follow Charles X."

The pistol shot had disposed of the Orleans Monarchy. At 2 o'clock on Thursday, February 24th, the King abdicated in favor of his grandson, the Count of Paris. Alone of the royal family, the Duchess of Orleans exhibited conspicuous courage at this time. Dressed in deep mourning, she went down to the chamber with her two children, the Comte de Paris and the Due de Chartres. In vain did Barrot and others make a sincere effort to secure the regency for the Duchess, and the crown for her son. At half-past four the mob entered the Tuilleries and destroyed the throne crying, "Down with Royalty." 32

Two parliaments were sitting at Paris debating the fate of France. Three days before, neither group had any idea of the present crisis. One Assembly, an illegal one, sat at the Hotel de Ville. They had met spontaneously upon receiving word that the king had abdicated. The leaders of this group, head of La Reforme, were Louis Blanc, Albert, Martin and Flocon. This group, following the tradition of 1792, organized a provisional government. These were really merely the people in arms and were very different from the legally authorized group who met at the "Corps Legislatif." This group were bewildered and discouraged by the abdication of the king. When Louis Philippe abandoned the Tuileries, the insurgents surged in and the Government was left without a Ministry or a definite head to lead them or to help consider a program. They did not have enough faith in their own cause to establish definite plans. President Sauzet instead of being decisive was hesitant, having neither the inclination or the power necessary to formulate action. The Deputies were forced to decide between two factions, - the Duchess d'Orleans, or the Paris mob. Barrot and Dupin defended, but weakly, the Royalists' claim. Lamartine, who was supposed to have had a secret agreement with Marie, Marrast and Cremieux of Le National, was afraid to proclaim the Republic prematurely, but wished to pave the way through a Provisional
Government. This Provisional Government was established with amazing rapidity. Louis Philippe and the President retired before the armed majority of the people.

Many reasons have been given for the events of February, 1848, but in general, the sentiment is the same. The Orleans Monarchy was not a failure materially but it lacked all spiritual appeal for the French. The people, urged on by a moral idea, were allowed to carry on because the bourgeoisie ruler and group had lost confidence in themselves. Economic development alone did not suffice. It alienated the people who did not want peace at any price or humiliation in the eyes of Europe. Guizot, who was said to be more Royalist than the King, hated change or reform and so was a poor adviser for the King at this time. The King did not have the good will of the people and depended on his Middle Class guards. A constitutional throne has been compared to an armchair and an absolute throne to a stool without a back to support it. The King was the government, therefore when the ministry was swept away he, too, was lost. He had not made use of his support. Louis Philippe's government was found wanting as it served only the material interests of one class and it was convicted of corruption and dishonesty

33 London Times, February 28, 1848, "Chamber of Deputies, Extraordinary scene - Sitting on February 24."
at the public bar. One hundred thousand of the finest troops in the world were defied by an armed populace.

According to the Newspapers of the time, Louis Philippe's downfall was received generally with applause. The London Times said that they would accept the wishes of the people now just as they had in 1830. The Archbishop of Paris told the Provisional government that they could rely on the loyal cooperation of the entire clergy of Paris. The French evinced a calm acceptance of the change.

But what had happened to the king. He was seen leaving the Tuilleries among a group of National Guards, leaning on the Queen for support. He reached Dreux with only a five franc piece in his pocket. On March 2, they crossed from Havre to Newhaven where they landed with passports made out in the names of Mr. and Mrs. William Smith. Very different was this procedure from that of Charles X. The Bourgeoisie King was still playing the part of the bourgeoisie.
That the Revolution was economic rather than political soon became evident in the kind of legislation demanded of the Provisional Government. Early on the day of the 25th, about 40,000 people made a rush on the Hotel-de-Ville, and later in the day, the Place-de-Greve was filled by a surging crowd who demanded the substitution of the Red Flag for the Tricolour and an immediate declaration of the Republic. Louis Philippe had long ignored the demands that the people had made of him and the people were in need. Many of these men were in want from a year of scarcity. Many were out of employment because of displacement by the introduction of improved machinery. With their very small earnings they had had to pay monopoly prices for the necessities of life. Children of seven years of age worked twelve hours a day in the manufactories and hordes of half-starved beggars slept in their rags upon the marble steps of the palace of Paris. These people "had made out of a row, a revolution; and had
carried the reluctant bourgeoisie, the army and the whole French nation along with them.\footnote{The American Whig Review, "The Three Stages of the French Revolution," 303.}

