

Turgot and the American Revolution

JACQUES M. WENDEL

WHEN, in the summer of 1774, Louis XVI and Maurepas were seeking a qualified successor to the inefficient and undependable Minister of Finance, the Abbé Terray, they cast reluctant eyes on Anne Robert Jacques Turgot, whom, a few weeks earlier, they had named to the post of Secretary of the Navy. His former association with the *Encyclopédistes* explains their reluctance, but his reputation for uncompromising integrity, and his brilliant thirteen-year term as Intendant of Limoges were enough to overcome their hesitation. Accordingly, on August 24, Turgot was appointed "Contrôleur Général de Finances."

He was then only 47, and already enjoyed an interesting as well as diversified background. As the youngest male member of his family, he was destined for a career in the Church, but, after completing his theological studies, he refused to take holy orders. For the next few years, while holding an official post in the Parliament of Paris, he made his way into the class of society where he became acquainted with the leading *philosophes*, *économistes* and *physiocrates*. His involvement with the *philosophes* culminated in his contributing five articles to *Encyclopédie*, from which endeavor, however, he later disassociated himself, after it had been condemned by the authorities. His appointment as Intendant of Limoges afforded him the opportunity to put his economic theories into practice as much as possible; for thirteen years, he subjected these theories to the test of reality and revised them accordingly. In 1769, he reluctantly permitted Dupont de Nemours to publish his doctrine under the title *Réflexions sur la formation et la distribution des richesses*.

He brought to the Ministry of Finance the same spirit of reform he had displayed in Limoges and attempted to implement a strong program of financial, economical and social improvement. He tried to restore the stability of France's treasury by a strict control over

expenditures and a more equitable reapportionment of taxes. Again he sought to apply the economic theories which he shared with the physiocrats, by freeing interior commerce from all restrictions. These efforts exposed him to the hatred of the masses, who held him personally responsible for the scarcity and high price of wheat, a situation which led to the uprisings known as the *Guerre des farines* in the fall of 1775. In the following year, he prevailed upon the king to force the Parliament to register his famous Six Edicts. Two of these edicts in particular had far-reaching social and economic implications: the one abolishing the *corvée*, i.e. the construction and maintenance of public roads required of the French peasantry, and replacing it by a tax levied on all landowners; the other one, an edict on corporations, which abolished most of the restrictions stifling commerce and industry. The king soon wearied of defending his enterprising minister against the Parliament and the nobility, both of whom vehemently opposed Turgot's reforms. His enemies finally prevailed and, on May 12, 1776, he was notified of his dismissal from his post.

Although his program of financial, commercial and social reforms was intended to save the monarchy, Turgot lacked the necessary patience and diplomatic qualities to effect their implementation. Both of these shortcomings were constantly drawn to his attention, but he repeatedly ignored his friends' advice to proceed with greater caution, claiming that he could not afford to waste time since his family had a history of dying from gout around age fifty; and to be sure, after a few years of studious retreat, he did die on March 18, 1781, at the age of 53.

Turgot entered the French political scene about six months after the Boston Tea Party; he was ousted a few weeks before the Declaration of Independence, and died six months before Yorktown. He never witnessed the final Amer-

ican victory, but to the end of his life he closely followed the development of events in the New World. As an administrator, he was forced to take a position on the conflict between England and her colonies, and along with his fellow *philosophes* and economists, he took special interest in the fate of the American people. In all these aspects, he embodied the main currents of French thought about the American Revolution.

The revolt of the Anglo-Americans against their mother country did not come as a surprise to Turgot. Others before him—Montesquieu and d'Argenson for example¹—had vaguely hinted at the eventuality of such occurrence, but it does not seem that anyone had ever predicted it as forcefully as he did in a discourse he delivered at the Sorbonne in 1750, in which he stated

Colonies are like fruits which cling to the tree only until they reach maturity: once [the Phoenician colonies] had become self-sufficient, they did what Carthage did and what America will do one day.²

In 1769, a little closer to the actual event, Diderot agreed wholeheartedly with his colleague:

Thus it is that (the) pact between the mother country and its children, based on the present superiority of the mother country, will come to be denounced by the children when they have come of age.³

