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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

INTERPRETING THE TALLEYRAND REPORT OF 1791

If you have never dreamed of history with a document in hand, you cannot be a historian. — Braudel

Socialization, revolution, and the history of schooling

Schools have always been agents of socialization to one degree or another, and they are not the only institutions of socialization in society. This dissertation is restricted to socialization processes in schools during the early modern era of French history up to the time of the early stages of the Revolution. Its purpose is to provide socio-cultural and historical explanations for characteristics of formal school socialization processes relative to the rise of secularization and democracy in Western culture.

Use of the term socialization process in this study refers to the internalization of values and norms that make up standards of morality. This internalization process can take many forms within the formal school setting. It can involve strict indoctrination in a
catechetical and highly disciplined manner, or it can consist of a constructivist approach to learning that allows for student inquiry free from inculcation and authoritarian restraints. Socialization processes can never be completely free of preordained conceptions, however, because the purpose of socialization processes is to pass on to youth social and cultural values deemed worthwhile or necessary by the adult members of society.

Socialization becomes a problematic concern when conflicting values arise. Historically, when those with power and influence over education have recognized the existence of conflicting values in the community, they have had to make decisions about how to resolve this conflict as it may exist or potentially exist in the curriculum and culture of schools. Ultimately, these become political choices influenced by cultural traditions, individual beliefs, and social structural relations between schools and other social institutions.

Early in the 16th century, which we may consider to be the beginning of the early modern era in French education, municipal schools were established by city officials who set out to transmit the values of secular humanism as derived from the classical works of the ancients. The school culture in these municipal colleges (colléges), through their organizational structure of
age-grading and curriculum differentiation, transmitted values associated with an efficient orderliness and bodily discipline, not hitherto known in the traditional medieval schools of the church. Conflict developed between church and town officials in competition for students. It involved a conflict of values in the two curricula, one Roman Catholic in emphasis, the other secular in nature.

This conflict heated up with the advent of the Protestant Reformation. The Catholic church, in attempting to stem the tide of both secular humanism and the Protestant heresy, refused to support the municipal colleges of the Renaissance and created its own curriculum and schools to counter any progress Protestantism or secularization might make in the schools of France. In doing so, the church and its teaching orders took over most of the municipal schools as their own. The urban bourgeois values of efficient orderliness transmitted through disciplinary practices and the hierarchical organization of the curriculum were adopted by the clerical educators. They also retained the classical curriculum. In order to dispel any real effect which the pagan and republican themes of classical literature might have upon the minds of students, socialization processes were developed to instill Catholic orthodoxy.
These processes involved the development, within Catholic school culture, of rigorous discipline and time on task schedules, prayers and Christian artwork, and religious rituals, including attendance at chapel or the local church. In the curriculum, various Catholic catechisms were used, and classical literature was interpreted by teachers so that the values of the Christian faith displaced those of the ancients which were in conflict with Christian and monarchical values.

In this way, the values of Christian orthodoxy and of monarchical absolutism dominated French education down to the period of the Revolution. The transmission of these values reflected the social and political structure that existed prior to the Revolution, as well as a dominant ideology based on particular philosophical and theological principles. It was only with the rise of a new secular ideology, and political and social changes of the Revolution, that democratic and secular values began to successfully compete with the Christian and absolutist values of the ancien régime in educational institutions. One of the most important declarations of the new secular and democratic values of the Revolution, in their application to education and socialization processes in schools, is the Talleyrand Report of 1791.
The Talleyrand Report and moral education

Moral values derived from 18th century conceptions of nationalism, utilitarianism, meritocracy, and democracy have provided socialization processes with their particular content and form in modern democratic school systems. To acquire an understanding of these values in one national-historical context in which they arose (that of the French Revolution), is to gain deeper insight into the secularization of modern education and its relationship to nationalism.

With this insight comes a better understanding of the conflicting values that persist in the schools and the social order of modern democracies. Most important are conflicting values in regard to defining the national interest. In education, this means making choices about formal school socialization processes that will foster the public interest at the same time democratic values of individual freedom and choice are respected. Designs for education that arose during the French Revolution gave primacy to the transmission of values, in the form of a revolutionary secular morality originating in a science of freedom. The secular science of morality offered a way to resolve the potential conflicts within the new democracy. The first time this secular morality was integrated into a
national educational design by a revolutionary government of France was in the Talleyrand Report.

The formal title of the Talleyrand Report is *Rapport sur l’Instruction publique, fait au nom du Comité de Constitution à l’Assemblée Nationale les 10, 11, et 19 septembre 1791, par M. de Talleyrand-Perigord*.¹ The document will henceforth be referred to as *L’Instruction publique* or the Talleyrand Report. *L’Instruction publique* is the single source of historical inquiry in this study which concerns the French Revolution, moral education, and the state.

The Talleyrand Report provides evidence of the values and expectations of the early revolutionaries, particularly those who made up the National Assembly, also known as the National Constituent Assembly, which held power between 1789 and 1791. It is the major educational work of the National Assembly, a group which most importantly, gave France its first democratic constitution, including the *Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen*.

*L’Instruction publique* is a plan for a national system of education with particular emphasis upon formal socialization processes. These processes are intended to motivate youth to defend the new constitution and with it the new nation, at the peril of their lives if need be.
By including the Declaration in this socialization process, the door was opened, however, to conflicting values between direct democracy, representative democracy, and national interests. Therefore, one important virtue espoused by the revolutionaries was that of recognizing the limitations of freedom and direct democracy which were not clearly expressed in the Declaration. This effort was to be achieved through an educational socialization process that involved "scientific" methods of education, as well as a socio-political catechism, both in accordance with a secular science of society anterior to the constitution.

The concept of a secular science of society, as found in *L'Instruction publique*, was not only applied to problems of democracy. It also encompassed social virtues related to utilitarianism, meritocracy, secular humanism, and nationalism. Civic virtues in the Talleyrand Report that are associated with national utility (nationalism and utilitarianism), derive from a reform movement in education begun a half century prior to the Revolution. Virtues associated with meritocracy and secular humanism derive from school culture and a curriculum dating to the beginning of the early modern era. Therefore, behind the revolutionary and functional purposes of the Talleyrand Report lies a history of social, cultural, intellectual,
and political factors that provide explanations of the socialization processes and secular ideology found in the Talleyrand Report. These explanations provide answers to the primary inquiries of this study—How is it that virtue came to be defined by the state for formal educational institutions in 1791? And, why did the revolutionaries choose to transmit the specific values that can be identified in the socialization processes proposed in *L’Instruction publique*?