The Revolution was indeed unpremeditated and spontaneous. The Republicans, immediately after the crisis, took charge as they, alone, had a definite political creed and did not need to improvise one. Of the eleven members of the Provisional Government, M. Ledru-Rollin alone, before the 24th of February, thought that France was ready for a Republic. With the downfall of the old, however, something new had to take its place. These men had a very complicated task set for them. They became dictators, in reality, without soldiers or police on whom they could call for assistance. Two other great difficulties loomed up to confront a new Republic, one, the political indifference of the majority; and the other, the fear and dread of what they remembered of the past of 1793 and 1794. Their task was to Republicanize the public mind.\footnote{John Stuart Mill, "Vindication of the French Revolution of 1848," Dissertations and Discussions, Reprinted chiefly from the Edinburgh and Westminster Reviews, Longmans, Green, Reader and Dyer, London MDCCCLXVII; II, 356 - 362.}

Lamartine and his colleagues had the courage and sagacity to demand the recognition of their powers by the
sovereign people. The ministers complied, and the compromise between the deputies and the people of Paris was confirmed. The deputies who represented the sovereignty of the people surrendered their power into the hands of the Provisional Government. Lamartine, the silver tongued poet, expressed the sentiment of mutual good will and a common dream of justice. The rich and poor had a common cause. The provinces made no complaint about changes in regard to which they had not been consulted. The motives of the group into which the country put their faith were believed generally to be almost of romantic integrity. Lamartine's eloquence averted many crises. Five times during the day of February 25, he addressed the crowd. Thirty to forty thousand people made a rush on the Hotel-de-Ville, and later about eighty thousand men filled the Place-de-Greve. This group demanded a change in flags. To this request, Lamartine responded:—

"Today you demand from us the red flag instead of the tricolour one. Citizens! for my part, I will never adopt the red flag; and I will explain in a word why I will oppose it with all the strength of my patriotism. It is, citizens because the tricolour flag had made the tour of the world under the Republic and the empire, with our liberty, and our glories, and that the red flag has only made the town of the Champ de Mars, trained through torrents of the blood of the people."
During the next forty-eight (48) hours proclamation after proclamation poured forth from the Hotel-de-Ville. The first ran as follows:-

"A retrograde Government has been overturned by the heroism of the People of Paris. This government has fled, leaving behind it traces of blood, which will forever forbid its return.

The blood of the people has flowed, as in July; but happily, it has not been shed in vain. It has secured a national and popular Government in accordance with the rights, the progress, and the will of this great and generous people....

The Provisional Government desires a Republic pending the ratification of the French people, who are to be immediately consulted. Neither the people of Paris nor the Provisional Government desire to substitute their opinion for the opinion of the citizens at large, upon the definite form of government which the national sovereignty shall proclaim.

'L'unite' de la nation, formed henceforth of all classes of the people which compose it.

The government of the nation, by the nation itself,"5 etc.,

ran the bulletins. Lamartine's motives were attacked for saying that Louis Philippe had, "left behind a trace of blood." It was pointed out that it was because of his determination not to shed blood that both Louis XVI sacrificed his life and Louis Philippe his crown. If Louis Philippe had acted with the decision that he displayed in 1832 - 1834, the crown would probably not have been taken from him.6

5 Marriot, The Right to Work, }VI - }VII
From the beginning there were serious differences of opinion among the members of the Provisional Government. The moderates who were led by Lamartine were anxious to regard their work only as a provisional government and not decide for the country as a whole. On the other hand, Louis Blanc, who was the medium of communication between his colleagues and the mob, Ledru-Rollin, and the Reds, were determined to accept the clamor of the Paris mobs as the voice of the country and wanted the country to commit itself as a socialist republic.