Although Turgot was not surprised by the events, he did deplore that matters had to come to a head in such a manner. He regretted that the British, though an enlightened people, stubbornly refused to admit that the governance of one nation by another is "of all tyrannies the most cruel and the most intolerable, and the one which leaves the fewest resources to the oppressed nation."⁴ That is why he warned in another discourse of 1750 that, if all other avenues for the improvement of the legislation have been blocked, "the only remedy for abuses that remains—Revolution—is sadder than the abuses themselves."⁵

As was to be expected, when Louis XVI solicited his Finance Minister's opinion on the

eventual involvement of France in the Anglo-American conflict. Turgot strenuously opposed any such proposition. In this respect, he played into the hands of such *Anti-Américanistes* as Mme Du Deffand or Linguet, who feared that America's future growth would lead her to dominate the world.⁶ Although most of the *Anti-Américanistes* opposed France's intervention primarily for ideological reasons, Turgot's official anti-involvement position was based entirely on practical considerations: given the financial, social and political conditions in the country, a war against England would prove fatal and therefore had to be avoided

as the greatest of all evil, since it will render impossible for a very long time, and perhaps forever, the reform which is absolutely necessary for the prosperity of the state and for the relief of the people.⁷

Indeed, many historians consider France's ultimate intervention in the American War of Independence and the subsequent bankruptcy, as one of the major causes of the French Revolution. Unfortunately, the king did not heed his minister's advice, who, just prior to his dismissal, prophetically admonished his master never to forget that it was Charles I's weakness of character which had sent him to the scaffold.⁸

Although he recommended that the French government do all it could to secretly help the insurgents, Turgot's desire to preserve France's neutrality was indeed sincere and was shared by many of the *philosophes*, especially d'Alembert who, on February 23, 1776, wrote to Frederick II concerning his fears about the war spreading to Europe.⁹

When France finally did enter the conflict, no one at the time really believed that she did so prompted solely by sympathy for the Rebels' cause, and, over the years, much more doubt has been cast upon the purity of her intentions. Yet, one may wonder what would have happened if the opinions of such men as Turgot had prevailed. There was absolutely no doubt in his mind about the ultimate issue of the matter, for he was sincerely convinced that America was quite capable of achieving a military victory

single-handedly, no matter what Spain or France would decide to do, as he advised his king: "Nothing can hinder the course of events which must certainly lead, sooner or later, to the absolute independence of the English colonies."¹⁰ Thus he could not help but smile when reporting La Fayette's departure for America to Dupont de Nemours: "It would be amusing if this enthusiasm would become fashionable. I doubt that our young gentlemen could be of great help to them."¹¹

For Turgot, however, as for the majority of *philosophes*, the events taking place in America were interesting, not so much in themselves as for the far-reaching consequences which, he thought, must inevitably result, and which would initiate "the era of greatest revolution on the commercial and political scene, not only in England, but in all Europe."¹² At this juncture the administrator's apparent half-heartedness yielded to the enthusiasm of the *philosophe* and the *économiste* in him, who took an immense pleasure in looking forward to and enjoying in advance the new order of things that was to result from an American victory, a new age which would likewise revolutionize man's way of thinking.¹³ In this respect, Turgot shared the dreams of the *philosophes* and he was among the first to see in America—to quote his own words—"the hope of the human race."¹⁴

One might ask why the French intellectuals were so taken by the American Revolution. The reason seems to be based on their confidence that, once independent, the Anglo-Americans would effect the longed for heavenly city which they—the *philosophes*—had been envisioning for more than half a century:

It is perhaps in America that the Human race is to be recreated; that it is to adopt a new and sublime legislation, that it is to perfect the arts and sciences, that it is to recreate the nations of antiquity. America is the asylum of liberty . . . and will prove what man can do when he adds to knowledge a courageous heart.¹⁵

Or as Condorcet put it:

It is not enough that the rights of man be

written in the books of philosophers and inscribed in the hearts of virtuous men; the weak and the ignorant must be able to read them in the example of a great nation. America has given us this example. . . .¹⁶

Although he steadfastly refused the label of physiocrat, Turgot's economic theories were very similar to theirs and, like them, he counted on the American people to prove the validity of their basic principles. As he wrote to Josiah Tucker in 1770:

As a citizen of the world, I rejoice at the prospect of an event which, more than all the books of the philosophers, will chase away the ghosts of the jealousy of commerce. I refer to the separation of your colonies from the mother country.¹⁷

The two basic tenets of the physiocratic doctrine were the respect for individual liberty—the famous *laissez-faire* principle—and private ownership of property, by which they meant essentially land ownership. Turgot wholeheartedly agreed with the physiocrats, that the land was the source of all wealth and that, in the final analysis, landowners had to bear the brunt of taxation. He felt so strongly about this that in 1777, he wrote a lengthy Memoir to Benjamin Franklin, in order to demonstrate his point and to urge him to prevail on the Congress to adopt a system of taxation based entirely on the levying of direct taxes to the exclusion of all indirect taxes.¹⁸

With many of the *philosophes*—in particular the physiocrats and Rousseau's disciples—he felt that an agricultural economy offered the best way of life, "for both colony and man,"¹⁹ because a rustic and simple existence was more attuned to the preservation of good morals and true equality. Diderot himself advised the Americans to guard against greed, because it must necessarily result in an unequal distribution of wealth, and would bring in its wake luxury, corruption of manners, false ambition and the eventual destruction of freedom. Oddly enough, Diderot went so far as to say that prosperity was indeed a public enemy since, although "great talents are needed in times of adversity, prosperity makes them useless and

opens the doors of higher offices to the inept, the corrupted rich, and the wicked."²⁰

The principle of freedom of enterprise was radically opposed to the then prevailing monopolistic system which, in the physiocrats' eyes, was a serious hindrance to commerce, and Turgot even diagnosed this system of monopoly as the major cause of the American Revolution.²¹ He therefore rejoiced with his colleagues at the prospect of American independence, because the new country would then prove to the whole world the obsolescence of the monopolistic system and the validity of the principles of liberty. This alone, he predicted, would have innumerable and far-reaching consequences, in fact nothing short of a complete remapping of the world. First, it would force all countries not only to abandon all control over their colonies and to treat them as equals, but also to apply the same economic principles in their relations with one another, and to abolish all restrictions stifling commerce and industry within their own borders.²² And, last but not least,

When the total separation of America shall have compelled all the world to recognize this truth, and shall have corrected European nations of the jealousy of commerce, there will exist one great cause of war the less, and it is difficult not to desire an event (the independence of America) that must bring about this benefit for the human race.²³

Turgot was pained to see that Spain did not seem ready gracefully to accede to the loss of her colonies, and he sadly foretold that, by vainly trying to avoid the inevitable, she would ultimately precipitate her own ruin.²⁴ He therefore invited all countries willingly to share their freedom with their colonies, and thereby maintain good relations with them, rather than to antagonize them and force the settlers to fight for independence.²⁵

When dealing with the probable future of the other European colonies in South America, Turgot displayed again an uncanny sense of foresight. In his "Memoir to the King," he all but spelled out what would become one of the basic tenets of American foreign policy in the

nineteenth century, when he casually predicts that the Anglo-Americans, once they had achieved their independence, would "very likely seek to incite the Spanish settlers to follow their example and shake the yoke of the mother country."²⁶ It does not take too much imagination to see in this statement the seeds of the Monroe Doctrine. He also foresaw that, for reasons of security, America could not be satisfied with its 1778 boundaries and would be forced to expand westward all the way to the Pacific.²⁷

There was one important issue on which Turgot radically differed with his physiocratic colleagues, namely their insistence on the necessity for an enlightened despot. Indeed, even in their wildest dreams, many of the *philosophes* stopped short of absolute democracy, for they lacked confidence in the masses; they would have been quite content with a philosopher king. However, when they realized that even moderately educated people could choose such outstanding personalities for their leaders as, for example, Franklin, they relented somewhat, and Turgot himself felt that the form of government the Americans would eventually adopt would prove successful judging "from the prudence that has as yet presided at the conduct of the Americans, from the courage and enlightenment diffused among them, and from their confidence in the wise counsels of the celebrated Franklin."²⁸ Here again Turgot relied on the Americans to

prove to the world, as a fact, that men can be both free and peaceable, and can dispense with the trammels of all sorts which tyrants and charlatans of every guise have presumed to impose under the pretext of public safety. They must provide the example of political liberty.²⁹