Although virtue is practically synonymous with moral education in this study, the two terms can also be distinguished for analytical purposes. Virtue differs from morality in that virtue implies right action, in the form of specific behaviors and ways of thinking. Political examples might include running for public office or deciding to vote for an unpopular measure that is, nevertheless, perceived to be in the public interest. Morality is about the basis for right action founded in specific values that denote standards of desirable and undesirable action. Examples of these are democratic, utilitarian, meritocratic, and nationalistic values that made up the revolutionary model of civic and social morality.

For the men of the 18th century, "virtue" could mean different things depending upon the context of its use.
For in the course of the Enlightenment virtue came to mean, much as it does today, general moral excellence. Thus it could relate to proper conduct and good character, or consistent work habits and sound judgements. It meant more than mere instruction as in the acquisition of fluency in communication or knowledge of specific subject matter. It implied broad goals for both individual development and socialization of the individual. This is what was meant by the use of the term "instruction" in L'Instruction publique. This is why it is a document about moral education as much as it is a document about the organization of a national curriculum and a national administration.

Although L'Instruction publique addresses virtue in the broad sense noted above, its value is also in providing insight into specific "revolutionary" virtues supported by the dominant group within the National Assembly. For these revolutionaries virtue included selfless republican virtues of the ancient Latin moralists, particularly of the Stoics, to which the revolutionaries had been schooled in their youth. On the other hand, revolutionary virtues associated with the new constitutional government gave form to more modern conceptions of civic virtue, including Rousseauian ideas.
Paradoxically, Catholic and monarchical doctrines, although limited in scope, were retained by these early revolutionaries as part of the national educational system. Neither institutions had been rejected completely by the revolutionaries for reasons that related to national cultural heritage and political events of the early Revolution. This admixture of revolutionary with traditional values led to fundamental contradictions within the curriculum proposed in *L'Instruction publique*, reflecting the contradictions in the social order of the revolutionary constitutional monarchy. In the end these contradictions helped split the state apart shortly after the early triumphs of the Revolution.

The most obvious reason that the French state came to define virtue in 1791, and to plan for state control over education in general, was the creation of the revolutionary constitution of the Constituent Assembly. This would, after all, be in keeping with the intellectual origins of modern constitutionalism. Constitutional government, according to Montesquieu, necessitated virtue in order to function effectively. Both Montesquieu and Helvétius assumed a new educational system would be required if the constitution of government was changed. However, the teaching of constitutional virtues does not necessarily require a state system of education. For it
is feasible for institutions other than the state, private or local schools for example, to reinforce the values associated with a national constitution. It could also be claimed, theoretically, in contradistinction to Montesquieu's view, that the democratic state need not be compelled to define democratic virtues nor even ensure that non-state agencies do so, as long as values taught in schools are not a threat to the constitution nor to the government in power.

To fully answer why the Constituent Assembly felt the state should be compelled to define virtue and to institute moral education in schools in 1791, social and cultural interpretations of *L'Instruction publique* are required in addition to standard narrative accounts of people, ideas, and events. What follows is a review of some key moral issues in the Talleyrand Report as addressed in educational histories written about education and the French Revolution. Following this is an examination of the role which specific socio-cultural theories play in attempting to answer the central inquiries of this study.

**Historians and the Talleyrand Report**

After the Revolution and the rise of Napoleon, plans for education in civic virtues associated with democracy
were generally held in abeyance until the Third Republic. Indicative of the renewed attention to republicanism and education for democracy at this time were the writing of histories that focused on the works of education written by the revolutionaries of 1789. Two histories in particular from the 1880’s reflect partisan interpretations of the values of democracy and of the integration of these values in educational processes. The Talleyrand Report is of particular significance in these histories.

C. Hippeau expressed the republican viewpoint in the introduction to his collection of educational documents from the Revolution. He counseled as follows: "the deputies, the senators, the members of the new Superior Council on Public Instruction, will imbibe here new arguments to oppose to those of their colleagues, who, do not share their profound faith in republican institutions. . ." Hippeau emphasized what has become an acknowledged fact about the revolutionary plans and moral education—that in the educational plans of the revolutionaries is a consensus to establish a secular, civil society, in both the political and moral spheres. To highlight the general nature of this revolutionary view, Hippeau emphasized the attention given to a new "science of morality" in the Talleyrand Report. It was
with the Enlightenment's concept of a science of morality that the revolutionaries planned to institutionalize educational secularization at the time of the Revolution.

A year after the publication of Hippeau's work, another appeared, by Albert Duruy, which was much less sanguine about the reports of the revolutionaries. Duruy's major concern was about the institutionalization of curriculum practices compatible with democracy. In particular, he criticized the proposal for the democratic participation of students in school policy-making as serving zealous political purposes that would lead to dysfunctional outcomes. He suggested that Talleyrand's curriculum placed such a strong emphasis upon the constitution and secular morality that "the primary aim of schooling seemed to be to create apprentice citizens in the classroom, to such a degree that making an honnête homme was not enough, and worse, it would create anarchy and disruption in the process."  

Duruy's criticism identifies the most compelling feature of the secular morality in L'Instruction publique, and that is its link with the politicization of moral education and its close ties to democratic constitutionalism. Duruy, who feared the implications which democratic constitutionalism might have in the classroom, claimed Talleyrand's plan represented the
"emancipation of the child, and in this way the destruction of all discipline," making Talleyrand "the editor of the most anarchic and destructive doctrine."⁶

Duruy made another important and partisan observation when he marveled at the rigorous, deductive manner and geometric form with which Talleyrand unfolded his scheme. Duruy suggests that this logical rigor is in reality an "imposing facade" which is a deception because of lacunas in the plan which would make it impractical to implement.⁷ Certainly, from a practical viewpoint, the report does suffer from particular inadequacies that have been noted by historians as well as by Talleyrand's contemporaries. These weaknesses, however, are perhaps inherent in any educational treatise of such scope, especially those, like the Talleyrand Report, which are political as well as practical in purpose. Hippeau, in recognizing the report's shortcomings, also identified the importance of what Duruy called an "imposing facade" when he stated: "We have in this report which offers the majority of qualities and unfortunately some of the faults of academic discourses, a brilliant example of the doctrines of the Constituent Assembly."⁸ It is from these doctrines that both the values and ideologies of the Constituent Assembly can be deduced.
Sharing the view of Duruy was Augustin Sicard who also concentrated attention on Talleyrand's school democracy plan. Sicard, an apologist for ancien regime education, noted with contempt that Talleyrand was not merely content with teaching the constitution to students, but wished also to implement it by introducing the representative system into the schools. He condemned this idea as dangerous because it was similar to preaching revolt against teachers. He also considered the idea naive and found it ironic that a man who was never known as naive should have proposed such a plan.