Lamartine was willing to stop when the government proclaimed, "Royalty is abolished. The Republic is proclaimed and the people will exercise his political rights." Not so, however, the workers of Paris— they wanted something more. They were not willing to put their trust in the mere name Republic. This is expressed by Louis Blanc, when he says,

"It has always been my opinion that the Republican form of government is not the sole object to be aimed at, even by the politicians of the Republican school, if their love for the commonwealth be sincere and disinterested. For there is no form of government which may not be used as a weapon against the interests of the community. How often did the name of Republic serve only to mask oppression and to gild tyranny!...I believe then,...that the chief object to be aimed at is to make him that works enjoy the fruit of his work, to restore to the dignity of human nature those whom the excess of poverty degrades; to enlighten those whose intelligence from want of education, is but
a dim vacillating lamp in the midst of darkness; in one word to enfranchise the people, by endeavoring to abolish this double slavery - ignorance and misery."7

While the mob surged round the Hotel de Ville on meeting place and demanded February 25, a workman named Marche rushed into the recognition of the, "Droit an travail." Due to this menace and demand of the people Louis Blanc issued the following decree:

"The Provisional Government engage themselves to guarantee the existence of the workmen by means of labour.
They engage themselves to guarantee labour to every citizen.
They take it to be necessary for the workmen to associate with one another, in order to keep the legitimate reward of their toil.
The Provisional Government restore to the workmen, who are its real owners the million belonging to the late Civil List, which will soon be due."8

In order to fulfill this pledge the Provisional Government charged the Minister of Public Works to carry out a decree for National Workshops. This still did not satisfy the crowds. Louis Blanc then acted as their spokesman and demanded a Ministry of Labor. This was refused by his colleague and Blanc tendered his resignation. As a compromise measure Blanc was installed at the Palace of Luxembourg as president of a commission to examine the claims of labour and to ensure the well-being of the working class. The decree

7 Marriott, The Right to Work, XI - X.
8 Ibidem, X.
announcing the decision of the Government ran as follows: -

"Considering that the Revolution made by the people ought to be made for them;
That it is high time to put an end to the inequities and protracted sufferings to workmen;
That the labour question is one of supreme importance," etc.

That social reform was the dominating factor of the time may be seen, too, on one of the most popular journals of the working class of Paris - the Democratic Pacifique for March 1, 1848.

"The Revolution of 1789 has destroyed the old Regime; that of 1848 should establish a new one.
Social reform is the end, as the Republic is the means; all the Socialists are Republicans, all the Republicans are Socialists."

In the same edition the Program of the People was found

"The last Revolution is an explosion of light which has dissipated the darkness. The Socialist ideas railed at yesterday, accepted today, will be realized tomorrow. Its principles are,

1. The rights of labour - It is the duty of the state to furnish employment and if necessary a minimum of wages to all the members of society whom private industry does not employ," etc, etc.

The Committee at Luxembourg were able to issue some very useful orders such as the reduction of the working day to ten hours, in Paris. However, the employers resisted the

9 Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, V. 63, 399, Jan. - June, 1848, "Fall of the Throne of Barricades."
attempts made by the committee and there was a great increase
in the number of unemployed. On April 26th, the workingmen's
clubs paraded to the City Hall again to demand "the abolition
of the exploitation of one man to another and for the
organization of labor by association." The moderate Republi­
cans were worried and the leaders knew that the surest way to
drive France back to Monarchy would be to submit to socialism.
Ledru-Rollin had the National Guard meet the men with the
counter-cry, "Down with the Communists," and the radicals
dispersed.10

Senior said that every act of legislation that could
be thought of was printed as decrees and thrown from the
windows to the crowd. Impetuous as ever, without harmonizing
theory and practice, the presses, on the 25th and 26th, rolled
out decree after decree. The 18th decree, set at liberty
all persons imprisoned on political grounds; the 19th, the
government engaged to secure employment to all citizens,
the 22nd, dissolved the Municipal Guards; the 26th, declared
that the actual government of France was republican, and that
the nation would be called upon to ratify this; the 29th,
declared that Royalty under any name whatever, - Legitimacy,

10 William Stearns Davis, A History of France From the
Earliest Times to the Treaty of Versailles, Houghton
Bonapartism, or Regency—was abolished, and that the Government had taken steps to prevent the return of former dynasties; and the 30th, which promised to establish national workshops.¹¹

The decrees, on universal guarantee of employment and the creation of National Work-shops, caused the most trouble. Lamartine abhorred both Socialism and Communism, and Tocqueville pointed out that these decrees must result in one or the other. He said that if the State gave out work it was the only Capitalist who could not refuse work. The public revenue, instead of just supporting the Government, must support all of the individuals of the country. Rents and profits, because of taxes, would become an incumbence and would be abandoned by the people of the State; therefore, the Government would be the only proprietor and this would be Communism. On the other hand, if the State took the responsibility of seeing that work was available through individual capitalists, it must take on the management of both capitalist and laborer. Hence, it must regulate profits and wages by retarding or accelerating production and consumption. It must organize industry and this is Socialism.¹²