As was clearly implied in the preceding quotation, the political future of America was interesting not only in itself, but also because of the impact it would have on the rest of the world. At the very least, "the asylum which America affords to the oppressed of all nations will console the world,"³⁰ an opinion shared equally by Diderot.³¹ Both men hoped, however, that people would not have to resort to such extreme measures as emigration and they

trusted that the rulers of all countries would be able to draw a lesson from what was happening:

. . . may the Revolution which has just taken place overseas . . . instruct those who govern men on the legitimate use of their power.³²

The facility of profiting by it (America's political asylum) in making escape from the consequences of bad government possible, will compel the European powers to be just, and to see things as they are. The rest of the world will, by degrees, have its eyes opened to the dispersion of the illusions amidst which politicians have been cradled.³³

In point of fact, even if rulers were stubborn enough to persist in ignoring the message, it had already fallen upon very receptive ears, and had started men thinking. This, indeed, could have very serious consequences. Of Dickinson's *Letters to an American Farmer*, Diderot stated:

I have been somewhat surprised to see the translation of these *Letters* appear here. I know of no other work more capable of instructing the people in their inalienable rights and of inspiring in them a love of liberty. Because Dickinson was writing for Americans, they did not conceive that his *Letters* were addressed to all men . . . They allow us to read things like this, and they are amazed to find us ten years later different men. Do they not realize how easily noble souls must drink of these principles and become intoxicated by them.³⁴

Economic and political perfection would inevitably result in moral and social improvements which, again, would make America a model for others to imitate. Such sentiments, however, were hardly anything new, since, apart from a few dissident voices, most of the *philosophes* had always looked upon the English colonies in the New World as the epitome of good, free and clean living. As we have already observed, the *physiocrats*—not to mention Rousseau and his followers—were convinced that life in the country and the cultivation of the land were more appropriate to the preservation of the true and manly virtues than

were life in the city and its resultant industrial complex. By praising William Penn and the religious tolerance and civil liberty of his Quaker State, Voltaire himself had in no small way contributed to this image of the good and happy American settler.³⁵ Turgot painted a similar idealized picture of North America when, in 1750, he eulogized the colonies as follows:

Equality has banished from them poverty and luxury, and preserves there, with liberty, virtue and simplicity of manners. Our arts will spread themselves there without our vices.³⁶

In this last sentence, Turgot assumed a position sharply traverse to that championed by Rousseau in his *Discourse on the Arts and Sciences*, published a few months earlier. Rousseau maintained that the development of the arts and sciences had led to luxury and corruption. Turgot, on the other hand, asserted his faith in the Americans' ability to build a civilization which would make possible a simple and virtuous life without surrendering the advantages to be derived from progress. In this respect again, Turgot was well ahead of his time. One of the major dilemmas of the eighteenth century was that of reconciling Voltaire with Rousseau, i.e. a reconciliation of reason, enlightenment and progress with a simple, natural and virtuous mode of life. It was not until the arrival of Benjamin Franklin in 1767, that the rest of France came to realize that there was indeed a solution to this dilemma. Because of his intellectual and moral qualities, as well as his statesmanship, Franklin was, in the eyes of France, the living proof of that solution.³⁷

As an aside, we might call to mind here that it was Turgot who composed the Latin verse which adorns Franklin's portrait: *Eripuit coele fulmen, sceptrumque tyrannis* (From the sky he stole his fire, and from the tyrant his scepter). Louis XVI had the portrait and verse reproduced on the inner bottom of a chamber pot which he presented to a countess, whose boundless admiration for Franklin somewhat annoyed the king. Turgot's admiration for the American "philosophe" was not totally unmitigated however; he was particularly incensed by

Franklin's assiduous wooing of an old flame of his—Mme d'Helvetius—thereby proving that, well into his seventies, the scientist had not yet exhausted all his celestial fire!