Thirty years after Hippeau, Duruy, and Sicard wrote their histories, Compayré examined the revolutionary doctrines in *L'Instruction publique* and discovered what he considered a fundamental contradiction in its plan for moral education. This contradiction is as follows: Talleyrand proposes, on the one hand, a new science of morality that will lead to advances in the understanding of human relationships, which as a source of moral progress, will also lead to changes in the constitution. This will be done, according to *L'Instruction publique*, by teaching the young "to know, to love and to perfect the constitution" by learning a constitutional catechism. How then can one declare perfectible and by consequence provisional the same constitution which is the primary
object of the catechism without discrediting the authority of the constitution? This query by Compayré implies a belief that it is either impossible or undesirable for young children to conceive of and to respect a provisional authority, in particular, a democratic constitution susceptible to change by the people or their representatives. Therefore, what most concerned Compayré about the catechism was not that elementary students should learn about rights and duties, but that they should also be taught that the constitution is provisional such that the rights and duties they learn today may change tomorrow. On the other hand, Compayré noted the limitations of a secular catechism when he stated that it substitutes "l'exageration de l'idée religieuse" with "l'exagération de l'idée politique".

What escaped Talleyrand and the majority of men of the Revolution, according to Compayré, is that the results they wanted require a long and slow instruction, not a catechism. "Love of the constitution of the country is not a science that one can learn by heart, like history or geography." The way that Talleyrand dealt with this contradiction was to devise two different methods of teaching morality, one appropriate for primary education necessary for everyone and another appropriate for secondary education for a select few. By way of
implication in *L'Instruction publique*, the constitutional catechism was intended for the former, while for the latter a more thorough instruction was recommended including democratic participation in school polity. It is significant to note that Talleyrand's plan for two different approaches to teaching civic virtues, with participation at the secondary level restricted to a few, indicates the importance of the relationship between socialization and selection processes. For only a select few will be socialized to thoroughly understand the higher civic virtues according to *L'Instruction publique*.

Compayré did not consider the democratic approach Talleyrand proposed for secondary education and seems to have favored avoidance of the subject of democratic constitutionalism altogether. For at one point, he asks if it is even necessary to consider the idea of revising laws and the idea of political progress as an object of education. But who then will change and perfect the constitution? And how will they know how to do so? For Compayré the answer is uncertain, but for the revolutionaries it is apparent that it would be a ruling elite who learned the political skills to perfect the constitution by practicing them in secondary school.

The most fundamental idea of democratic constitutionalism is that people (usually through their
representatives) can make and change laws and constitutions. For those who find it necessary to base morality upon abstract moral principles, it is difficult to perceive a high moral ground in a society which offers an opportunity for citizens to be able to pledge allegiance to different constitutions when given an opportunity to do so in their lifetime. This is the perspective from which Compayré judges Talleyrand and his plan. And he does so in a manner similar to many biographers of Talleyrand, who find in his multiple allegiances an opportunity for criticism. Compayré shows himself to be in league with these writers when he states that all his life Talleyrand had a "marvelous aptitude to know, to love and to defend the constitution: unfortunately, it was not always the same constitution!" 

Compayré's judgment of Talleyrand's character is in keeping with his judgment about the provisional nature of civic morality in *L'Instruction publique*. His primary concern, which is about social order, is the basis for his criticism and as such resembles criticisms of the report offered by Duruy and Sicard. Although only Sicard was an apologist of the ancien regime, all three historians reflect the concern with discipline and order which so preoccupied ancien regime educators. Their views stand in contrast to Hippeau's recommendation that much good can be
learned from the revolutionary plans. In general, however, these French historians identified the key elements of the revolutionary concept of morality by drawing attention to the secular and political nature of moral education expressed in *L'Instruction publique*.

Although the partisan debates in the late 19th century histories appear to be centered on different conceptions of what secular moral education should be like, it must not be forgotten that religious definitions of virtue and church influence over moral education only gradually lost ground to educational secularization during the course of the 19th century. Likewise in the eighteenth century, it was in the context of confrontation with church control over education, particularly moral education, that Talleyrand defined secular virtues and devised a state system of education. What made *L'Instruction publique* revolutionary was not, however, the elimination of religious education, but the subordination of religious values and monarchistic values to democratic constitutional values. In this early, milder stage of Revolution, when a democratic constitutional monarchy was established, partisan politics had not yet split asunder the synthesis of religion, constitutionalism, and monarchy; but it did considerably subordinate religion and monarchy to democratic politics.
Twentieth century historians of education and the Revolution have been less inclined to explore the moral concepts in the revolutionary designs for education. Rather, they have concentrated on the 18th century reform movement literature and on social factors (based on research in the Annales tradition) prior to the revolutionary plans.

Two English writing historians, H. C. Barnard, in 1969, and R. R. Palmer, in 1985, published histories of education and the Revolution which utilized most of the important educational research of the modern French historians.¹⁶ Their accounts of the revolutionary plans, like those in the French histories after Compayré, are basically summaries of the various designs and avoid thorough analysis of individual texts. This, of course, reflects their purpose to provide a narrative about education and the Revolution in the context of 18th century political, social, and educational events leading up to the Revolution. Thus existing research and social histories about 18th century France and the Revolution have not been fully applied to the Talleyrand Report, nor in particular to the recommendations for moral education it contains. When addressing the Talleyrand Report specifically, historians have continued to treat it as an exemplary constitutional document, but have not applied
the available research to an in-depth political, social, and cultural analysis of the plan for moral education, which is the aim of this study.

Applying socio-cultural theory and research to an analysis of *L'Instruction publique* provides a means to, in Alfred Cobban's words, "present causal explanations according to complex interrelationships." This effort is called for, according to Cobban, because "all possible single causal explanations of the Revolution may have been exhausted." The explanations of this study are based on interrelationships derived from combining traditional biographical and historical narrative with socio-cultural analyses that have not traditionally been applied to *L'Instruction publique*. The intent is to combine traditional and social histories of education as expressed in the following passage:

> Concerned for a great while with the pioneering activities and writings of individual educators and with the legal and constitutional framework on which our present educational system was constructed, historians of education are now increasingly addressing themselves to education as an activity of men in society.\(^{18}\)

In this study, analysis of select ideas in *L'Instruction publique*, based on the social and cultural activities of educators and revolutionaries, will provide a socio-cultural interpretation of one example of the legal and
constitutional framework upon which modern educational systems have been constructed.