¹¹ Senior, "Sketch of Revolution 1848," 46, 47.
¹² Ibidem, 53.
On March 4, the Provisional Government fixed the 9th of April for the date of the convocation of the Electoral Assemblies and April 20, for the meeting of the Constitutional National Assembly. Among the principles stated was,

"That the representatives of the people shall amount to 900 in number; that the suffrage shall be direct and universal without limitations on property, that all Frenchmen of the age of 21 shall be electors and that all French of 25 years of age shall be eligible and that the ballot shall be secret."13

As the feeling was prevalent that the people were not yet sufficiently enlightened to vote, the provision was made that before the 9th of April, thirty-six thousand (36,000) primary instructors were authorized to instruct the citizens in their privileges and duties.14

Doubt as to the wisdom of the Provisional Government began to show itself in the London Papers, about the middle of March. An instability was felt in regard to the electoral decree and about the bank suspension of payments, etc. The credit of France was felt to be insecure. The argument, that a peasant was the fittest man to represent a peasant, was said to sound reasonable, but that all experience had proven to the contrary. He would not be able to cope with the smallest detail of historical antecedents, statistical analysis, or

13 London Times, March 6, 1848, "Revolution In Paris."
14 Ibidem, March 11, 1848, Editorial.
geographical circumstances. It was doubted, too, if repre-
sentatives of no property could govern the rights of property
and the representatives of no education could govern the
rights of the intellectual. Louis Philippe had managed the
credit of the country very badly and financial problems
loomed large. The expenditures had exceeded the revenue,
and loans had added to the debt. The ex-king left a much
greater debt than what he found. He bought constantly and
paid as little as possible. Even his tradesmen were left
unpaid. In 1830 the debt was 170 million sterling, - in 1848,
it was 207 million sterling; it had increased 37 million.15
The Provisional Government had promised to reduce the taxes.
This was impossible with the added burden of the program of
public works, employment, etc. The workman who went to the
bank to withdraw his deposits was to be told that he would
receive 1/10 in cash, 4/10 in a Treasury note bearing interest,
and the other half in stock which at the time was worthless.
This certainly would be a shock to the depositors. Trade
was very bad and work was scarce.16

It was the misfortune of the Provisional Govern-
ment that the numbers requiring employment were so much
greater at this time, than at any other time. Early in March

15 Ibidem, March 14, 1848.
16 Ibidem, March 13, 1848, Editorial.
1848, there were 6000 "national" workingmen. This number increased to 25,000 and by May, there were 100,000. This was a great calamity, as the National Workshops could not possibly continue to provide funds for their maintenance. Obviously great factories would be needed but as appropriations could not be made the men were put to work building fortifications around Paris at two francs (40¢) per day. Soon the laborers could only be given two days a week and were given one franc (20¢) a day for their idle days. These workers, then, had much time to listen to those who were to breed discontent among them. When then, the Assembly ordered the National workshops closed the Socialists turned the east side of Paris into a barricaded encampment. It was on issue between the working quarters of France and all the rest of France. The fight was a fierce and bloody one and lasted four days.17

This downfall of the industrial classes had very importance consequences. The workers hated the bourgeoisie more than ever. It also alienated from the Republican party, which had elements of stability, the effective strength of the democracy and filled the bourgeoisie with great terror at the thought of great social changes. On the other hand, the fortunes of the bourgeoisie were threatened and the national

17 William Stearns Davis, 455, 456.
bonds which had sold for 116 in February had dropped to 50 in April and business was prostrate. The peasants found that the change in regime had merely brought them 45% higher taxes and they were afraid that the Reds would take over their farm lands.