This utopian picture of America was promoted by groups of intellectuals who, although enlightened, were occasionally prone to exaggerations: the magnification of American virtues was the direct result of a concentrated effort to demonstrate the validity of certain French ideals. This is evidenced in the so-called translation of the *Letters of an American Farmer* by Saint-John de Creve-Coeur, who was pressured by the members of the Salon of Mme d'Houdetot, a leading *Américaniste*, to modify whole sections of the original to make it more perfectly conform to their idea of America. With some semblance of truth, Durand Echeverria has compared this attitude to that of the Communists of the 1950's toward Russia.³⁸ In all fairness it must be admitted that people like Franklin, in order to gain the support of the "philosophes," did everything to help them identify their own social and political ideals with America.³⁹

Turgot on the other hand, seems to have been more level-headed. He was quite aware that a great gulf exists between theory and practice. He realized further that for their dreams to come true, the Americans would have to devise a system of government founded on "nature, reason and justice,"⁴⁰ three of the key words of the Enlightenment. Thus, in 1778, he again posed the questions:

Will this people be able to form such a constitution? Will they be able to establish it on permanent foundations and to ward off all the causes of division and of corruption which can undermine it little by little and destroy it?⁴¹

In 1776, he did not attempt to answer these questions, but, as we have seen, his expectations and hopes for the wisdom of the American people were of the highest order. Two years later, however, in a letter to Dr. Price, he had to confess his sad disappointment.

As an economist, Turgot felt that the American colonies had fallen short of what was to be expected of them. First, none of the various

state constitutions which had come to his attention, had adopted the physiocratic principle of distinguishing, for the purpose of tax assessment, between those who owned land and those who did not. Secondly, all forms of taxes—individual taxes, sales taxes, taxes on imported products, etc.—were levied indiscriminately, in spite of Economists' claim that direct taxation was the only justifiable one, since the whole financial burden of a State eventually devolves on landowners. Finally, too many legal and administrative bodies were empowered to regulate commercial transactions, thereby demonstrating that the framers of the constitutions were still far from realizing that "the total liberty of commerce is a corollary to the right of property."⁴² Even more alarming, however, was the fact that there was no uniform model by which to regulate the commercial policies of the various states, nor a centralizing authority by means of which all would join forces to achieve a common goal. On the contrary, each state was left to fend for itself, each was free to decide where its own private interest lay, without consideration for the common good of all the thirteen colonies. This, in Turgot's opinion, posed a serious threat to the very life of the confederation.⁴³

As was to be expected, Turgot discerned the same slackness in the political machinery proposed by the new constitutions. He was amazed to see that practically all of them were founded on the principles of the separation and balance of powers, a system which, in his eyes, was justified only in a monarchy, in order to counterbalance "the enormous preponderance of the royalty,"⁴⁴ but one which ought never to become the basis of a republican state founded on the equality of all citizens. Any separation of powers not only weakened the central and supreme authority—*i. e.*, that of the nation—but was also a cause of internal divisions as a result of the different bodies it created. It is not as if Turgot did not believe in the delegation of power; he envisioned this, however, on a vertical rather than a horizontal plane, as a hierarchy of assemblies, from local to general, interacting with one another. In this, he followed a plan of administrative reform that he and his physiocratic friend Dupont de Nemours had

previously submitted to the king during his tenure as Finance Minister.⁴⁵

Furthermore, Turgot thought that the framers of the American constitution had not done enough to “reduce to the smallest number possible the kind of affairs of which the government of each state could take charge,”⁴⁶ because, as he had already stated in 1753, “every exercise of authority that goes beyond what is really necessary is a tyranny.”⁴⁷

It was undoubtedly on the social plane, however, that Turgot and the *philosophes* suffered their most bitter disappointment, a disillusion which, as it has already been pointed out,⁴⁸ they brought upon themselves by their insistence on interpreting the American War of Independence as a social rather than a political revolution. Their greatest disappointment concerned two major points which ranked high on the list of priorities in enlightened circles. First was the fact that, in the country which they considered to be the land of religious tolerance *par excellence* a religious oath was required of each elected officer in practically every state—even, paradoxically enough, in the Quaker State—and some states went as far as to declare members of the clergy ineligible for public office. In this also Turgot discerned a source of divisions, since it would create groups with separate interests within the State. Another such cause of division was the large number of black slaves since, in his own words, “slavery is incompatible with a good constitution.”⁴⁹ In 1788, the *Mercure de France* would again raise the same doubts as to the sincerity of the Americans’ convictions:

The friends of justice and humanity will be perhaps astonished to learn that in the United States, in that asylum of peace, happiness and liberty, which has so often reechoed to those sacred words ‘All men are created equal’, there still are today nearly seven hundred thousand slaves.⁵⁰

If Turgot was not quite as harsh in his judgment, it was because he could very well comprehend the dilemma confronting America: either the social status of the slaves was to remain unchanged, thus posing a crucial moral and social problem, or they were to be set free,

in which case they might present a threat to the union by forming a second nation within the one body politic.⁵¹

This indeed was one of the *philosophes*’ main concerns: the preservation of a strong confederation in America. Turgot feared lest the variety of laws, customs and opinions among the states would prove a formidable obstacle to the union.⁵² He was nonetheless hopeful that the imperfections of the separate constitutions would be eliminated when, at the end of the war, all the states could leisurely turn their undivided attention to the framing of a federal constitution.⁵³ He did not live to see this realization, and it is perhaps just as well, since those who did, those who were counting on the Constitutional Convention to remedy the situation, were once again disappointed, as Lafayette reported to Washington:

The American people, so enlightened, so wise, so noble, after having so successfully scaled the steep cliff, now stumble on the easy path.⁵⁴

The expectations of the *philosophes* had, in many instances, been raised too high for them calmly to resign themselves to the shattering of their most cherished dreams. They had hailed the birth of the new country as the advent of a political and social paradise which would lead the world into a new age of universal happiness, and thus realize the ideal they had envisaged. When America failed to fulfill their expectations, their friendship soured and they vented their frustrations in biting and sarcastic statements such as this one in the *Mercure de France* of March 1, 1788:

The praise which the partisans of aristocracy in Europe continue to give to this proposed constitution is sufficient to let the Americans know what they may expect from this form of government now proposed to them.⁵⁵

As for Turgot, he may have been one of the very first to express his disappointment, but he was also quick to find excuses for the Americans and to attribute the shortcomings of their first attempts at self-government to their reliance on

inherited prejudices. He trusted that they would eventually rid themselves of the "mists of European illusions"⁵⁶ and, one day, open their eyes to the dictates of "nature, reason and justice."⁵⁷ He was confident that they would, in the end, surmount all the obstacles confronting them. It could be said that, by dying even before the end of the war, he was spared all the bitterness and frustration that plagued some of his fellow *philosophes* at the time. It may also

be argued, however, that after fifteen years as an administrator, and after his own resounding failure at implementing his plan for social and political reform in France, he was enough of a realist to reconcile himself with the facts and put the American Revolution and its momentous consequences in a proper perspective: even though it did not quite measure up to the *philosophes'* expectations, it was nonetheless a giant step forward in the history of humanity.

¹Montesquieu, "Notes sur l'Angleterre," *Oeuvres complètes*, Roger Caillois ed. (Paris, Gallimard) I, 833. *Journal et Mémoires du Marquis d'Argenson*, E.J.B. Rathery ed., I (Paris, 1869), pp. 1v-1vi. ²"Tableau philosophique des progrès successifs de l'esprit humain," *Oeuvres de Turgot et Documents le concernant*, Gustave Schelle, ed., Paris, Librairie Félix Alcan (1913-1923), I, 222, (author's translation). Unless otherwise indicated, the English translations of the passages of Turgot are extracted from W. Walker Stephens, *The Life and Writings of Turgot, Comptroller General of France, 1774-1776* (London and New York, Longmans, Green and Co., 1895; New York, Burt Franklin, 1971); likewise, unless otherwise indicated, I relied on Durand Echeverria's translations (*Mirage in the West: a History of the French Image of American Society to 1815*, Princeton University Press, 1957) for the passages borrowed from the *philosophes*. ³Diderot, "Sur les Lettres d'un fermier de Pensylvanie," *Oeuvres complètes*, Assézat et Tourneux ed. (Paris, 1875-1877), IV, 87 (author's translation). ⁴"Lettre au Docteur Price sur les constitutions américaines," March 22, 1778, *Oeuvres*, V, 534. ⁵Discours sur les avantages que l'établissement du Christianisme a procurés au genre humain," *Oeuvres*, I, 207-208. ⁶Durand Echeverria, *Mirage in the West*, 63-64. ⁷"Réflexions à l'occasion d'un Mémoire remis par de Vergennes au Roi sur la manière dont la France et l'Espagne doivent envisager les suites de la querelle entre la Grande-Bretagne et ses colonies," April 1776, hereafter referred to as "Mémoire au Roi," *Oeuvres*, V, 406. ⁸"Lettre au Roi," April 30, 1776, *Oeuvres*, V, 454. ⁹*Oeuvres complètes de d'Alembert* (Paris, Belin, 1821-1822; Slatkine Reprints, Genève, 1967), V, 372. ¹⁰"Mémoire au Roi," *Oeuvres*, V, 385-386. ¹¹Lettre à Dupont de Nemours, April 1, 1777, *Oeuvres*, V, 521. (author's translation) ¹²"Mémoire au Roi," *Oeuvres*, V, 416. (Author's translation) ¹³*Ibid.*, 400. ¹⁴Lettre au Docteur Price," *Oeuvres*, V, 539.