Socio-cultural history and the Talleyrand Report

The social and cultural concepts used in this analysis of moral education in *L'Instruction publique* derive from two traditions within the history of education: cultural history and social history. Cultural history has been the more traditional approach, often explaining reform movements in education in terms of historical events, particular circumstances and social needs. Social historians, on the other hand, explain changes in education in terms of structural patterns of social organization including demands of social and economic life, socialized preconceptions of society, and the interests of classes for maintaining social stability.¹⁹ Two specific historical accounts of the French Revolution, one a cultural interpretation by Lynn Hunt and the other, a sociological study by Margaret Archer provide the theoretical basis for a social and cultural interpretation of the ideas and plans for moral education in *L'Instruction publique*.

Archer, working in the tradition of Max Weber, has interpreted the Revolution based on the structural relations between education and other social institutions.
Implicit in her analysis is the supposition that a theory of educational change requires a study of the structural relations of education with other social institutions, because education is never a completely autonomous institution—it is always related closely to at least one other. A group or groups with dominant influence over education will thus not be narrowly educational in nature. For example, prior to the Revolution, the Catholic church dominated education in France through a monopoly on resources (teachers and schools) and through influence on the curriculum.

Religious domination over education was challenged by the bourgeoisie and liberal aristocrats to a limited degree prior to the Revolution, and then, to a greater extent during the Revolution. This challenge brought with it the integration of education more closely with political and economic institutions. In particular, under the Constituent Assembly, education became integrated with the state, although the Talleyrand Report did not recommend a complete monopoly by the state. Rather, the plan made provisions for schools that would challenge the old system, not so much by legal restriction as through substitution of the old schools with a new system of schools.
Compatible with Archer's theory is the Marxist view that the bourgeoisie integrated education with the state in order to achieve control over education, including moral education which was compatible with their secular economic interests. Archer's theory, however, assumes that the successful challenge of a group's domination over education is based on various social factors, not just upon economic interests alone. In Archer's view, the bourgeoisie achieved success through the development of a counter-ideology and through the numerical strength and the organization of allied groups which were able to compete against the allied groups supporting church control over education.\textsuperscript{21} As applied to this study, \textit{L'Instruction publique} offers an expression of the counter-ideology while the Constituent Assembly represents the organization of allied groups of bourgeoisie and liberal aristocrats as well as some clergy. Theoretically, the most general structural factor that led to the emergence of national secular education were the "complex forms of group interaction, partly conditioned by education being owned and monopolized by a restricted section of the population."\textsuperscript{22}

This theory attributes change to the interplay of groups and ideas within the context of social structure. Many types of groups, ranging from religious, class, and
status groups to political groups and economic organizations and associations can achieve domination over education or assert themselves to challenge a dominant group. In addition ideas and values are important, especially when they take the form of an ideology giving authority to the dominant group's legitimacy or to an assertive group's challenge. In this regard, *L'Instruction publique* contains the ideology of an assertive group, the Constituent Assembly, who were on the verge of achieving domination over education by consolidating various political, economic, and class interests. An emerging secular concept of morality provided the ideology necessary to unite this group.

The trend toward educational secularization, which has its roots in the intellectual thought of the Enlightenment, and to a lesser degree, in Royal policies of the ancien régime, accelerated into a vigorous reform movement with the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1762. Although *L'Instruction publique* represents the culmination of this reform movement, some of the ideas and especially the rhetoric in the document can best be explained only in the context of revolutionary events. This is where Lynn Hunt's cultural interpretation of the Revolution can help explain more fully certain aspects of moral education in *L'Instruction publique*. 
Hunt’s interpretation of the Revolution is identified with the concept of "revolutionary political culture" as an object of study. This political culture generated by the revolutionaries cannot be deduced from social structure, or socio-economic interests in isolation from the conscious attempt of historical agents to create new social and political relations--to "recast the categories of social thought and political ideas." Just as the emphasis of Hunt is not on social structure, neither is it about the preconditions of change, such as Archer establishes. Rather, Hunt’s analysis begins at the heart of the Revolution, in the rhetoric and rituals that gave the Revolution its unique identity.

In contrast to social interpretations, Hunt suggests that "rather than expressing an ideology, revolutionary politics brought ideology into being." In the context of revolutionary events the "revolutionaries fashioned their rhetoric in fits and starts after 1789, and it was only in the heat of political struggles that they clarified their principles." According to this interpretation, concepts such as the constitutional catechism, the apprenticeship in democracy, and a science of morality which appear in L’Instruction publique represent an attempt of the members of the Constituent Assembly to create viable alternatives to monarchical
institutions and to ritualize revolutionary concepts in seeking a replacement for the rituals of Christianity and the charisma of kingship. Hunt's analysis is cultural analysis at a conscious level focused on groups responding to historical events. However, in Durkheimian tradition, it also includes elements of cultural analysis at an unconscious level which is based on the social theory that every society needs to provide structures of thought, ritual symbolism, values, and expected ways of behaving. *L'Instruction publique* offers particularly fine examples of the values and expectations of the early revolutionaries, in particular, of the dominant group within the Constituent Assembly.

The French Revolution and the revisionist challenge

The 19th century liberal interpretation of the French Revolution as a bourgeois revolution, which Marx adopted in his analysis of capitalism and the Revolution, was the orthodox paradigm for explanations of the Revolution well into the post war period of the 20th century. This theory which found in the Revolution the consolidation of the social, political, and economic interests of the bourgeoisie in opposition to the interests of a feudal aristocracy, and which conceived the bourgeoisie as a capitalist class, was successfully undermined by the
revisionists beginning with Cobban's *The Social Interpretation of the French Revolution*, published in 1964. George Comninel succinctly states the revisionist's case when he says that Cobban, "demonstrated that the French aristocracy was not feudal, the bourgeoisie was not capitalist, and the Revolution itself did not consolidate the triumph of a capitalist society."26

Archer, proposed another revised interpretation and brought to light inconsistencies in the social account of educational change as it was theorized in relation to industrialization and educational secularization. According to the traditional social account, the industrialization process was the major factor in educational secularization. Industrialization was supposed to have produced these effects because of the influence of group (corporate) organization and the rationalization of industrialism.27 This view, which links educational change with economic development, resembles a narrow Marxist interpretation wherein the forces of production determine the structuring of antagonistic groups and the social structure arising from this conflict. Archer notes, however, that in the French revolutionary tradition "the educational hegemony of the bourgeoisie was achieved through its control of the political superstructure, not the economic, agricultural
What then was the focus of this political conflict?