A Feast of Fraternity was held and seemed to put the Parisians in good humor. Lamartine was described as, "pale, wearied, and careworn but erect and noble as ever." The ceremony, like the first great Federation of the 14th of July, 1790, was celebrated under acres of umbrellas, but produced real benefit to the cause of peace and order. The Provisional Government were overjoyed at the sentiment expressed and published a proclamation addressed to the people:

"We would wish to preserve, for posterity the faithful image of this great fraternal day. That waving forest of bayonets which sixteen hours did not suffice to pass in quick time - those flowers - those pavilions - those branches in the barrels of the guns, symbols of peace in force - those battalions which hastened from the most distant towns and villages with a portion of their population - those regiments composed of our sons and brothers..., those forces on which were stamped concord, confidence, the serenity of order and liberty - those cries, of which not one was an exclamation of hatred or alarm...."18

The attitude of the people in regard to religion had changed again. In 1830, religion was mocked and it was

difficult to detect a priest, or any other ecclesiastic, as they went about in disguise. In 1848, they went about with all the emblems of their calling and woe to anyone who might display irreverence towards them. They, too, planted trees of liberty with all due ceremony. One instance is cited where a very animated speech was given by a cure in which he said, in recommendation of good feeling and unanimity, "Our divine Redeemer descended from Heaven to preach to us fraternity and equality and the Cross upon which he suffered for our sins, - was the first tree of liberty."19

The feeling of unanimity among the French was not to last very long. Again the voice of the "Clubs" was being heard, - abstract ideas of government, schemes for organizing labor or plans for relieving financial difficulties were all heard. Some advocated doctrines of terror; despotism over persons and opinions, and confiscation of property. Some were so wild and unchecked they alarmed the public.20 The electoral question made the Government's problem more acute. The names of Socialist leaders were omitted from the lists of candidates for the National Assembly and this gave the operatives of Paris, a fine opportunity to criticise the government saying that in excluding them, it was imitating

19 Ibidem, March 29, 1848, "The French Republic."
20 Ibidem, March 22, 1848, "The Clubs of Paris."
the government that was just overthrown. The Communists, led by M. Blanqui, in one club, suggested a plan, by which the affluent give up their incomes to the people. Another, planned insurrection against the government. Louis Blanc believed in a perfect society where there would be no inequality. He believed in his idea so sincerely that he believed that peaceful and constitutional means could be obtained to enforce them. Capital was to be overthrown by the competition of the State. The principal of association rather than that of competition was to be applied and the superiority of the first over the second would in itself be argument enough to convert the people to the idea. Blanqui and Cabet believed in compulsion and that no citizen should be allowed to keep any money. Blanc, however, hoped to perfect the French and felt that they themselves would surrender their possessions.

The principle of the majesty of the Judges was abrogated by decrees which empowered the Minister of Justice, M. Cremieux, to remove, all, or any of the Judges, at his pleasure. Patronage of 3,000, to 4,000, judicial offices, is thus placed at the disposal of the government. Other decrees removing taxes without providing adequate means

21 Ibidem, April 15, 1848, "Express from Paris."
22 Ibidem, April 2, 1848, Editorial.
for the expense of the government, also caused distress. Taxes on salt, wine, and meat, which afforded the government with much revenue, were abolished. The revenue was to be gotten through taxes on rents, carriages, men-servants, etc. A tax was also levied on capital of all money lent on mortgages on lands and houses. These taxes were upon the rich and they were expected to bear the burden.23

In the elections of the last of April, the Moderates headed the lists. As the returns came in day by day, from the different arrondissements, the name of Lamartine rose higher and higher on the list. When the results were read to different groups it was his name that received the responsive shout, "Vive Lamartine." The Ultras were placed definitely at the bottom of the list. Instead of accepting defeat peacefully they said that the representatives were of the privileged class. The Provisional Government then gave the reigns of the Government into the hands of the new Assembly. The new Assembly did two important things; - accepted the Acts of the Provisional Government, and appointed an interim Executive Committee, consisting of five men, Lamartine, Ledru-Rollin, Arago, Marie, and Garnier Pages.

The Assembly and the interim Government were called upon almost immediately to show firmness, as the people of

23 London Times, April 24, 1848, Editorial.
Paris forcibly entered the National Assembly and it was asked to interfere actively in the affairs of Poland and of Italy. Uneasiness, that was produced by the Ultra Republican press and some of the clubs, caused a fall in Government securities and greatly influenced the market. To protect the Assembly and to prevent invasion on Tuesday, May 23, General Cavaignac had 15,000 men in the neighborhood. By June the Government was much less strong then it had been on the day of its installation. The Government was becoming unpopular not because it had offended but because it was inert. The Ultras accused it of becoming reactionary in spite of its Republican character. An insurrection in June, in which the Reds enlisted the aid of about 10,000 known thieves, aroused universal indignation.\(^{24}\)