¹⁵Louis Sébastien Mercier, *De la Littérature et des littérateurs* (Yverdon, 1778), p. 19. ¹⁶Condorcet, *l'Influence de la Révolution américaine sur les opinions et la législation de l'Europe* (Paris, 1786), p. 13. ¹⁷Lettre au Docteur Tucker, September 12, 1770, *Oeuvres*, III, 422. ¹⁸"Mémoire pour Franklin," 1777, *Oeuvres*, V, 510-519. ¹⁹"Mémoire au Roi," *Oeuvres*, V, 392. ²⁰Diderot, "Essai sur les règnes de Claude et de Néron," *Oeuvres complètes*, III, 324-325. (author's translation) ²¹Lettre au Docteur Price," *Oeuvres*, V, 533. ²²"Mémoire au Roi," *Oeuvres*, V, 416. ²³*Ibid.*, 398. ²⁴*Ibid.*, 400. ²⁵*Ibid.*, 416. ²⁶*Ibid.*, 399. (author's translation) ²⁷"Lettre au Docteur Price," *Oeuvres*, V, 538. ²⁸"Mémoire au Roi," *Oeuvres*, V, 391. ²⁹Lettre au Docteur Price," *Oeuvres*, V, 539. ³⁰*Ibid.* ³¹Diderot, "Essai sur les règnes de Claude et de Néron," *Oeuvres complètes*, III, 324. ³²*Ibid.* ³³"Lettre au Docteur Price," *Oeuvres*, V, 539. ³⁴Diderot, "Sur les Lettres d'un fermier de Pensylvanie," *Oeuvres*, IV, 88-89. ³⁵Voltaire, *Lettres Philosophiques*, lettres i-iv. ³⁶Discours sur les avantages que l'établissement du Christianisme a procurés au genre humain," *Oeuvres*, I, 205. ³⁷Durand Echeverria, *Mirage in the West*, 151. ³⁸*Ibid.*, 145-146. ³⁹*Ibid.*, 23. ⁴⁰"Lettre au Dr. Price," *Oeuvres*, V, 534. ⁴¹*Ibid.*, 534. ⁴²*Ibid.*, 536. ⁴³*Ibid.* ⁴⁴*Ibid.*, 535. ⁴⁵"Mémoire sur les municipalités," *Oeuvres*, V, 568-621. ⁴⁶"Lettre au Docteur Price," *Oeuvres*, V, 535. ⁴⁷"Lettre sur la tolérance," *Oeuvres*, I, 412. ⁴⁸Durand Echeverria, *Mirage in the West*, 70. ⁴⁹"Lettre au Docteur Price," *Oeuvres*, V, 538. ⁵⁰*Mercur de France*, March 1, 1788. ⁵¹"Lettre au Docteur Price," *Oeuvres*, V, 538. ⁵²*Ibid.*, 536. ⁵³*Ibid.*, 537-538. ⁵⁴Lafayette, *Mémoires, Correspondance et Manuscrits* (Paris, H. Fournier Aîné, 1837-1838), lettre au Général Washington, Aug. 3, 1787, II, 203. ⁵⁵*Mercur de France*, March 1, 1788. ⁵⁶"Lettre au Docteur Price," *Oeuvres*, V, 536. ⁵⁷*Ibid.*, 534.