For Archer, the case of France is important "in showing a dominant group organizing public investment in education, not to increase economic productivity, but administrative efficiency." This view resembles the Tocquevillian account of the Revolution as the aggrandizement of state power and centralization. Archer traces her particular interpretation to the Weberian perspective that modern rationalism is based on "expanding bureaucratization of all public and private relations of authority" wherein the "rate of administrative bureaucratization will determine the degree of rationality in education." This theory can be applied to an interpretation of L'Instruction publique because the document reflects values associated with both secular, rationalistic morality and centralized bureaucratic administration. However, the rational bureaucratization theory does not provide a complete explanation of why secularity and efficiency were valued by the members of the Constituent Assembly, other than to suggest that these values were compatible with centralized efficiency or served purely functional purposes in regard to it. For a more thorough explanation, we must return to social conflict theory.
Although Archer makes use of some revisionist findings in her interpretations of the Revolution, she does not, like the revisionists, dismiss the importance of social conflict. She frequently uses the term bourgeoisie to describe the assertive ideology used to challenge the dominant religious ideology influencing education under the ancien regime. The revisionists, in finding that there was no emerging capitalist class which was necessarily opposed to the feudal restrictions of aristocratic society, and in showing that the bourgeoisie and aristocracy shared many economic, political, and social interests, have made use of the term "bourgeoisie" seem irrelevant. Archer's theory skirts this problem by equating the bourgeoisie with the secular ideology of the enlightenment that was championed by certain groups within the bourgeoisie rather than by a single homogenous class. Most important are groups engaged in political conflict. Archer suggests that, "most of the time most of the forms that education takes are the political products of power struggles."\(^{31}\)

Archer's theory is limited historically in being more of a sociological treatise than a history of the Revolution. Most importantly, she gives only a superficial account of the specific historical and educational antecedents of group conflict prior to the
Revolution. Also, much like the revisionists, Archer is better at explaining contradictions in traditional interpretations than in offering new explanations. The only conclusion she arrives at with confidence is the claim that the rise of educational secularization in pre-industrial France is at least compatible with the view of those "who maintain that the spread of enlightenment corresponds to a simultaneous decline in religious prejudice."\(^{32}\)

The importance of Archer's theory for an analysis of *L'Instruction publique* is her structural analysis of conflict between assertive groups and dominant groups and their conflicting ideologies. And even though she gives primary importance to political power struggles, she acknowledges that in the midst of these power struggles "educational action is also affected by a variable set of cultural and structural factors which make up its environment," among which may be accounted the "social distribution of resources and values," the "patterning of vested interests" and the "contemporary state of knowledge."\(^{33}\) This study will elucidate more clearly the specific historical phenomena associated with these factors as they relate to formal schooling of the 18th century and the revolutionary proposals in *L'Instruction publique*. 
In order to consider the relations between schools and the social distribution of resources and vested interests, socio-economic factors must be accounted for. Just because we can no longer expect socio-economic interests to break down upon definitive class lines, does not mean that there were no social group conflicts based on identification with specific economic interests. Comninel offers a theory of economic interests and the state which provides insight into the economic interests of the revolutionaries not part of the traditional Marxist interpretation. He begins by noting the inadequacy of the revisionist interpretation. All the revisionist interpretation is able to tell us is that some type of assertive group existed. The nature of this group, as conceived by the revisionists, is described by Comninel as follows:

The essential proposition is that, since both the nobility and the bourgeoisie had marked internal differentiation, and no impermeable social boundary existed between them, and the two statuses had a great deal in common in terms of their forms of wealth, professions, and general ideology, it therefore would be more accurate to recognize a single 'elite' in the ancien regime—or, more precisely, a dominant social stratum comprising several different, but sometime overlapping 'elites'. On the basis of this analysis, the 'aristocratic offensive' of 1787-88 and the subsequent agitation of the Third Estate in 1788-89 can be conflated into a single movement of reform, reflecting the emerging institutional requirements of the entire elite stratum and their emerging ideological consensus. In place of class
struggle, therefore, there is a movement of national renovation—which in opening society to the new reality also opened it to the potential for tumult, yet which ultimately secured expression in the Napoleonic society of the notables. The Talleyrand Report gives expression to the revisionist interpretation because it represents the liberal ideas of aristocrats, bourgeoisie, and even some clergy, but there is more.

Along with the rational logical scheme in the document are also rhetorical passages to fire the revolutionary imagination which clearly intend to distinguish the ancien regime from the new government. What is missing in the revisionist assessment, according to Comninel, is an explanation of what this intensity was all about. "Precisely what this liberal revolution was about—what the source of this intense struggle was if not a conflict between bourgeois and aristocrats—is something that the revisionist account has not been able to explain." Comninel proposes an explanation that can account for the intensity of revolutionary conflict without assuming that the Revolution was a bourgeois capitalist class revolution. His unique social interpretation involves study of the structural relationships between social groups and the state, in a manner which addresses the exploitative relations of class society.
Important in Comninel’s theory and to its potential for use in a socio-economic analysis of moral education in L’Instruction publique, are three key factors. First is Comninel’s concept of "state-centralized surplus extraction" of wealth. Just because the whole structure of surplus production and extraction throughout the ancien regime was not capitalistic in nature, does not mean there were no forms of surplus extraction over which social groups might contend. In the ancien regime, the essential form of surplus wealth was rent, extracted from peasant producers in a variety of ways. But private rent was not the only form of surplus extraction in the agrarian society. "An enormous edifice of state offices and jurisprudence, a huge military, and the powerful Gallic Church, all rested upon the further extraction of surplus from peasants through taxes, fees, and tithes."\(^{36}\) Thus, the bourgeoisie and the nobility together relied on both private rents and state-centralized surplus extraction to enhance their wealth.