It was the fatality of circumstances rather than misconduct that was responsible for the downfall of the Government. No group of men suddenly raised to power had a more difficult task. The members of the Provisional Government were nominal dictators without soldiers or police to carry out their will. They abstained entirely from illegitimate influence and from any employment whatever of governmental influence to procure elections in their own favor. They lived up to their principles in spite of great

\(^{24}\) Ibidem, June 28, 1848, "Latest Intelligence."
temptations. Many of the members did not feel that France was ready for a Republic yet when events occurred that precipitated the country into chaos they made a sincere attempt to work out their ideas. They believed that there was an obligation on society to provide work for those willing to work. Before the February Revolution of 1848 was thought of, M. de Lamartine in his History of the Girondists has expressed the idea of distribution of wealth in the following,

"An equal repartition of instruction of faculties, and of the things given by nature, is evidently the legitimate tendency of the human mind. Founders of revealed religion, poets and sages, have eternally revolved this idea in their souls, and have held it up in their Paradise, in their dreams, or in their laws, as the ultimate prospect of humanity. It is, then, an instinct of justice in the human mind. . . . Whatever tends to constitute in inequalities of instruction, of rank, of condition, of fortune among mankind, is impious; whatever tends gradually to level these inequalities, which are often injustices, and to share more equitably the common heritage among mankind, is religious." 25

In spite of the ideals of the Provisional Government, their unfortunate experiences could not help but result in their overthrow and in the placing of one, who in the country's estimation stood for law and order, in their place.

Napoleon Bonaparte had arrived in France in February and had announced his return to the Provisional Government,

in a letter, saying that he had placed himself under the
banner of the Republic and that he had no other ambition
than that of serving his country.\textsuperscript{26} Rumors of Napoleon's
popularity increased steadily. At the time of the elections
he came to the front. He pledged himself to economy, wise
laws, peace, the encouragement of enterprise, and at the end
of three years to leave to his successor, "power consolidated,
liberty untouched, and real progress accomplished." When the
returns of the election were obtained the report in one of
the newspapers was as follows:

"Prince Louis Napoleon had 5,500,000 votes,
General Cavaignac, 1,500,000, and the three other
candidates...500,000 between them. Thus, 7,500,000
votes have been given; and Louis Napoleon has polled
1,500,000 votes more than his uncle the Emperor.
Everything portends a return to tranquility
and confidence."\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{26} London Times, March 2, 1848, "Prince Louis Napoleon's

\textsuperscript{27} The Independent, January 11, 1849, Foreign News.
CONCLUSION.

Thus the expression of the desire of France as a nation for a strong government made more striking the evidence, that the fall of the throne of 1848, was, as one author aptly expresses it, due to a collapse in government. The impelling force of economic pressure had caused a mob to expel the monarchy, and the nation had not come to its defense. The materialistic bourgeoisie monarchy had not satisfied as it had neither captured the imagination nor the affection of the people. The Provisional Government because of its ideals was accepted at first, but by the end of the year it had shown its weakness. Lamartine, who in March would have had 9/10 of the vote of all of France, for President, polled less than 2% of all the votes cast.

Prince Louis Napoleon Bonaparte had expressed his opinion that the strength of France lay in the masses of her people, especially in the people of the country, rather than in the remnants of aristocracy, or in the middle and upper classes. When the people of France, not just the urban
population, were given an opportunity for expression, this idea was strikingly verified. The people of France felt, that through Napoleon, order would be established and their desire for independence and grandeur again fulfilled. Once more they expressed their desire for a leader to whom they could give their personal devotion. On the other hand, the army would be devoted to their government, the Red element knew that their hopes were annihilated, and the Legitimists, who had supported Napoleon, immediately realized their mistake. They apprehended, then, what they thought would be indicative of a monarchial spirit.

The spirit of the government seemed to be the deciding factor which influenced the French as a people. Their political and social aspirations were high and they were willing to try out any government which they thought would be for the people. This inherent belief that the government should be for the people, was established in the early days when the king was the first noble of the land. It was because of his interest in the people and his protection of their rights, that the real love for kingship grew. They felt the need of a strong leader, at first, to protect their rights as individuals, and later, to establish and protect their glory as a nation.

Henry of Navarre continued to strengthen this ideal
by helping his people individually and unifying them as a nation. Louis XIV kept the people satisfied because of the glory of France. But the restraints of privilege, due to costly wars and a King's extravagance, were to reach a climax in the reign of Louis XV, who brought nothing but degradation. Dissatisfaction mounted rapidly during his reign. Louis XVI, anxious to right the wrongs of his people, found them smoldering and ready for rebellion. Louis XVI lacked the power of leadership at this critical period, or kingship in France, with a Constitution for support, might still be an honored institution. For it was not the people of France, nor the Assembly which had met with the consent of the King to better the lot of the people, but a group of radicals in Paris, who sent him to his death.

In 1792, France experimented with a Republic, and this, after seven years, turned into a military dictatorship. In 1814, the Empire was overthrown and the Bourbons were recalled to re-establish the form of government that the French understood. As Louis XVIII understood the situation, he was very cautious at first and tried to unite the different parties. The factions in the Government soon exhausted him, however, and he submitted to the Ultras. At his death, Charles X, who was the head of this group, became King. There is no question as to the fact that Charles X had learned
nothing from past experiences. Louis XVIII had understood the situation, even though he had not sympathized with it, but Charles neither understood nor cared to learn anything about the past. He had one idea of sovereignty and that was that the King was the State. His constant warfare in favor of royal prerogatives, in opposition to the privileges guaranteed to the people by their Constitution, resulted in open rebellion. Charles X had done nothing to raise the spirits of France; the France that felt the Allies had humiliated her by limiting her territory, dismantling her fortifications and placing a militarized enemy on her soil for years. Precipitated into a crisis in 1830, the men in charge decided on Louis Philippe of the Orleans branch of the dynasty to reign but not to rule. Louis Philippe, who brought peace to the country, satisfied for a time. But again the people were dissatisfied as they felt that their government was corrupt and that it was being run by place holders interested only in their own greedy self-advancement.

A King who was not a King, could not hold the imagination of the people for long. The material character of his government and lack of real democracy soon killed their hopes and aroused unrest among the people. The people were willing however to give Louis Philippe another chance with a new ministry. But the mob of working people took things
into their own hands. While this group did not represent the deputies of the government, yet when the time came the moral power of popular rights triumphed over the physical sources of royal power. The King had enkindled so little enthusiasm among his subjects that they were unwilling to take up arms for him. Not only the King, but the governing body as well, was weak. It has been said that 2/3 of this Government, which supposedly represented the people, was in favor of the Duchess of Orleans and the Count of Paris, on the night of February 24, but the mob weakened and frightened them, and the Provisional Government, with its ideals, took charged. This Government with its legislation for the city worker, received its death sentence in the real voice of the people who voted strikingly for a strong government. The people still envisioned a strong leader with a legendary name of glory. From the experiences of the past as well as from that of the present, it seems as though it was not only the Bourbon Kings who were found wanting but most of the French leaders, including the writers, the press, the orators, etc., as well. Nothing seems to have been learned by the factions which have been so destructive in French government. In the devotion to an ideal, they precipitated the government into an abyss, instead of working to build up the nation to a realization of an ideal. Their brilliant ideas were expressed
as theories by writers, not as a slow growth and expansion of democratic ideals by the governing body. The slow deliberate building up of the Constitutional Monarchy of England did not meet with similar reverses, probably, because it was the men who represented the people in the government that made the changes. The French did not seem to know how to compromise; to apply more "light" and less "heat" for the general good.

The inherent rights of the people protected by a strong government and a leader that they could respect, whether King or Republican, seems to be the ideal of the French. The Bastille Day, of 1940, must have stunned France. The changes in their government that came before, were made by the French; the effect of changes imposed from without, by an enemy, cannot be imagined. The causes within the country will be the humiliating factor. The papers of the day, sound like an echo of an earlier period, when they say that the staff in charge, "must have been playing bridge," instead of being awake to their danger; or, "they hadn't learned anything" and thought that they were still fighting the war of 1914. Once more the spirit of the governing body is being challenged, and France now more than ever before needs a strong leader. From the history of its past, it is
not likely that France with her spiritual heritage and high ideals in government, will long submit to the philosophy of "Work, the Family, and the Fatherland."
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MEMOIRS OF THE DUC DE SAINT-SIMON of the Times of Louis XIV, and the Regency, translated and abridged by Katherine Prescott Wormsley, 4 volumes, Hardy, Pratt & Co., Boston, 1899, begins with year 1691 and ends in the year 1723, a good description of the Dauphin is found in III;
THE POLITICAL WILL AND TESTAMENT OF THAT GREAT MINISTER OF STATE, CARDINAL DUKE DE RICHELIEU, Booksellers of London and Westminster, London, MDCCXCV, copied from a manuscript written by Richelieu;