The second important element of Comninel’s theory is the particular social distinction he makes between bourgeoisie and aristocracy. Socially, the bourgeoisie was precisely the "ruling class of property and state office without the special privileges of noble status," while the aristocracy constituted a small minority that
was able to monopolize all the best posts through "access to royal favor and the chief offices of church and state." This made the aristocracy "the greatest property owners and the pre- eminent beneficiaries of the surplus extractive powers of the state."^37

The third relevant element of Comin nel's theory involves the political and ideological distinction between liberal constitutionalists and aristocratic constitutionalists. Both sought an end to absolutism, but they were incompatible ideologically. Liberal constitutionalism (which derived from "enlightened" state policies under the monarchy) appealed to the bourgeoisie and to a minority of aristocrats, while aristocratic constitutionalism (derived from Montesquieu) appealed strictly to those of noble status.^38

These three elements provide important insight into the early social group conflicts of the Revolution which led to the rise of the National Assembly in 1789. For Comin nel these elements provide the basis for a theory that has explanatory possibilities as follows:

The only credible explanation for the sudden and general mobilization of bourgeois opinion against the aristocratic proposal for calling the Estates is the central role of the state in the surplus extractive relations of the ruling class, an its direct importance to so much of the bourgeoisie. The social interests which underlay the political emergence of the bourgeoisie were thus themselves directly political. The central struggle of the French Revolution was about the state precisely because the
state itself was so central to the interests of the antagonists. The French Revolution was essentially an intra-class conflict over basic political relations that at the same time directly touched on relations of surplus extraction. It was a civil war within the ruling class over the essential issues of power and surplus extraction. The focus of the struggle was the nature of the state, giving the conflict its specifically political form, because the fundamental social interests at stake were directly tied to state relations.39

This view, in addition to providing social explanations for the secular morality in L’Instruction publique also explains why the Constituent Assembly, through proposals in the Talleyrand Report, hoped to erect a national system of education as opposed to a decentralized system.

This social history of Archer and Comninel fuses the two major historical interpretations of the Revolution, the liberal-Marxist interpretation and the Tocquevillian interpretation. Comninel and Archer, in the liberal-Marxist tradition, view revolutionary documents as an expression of ideology and social group interests that existed prior to revolutionary events. And even if the Revolution can no longer be conceived as one of the triumph of capitalism, it can be viewed as having established the legal and educational framework for the future development of capitalism. In the Tocquevillian modernization account, although language is not viewed as an ideological instrument of group conflict, there is still an element of deception behind it. For behind the
rhetoric of radical transformation, the revolutionaries were, in fact, reproducing the absolute power of the old regime they were fighting. For Comninel, the state is the prize for which the Revolution was fought; for Archer, the Revolution is important because it produced the integration of education with the state.

As for the revisionists, there appears as yet no developed position on language.  But peculiar to the revisionist interpretation is the attention given to social mobility, which is of importance in analyzing the relationship between socialization and selection processes in *L'Instruction publique*.

The revisionists have emphasized resentment as a motive of revolutionary action based on a crisis of social mobility at the end of the ancien regime. Resentment aside, it is the issue of social mobility and education in the 18th century that has direct application for explaining proposals in *L'Instruction publique* that restrict access to secondary education. This was also a conservative aspect of the reform movement prior to the Revolution, which led Palmer to suggest that restrictions on access to education may provide one of the unexplained causes of the Revolution, identified as a need to restrict social mobility.  This theory puts us at the juncture of selection and socialization processes in education where
selection impacts the type and degree of socialization attained. The Talleyrand Report makes provisions for selection processes regulating the number of students who will attend secondary school, and hence, those who will acquire advance knowledge of civic virtues in particular.

Concentration upon socialization and selection processes in *L'Instruction publique* provides a means to synthesize social interpretations of the Revolution, as indicated above. Also important for understanding moral education in the Talleyrand Report is a cultural analysis, which by its nature avoids the conflict between revisionist and Marxist interpretations that focus on origins and outcomes of the Revolution.

In the search for social origins and outcomes of the Revolution, in the Marxist-Tocquevillian, Archer-Comninel tradition, the heartbeat of revolutionary action itself becomes faint and of secondary importance. As indicated above, Lynn Hunt has attempted to make up for this inadequacy of social interpretations through a cultural analysis that is centered on the Revolution and not upon origins and outcomes. Social interpretations generally exclude revolutionary intentions and aims through a distrust of language to express literal intentions. The cultural interpretation of Hunt, on the other hand, accounts for intentions through consideration of the
function of revolutionary rhetoric, to, in a Durkheimian sense, serve as a carrier of cultural integration.\textsuperscript{42} According to this interpretation, the values in \textit{L'Instruction publique} reflect not only the ideology of an assertive social group, but also the expectations of this group in the context of historical circumstances. In the midst of revolutionary actions and social turmoil, it would seem quite normal for responsible historical agents to try to achieve some type of unity. It is Hunt's contention that out of this striving for unity amid revolutionary events came language which cannot be wholly derived from prior social influences.

\textbf{Synthesizing interpretations of the Talleyrand Report}

There are several explanatory limitations to a sociocultural interpretation of \textit{L'Instruction publique} wherein more traditional historical analysis is required for fuller understanding of the ideas it contains. Social structural analysis, in emphasizing the social purposes of ideology, is weak in addressing intellectual concepts which give ideologies their form and substance. The secular ideology expressed in \textit{L'Instruction publique}, which gave legitimacy to the Constituent Assembly's definition and plan for moral education, was based on intellectual concepts that arose during the Enlightenment,
often in opposition to the church's theory of morality. Therefore, the meaning of concepts such as the science of morality in *L'Instruction publique* have as much to do with intellectual conflicts between the theologians and the philosophes of the 18th century as they do with the conflict generated by the ideological positioning of the conservative bishops and nobles and the liberal members of the revolutionary National Assembly.

Another limitation of social structural analysis has to do with its concentration on social groups and structural predispositions to action that gloss over the circumstances and difficult choices faced by historical actors in moments of crisis. Commager noted this as an aspect of a well-known social analysis of the American constitution in stating that "issues such as personal liberty and local self-government without impairing the effectiveness of central government represent social contradictions which social interpretations tell us little about." The major social contradiction of this type which the Constituent Assembly faced in regard to moral education was how to provide for personal liberty and individual rights inherent in the *Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen*, and at the same time ensure the spread of a social morality that would bring everyone ideologically into the national fold.
Cultural analysis that focuses on the expectations, intentions, and values of the revolutionaries brings us closer to an understanding of the contradictions faced in the midst of revolutionary events. However, even in Hunt's cultural analysis, limitations similar to those of social history have been noted, because this cultural analysis rests on literary criticism of revolutionary rhetoric and on functional analysis of symbolic actions. Specifically, Robert Darnton has suggested that Hunt's analysis "fails to communicate the sense of men struggling to create some meaningful order out of difficult, dangerous circumstances." So where is the link to be found between expectations and values in cultural analysis and events that create difficult and dangerous circumstances? We can begin with the individual historical actor.

As valuable as socio-cultural analysis is to an understanding of why L'Instruction publique contains the ideas it does, it must still be remembered that it was a document written by one or more historical actors. And in this sense:

No document can tell us more than what the author of the document thought—what he thought had happened, what he thought ought to happen or would happen, or perhaps only what he wanted others to think he thought, or even only what he himself thought he thought.
The application of this view will bring into light
*L'Instruction publique* as telling us about what Talleyrand
and the Committee of the Constitution thought *ought* to
happen or would happen. In the case of Talleyrand, upon
consideration of his chameleon-like character which
enabled him to give service to many different governments,
the document may more likely be about what he wanted
others to think he thought, especially the members of the
Committee of the Constitution (on whose behalf he wrote
and presented the report) and the dominant group of
depuies within the Constituent Assembly. The document,
in the context of revolutionary events, also reflects what
Talleyrand and the men of the Constituent Assembly thought
had happened, such that it was opportune and necessary to
create a new system of education.

The fact that it is not totally certain that
Talleyrand did indeed write *L'Instruction publique* is of
little matter, because we do know that he publicly
endorsed the ideas in the report having been the one to
present it orally to the Constituent Assembly. The fact
that he also presented it on behalf of the Committee of
the Constitution makes it a general expression of their
views as well. It is therefore highly appropriate to
weave the biographical history of these men into the
analysis of *L'Instruction publique*. 
Biographical history is not out of keeping with a socio-cultural analysis because it is implied in both cultural and social histories. For example, Hunt's cultural history relies on examining group intentions through analysis of examples of the rhetoric of individuals. Although Weberian theory, as adapted by Archer, accounts for social action based on collective states of mind, Weber noted that "both for sociology... and for history, the object of cognition is the subjective meaning-complex of action." And this action, as a "subjectively understandable orientation of behavior exists only as the behavior of one or more individual human beings."\(^{47}\)

Both rational action theory and empathic understanding, according to Weber, offer the historian methods for interpreting subjective states of mind so as to impute intent and expectations to historical actors. Empathic understanding is based on application of the historian's own personal experience to the object of study and hence can be applied in a variety of circumstances. Rational action theory, which is more restricted but more verifiable, is applicable to what is considered rationally purposeful action. It is based on asking "what would have been a rational course, given the ends of the participants and adequate knowledge of all the circumstances?"\(^{48}\)
However, unconscious motives, conflicting motives which may exist in the actor's mind, and the fact that different motives may lead to similar processes of action make it such that ultimately, "only the actual outcome of the conflict gives a solid basis of judgement." Keeping this in mind, the ideas in *L'Instruction publique* will be viewed as the outcome of late 18th century social and intellectual conflicts over what moral education should be and who should control the teaching of it. The values behind the policy statements about content and control over moral education in the document represent the ends pursued by Talleyrand and the members of the Committee of the Constitution. Political events which took place prior to and during the writing of the document provide knowledge of the most significant circumstances involved. In this manner, rational action theory, in Weberian tradition, can be applied to an analysis of *L'Instruction publique* such that the values and expectations of the revolutionaries can be viewed in the context of difficult, dangerous circumstances.

The integration of various historical analyses in this study will provide for an understanding of a subject of traditional history--a formal, political, educational document--so as to fulfill Cobban's suggested aim that modern history present causal explanations according to
complex interrelationships. In order to examine such complex interrelationships, the integration of traditional historical subjects, including biography, intellectual history, and events will be woven into a socio-cultural analysis of the plan for moral education in *L’Instruction publique*.

At the outset, however, it is traditional functionalist theory of culture or functionalism at an unconscious level, which provides the socio-cultural categories of inquiry in this study. Weber recognized the necessity of functionalism of this traditional type when he described it as important for "purposes of practical illustration and for provisional orientation," as well as, "determining just what processes of social action it is important to understand in order to explain a given phenomena." The processes of social action important for understanding the plan for moral education in *L’Instruction publique* are those that serve socialization and selection functions. To answer how it is that virtue came to be defined by the state for formal educational institutions in 1791 requires an understanding of socialization and selection practices in schools prior to the Revolution and how issues of socialization and selection were addressed in *L’Instruction publique*. 
Socialization processes are defined for the purposes of this study as those practices in schools whereby individual self and consciousness are penetrated by social morality consisting of institutional values and norms. Values are conceptions of desirable and undesirable actions and norms are the rules and regulations wherein values are applied. The values and norms as they appear in schools can be religious, political, and/or economic in nature. They form the essence of school culture and provide legitimation for the disciplinary practices within the school culture. The problem issue of moral education in the 18th century and during the Revolution involved a conflict between secular and religious values and norms and ultimately a conflict between democratic and monarchical values and norms that were associated with school culture.

Selection processes are defined for the purposes of this study as those practices in schools which contribute to restrictions on access to certain levels of education for purposes of establishing a division of labor in society which requires elite recruitment. The most important aspect of selection processes for this study are those values which become part of the socialization process in schools so as to justify elite recruitment and the loyalty of the non-elites. The problem issue of
educational selection processes in the late 18th century and during the Revolution involved the issue of educating those who aspired to elite status but who were later rejected such that they were educated for a later stage of the educational system but not for vocations available.

Bringing a document to life

The use of integrative explanations to give meaning to the statements and concepts related to socialization and selection processes in L’Instruction publique will unfold in the following manner. In chapter two, the key historical agents associated with L’Instruction publique will be introduced as well as the constitution of 1791. Then major ideas and concepts in the Talleyrand Report related to socialization functions, some of which serve selection purposes, will be examined.

Chapter three provides a description of socialization and selection processes in schools of the ancien régime. It provides the social and cultural basis for understanding discontinuities in moral education in L’Instruction publique. It will also shed light on the formal moral education of the members of the Constituent Assembly.

Chapter four explores the social structural relations between educational institutions and social groups during
the last half of the 18th century. Economic, political, and social predispositions to challenge religious control of education are critical to this analysis. In addition, intellectual history will also provide insight into the institutional and ideological conflicts between church and state over socialization processes.

Chapter five concentrates on the effect of revolutionary events upon the formulation of a new democratic and secular ideology in education and the inherent contradictions it contained. This conscious cultural analysis provides further insight into the rhetoric and revolutionary discontinuities in *L'Instruction publique*, as well as an understanding of the conflicting values inherent in its design for national and democratic education.
CHAPTER II

THE CONSTITUTION OF 1791 AND PUBLIC EDUCATION

Those who want to treat politics and morals separately will never understand anything of either.