MEMOIRS OF THE PRINCE DE TALLEYRAND, edited with preface and notes by The Duc De Broglie, translated Raphael De Beaufort, G. P. Putnam's Sons, N. Y. 1891;

ARTHUR YOUNG, Travels in France and Italy, E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., N. Y., 1915, valuable study of social conditions in France just before the Revolution;


MASSAU WILLIAM SENIOR, Conversations with Distinguished Persons During the Second Empire, 2 volumes, London, Hurst & Blackett, 1880, I, in interviewing people blame placed on Louis Philippe and leaders of the day;

HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL MEMOIRS OF THE REIGN OF LOUIS XVI, from his marriage to his death, translated from French by John Lewis Soulavie, G. & J. Robinson, London, 1802;

TRANSLATION AND REPRINTS FROM ORIGINAL SOURCES OF EUROPEAN HISTORY, University of Pennsylvania, Department of History, 1897, contains Decree abolishing feudal system of 1789, Charter of 1814, declaration of Rights of Man and of the Citizen, etc.;


The periodicals of the time were found to have many interesting and analytical articles. An excellent account was found in:


THE CATHOLIC WORLD, A monthly magazine of literature and science, "Noblesse Oblige," taken from Taine's L'Ancien Regime, Catholic Publishing Co., N. Y., 1880, 30, October 1879 - March 1880, 170 - 192, points out the decline of social life with affectation and debts as base;


THE FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW, James Macdonell, "Paris Under the Monarchy of the Revolution," Chapman & Hall, London, 1879, XXV New Series, January 1, to June 1, 1879, 912, an account of the attempt to revive the Legitimate Monarchy amid the ruins left by the Revolution and something of the character traits of the Bourbons, which made it impossible; Goldwin Smith, "Ninety Years Agony in France," XXXI, December 1877 - March 1879, 103;


BLACKWOOD'S EDINBURGH MAGAZINE, "Fall of the Throne of Barricades," Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh, 1848, 63, 393, excellent account giving excerpts from papers of the day, holds Louis Philippe accountable for condition of people; "Result of the Triumph of the Barricades," 36, 209 - 227, July - December, 1834, tells of the derogatory effect on France and Europe; "Republican France," 64, 51 - 65, July - December 1848, title a misnomer as author felt the Republican principles were hateful to the majority of the country; "After a Year's Republicanism," 65, 275, January - June, 1849;

DISSERTATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS, political, philosophical, and historical, reprinted chiefly from the Edinburgh & Westminster Reviews, John Stuart Mill, "Vindication of the French Revolution of 1848," a splendid article justifying the leaders of the day, Longmans, Green, Reader & Dyer, London, MDCCCLXVII, II, 335;


LIVING AGE, "France, Past and Present," from Spectator, Littell & Co., Boston, 17, April, May, June, 1848, 141; "Lamartine," an evaluation, 17, 463;


Newspapers were found valuable in their accounts of the Revolution of 1848 and in following the progress day by day, of the Provisional Government. The paper that was most satisfactory was the:

LONDON TIMES, this was used from the fall of Louis Philippe up to the time of the election of Bonaparte in December 1848;
THE WEEKLY UNION, Richie & Hess, Washington, D. C., April 8, 1848, "Events in Paris," Letter from an American Gentleman in Paris to a Senator, dated March 6, 1848, also on same date, "The French Republic" - told of flight of Louis Philippe;


DAILY NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER, Gales & Seaton, Washington, 1848, "France - Opening of the Chambers," Translation of the Speech of the King of France, December 28, January 21, 1848;

BELL'S WEEKLY DISPATCH, London, March 5, 1848, whole issue of paper devoted to Revolution, biographical sketches, etc.;

The thesis, "The Fall of the Bourbon Throne, 1848", written by Marguerite C. Lynch, has been accepted by the Graduate School with reference to form, and by the readers whose names appear below, with reference to content. It is, therefore, accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Father Roubik September 26, 1940
Father Jacobsen September 22, 1940
Dr. Kiniery October 4, 1940