Rousseau

The Talleyrand Report and revolutionary values

The national system of education described in *L'Instruction publique* is the most important educational plan to emanate from the first turbulent and enthusiastic years of the French Revolution. The document, often referred to as the Talleyrand Report, is a complete expression of the educational values and expectations of the revolutionary assembly which gave to France its first written constitution. More important for what it says than for what it accomplished in point of law, the report set the tone for future relationships between democratic governments and educational institutions in France.

The Talleyrand Report established the basis, within the context of constitutional government, for a system of education that was meritocratic, utilitarian, universal, and most importantly, democratic and secular in nature. The secularization of education was the keystone around
which the other values were applied to educational issues in *L'Instruction publique*. This is largely because the first obstacle to change in education was perceived to be the manner in which the Catholic church exerted control and influence over the schools. Besides, the new constitution, by its very nature, was a work of secular wisdom and according to the revolutionaries required that democratic and secular values be taught in the schools so as to guarantee the existence of the constitutional government. Provisions for secular morality and constitutionalism in school practices and policies were intended to cause revolutionary changes in the curriculum and school culture matching revolutionary changes that were taking place in society.

This chapter begins with a brief description of the events and of the revolutionaries associated with *L'Instruction publique*. Following this short narrative is an examination of statements and ideas in the report which pertain to socialization and selection practices proposed for formal educational institutions of revolutionary France.

**Background events and historical agents behind the creation of *L'Instruction publique***

The national system of education described in *L'Instruction publique* represents the views of a
constitutional committee that was formed as a result of early events of the French Revolution. The most important of these events was the transformation of the Estates General, a national representative body based on ancien régime social organization, into the revolutionary National Assembly established in June 1789. The members of the National Assembly sought immediately to create a new government based on a written constitution and so declared themselves the National "Constituent" Assembly on July 7. It consisted of 1,300 (active and inactive) members having actually sat in the Assembly. In August 1789, the National Assembly was responsible for the abolition of feudal privilege and the creation of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen which are among the most profound and enduring achievements of the Revolution.

The Committee of the Constitution was established on July 6, one day prior to the formal adoption of "constituent" to the title of the Assembly. The Committee of the Constitution and the National Constituent Assembly remained in existence until the constitution was completed in September 1791. Thus it was over the course of a two-year period that the constitution of 1791, France's first formal democratic constitution, was created. The Committee of the Constitution was the heart of the
National Assembly responsible for bringing legislative and constitutional proposals before the Assembly for debate and adoption. As specific initiatives were voted upon and accepted by the Assembly, proposals acquired the form of legislative decrees to be acted upon immediately. Important pieces of legislation enacted by the Assembly included the nationalization of church property (2 November 1789); the suspension of local (ancien régime) parliaments (3 November 1789) and their abolition (6 September 1790); the administrative reorganization of France into departments, districts, and municipalities to be governed by elective bodies (22 December 1789); reorganization of the Catholic church through creation of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy (12 July 1790); reorganization of the judicial system (August 1790) and enactment of new criminal procedures (12 October 1790).

While dismantling the old regime and organizing a new one, the National Assembly also voted upon provisions for the new constitution. These generally originated within the Committee of the Constitution or were reviewed and modified by the Committee before presentation to the National Assembly. Among the important constitutional measures adopted by the Assembly were provisions for a unicameral legislature (10 September 1789), a limited ("suspensive") veto for the king (11 September 1789), and
a primary election system (22 December 1789). Also, intended to be an integral part of the constitution was a plan for a national system of education. It was at the very end of its reign, on 10 and 11 September 1791, that the National Assembly listened to Talleyrand present *L'Instruction publique* on behalf of the Committee of the Constitution. In the days following this presentation of the 127-page report, it was summarized into a series of decrees as a *projet de loi* (or bill) which was submitted to the Assembly on September 25. The National Assembly held its final meeting on September 30 and recommended the report be given serious consideration by the Legislative Assembly. The Legislative Assembly was designated to succeed the Constituent Assembly and its members were elected at the beginning of September according to the provisions of the new constitution. The *rapport*, the *projet de loi*, and a series of tables and charts were published in a book of 216 pages late in 1791.²

Talleyrand's name appears on the title page as author of the report, however, for various reasons it is far from being original to him except as far as its style is his. First, the Committee of the Constitution was generally representative of the dominant groups within the Assembly. As it was on behalf of the Committee of the Constitution that Talleyrand presented the report it is fair to assume
it was their thoughts and expectations, as representative of the dominant influences within the National Assembly, that guided Talleyrand's pen most closely. However, some qualifications must be made to establish just which members of the Committee of the Constitution are to be associated with *L'Instruction publique*. This is because the committee itself changed in composition over the course of the two year period.³

The Committee of the Constitution began with thirty original members appointed on 6 July 1789, but was quickly reduced to eight members by a decree on July 14. Of the original thirty, four members, Mounier, le comte de Clermont-Tonnerre, le comte de Lally-Tollendal, and Bergasse were retained. Added to this group were abbé Sieyès, Champion de Cicé, Le Chapelier, and Talleyrand. The committee was again changed on 12 September 1789 with Sieyès, Talleyrand, and Le Chapelier retained from the previous group of eight and Thouret, Target, Démeunier (member of the original thirty), Rabaud de Saint-Etienne (member of the original thirty), and Tronchet added to make a new group of eight. This change in membership was brought about because the leading members of the July 14th group, Mounier, Bergasse, and Lally-Tollendal were conservative liberals (known as monarchists) who presented constitutional proposals which proved to be inconsistent.
with the majority opinion of the National Assembly. These three men abandoned the Assembly in October 1789. On 23 September 1790, seven members were added to the revised group of eight for the revision of constitutional decrees. These men were Barnave, Alexandre de Lameth (member of original thirty), Duport, Buzot, Pétion de Villeneuve (member of original thirty), and Beaumetz. If we consider that Mounier, Lally-Tollendal, and Bergasse were out of favor with majority opinion and ceased to have effective influence as of 12 September 1789, and that Le Comte de Clermont-Tonnerre shared their conservative views and remained quiet in the Committee, while Champion de Cice left the Assembly in November 1790, we can then assume *L’Instruction publique* to be representative of the views of fourteen men. The list is as follows: Talleyrand, Sieyès, and Le Chapelier from the original July 14th group; Thouret, Target, Démeunier, Rabaud de Saint-Etienne, and Tronchet from the September 12th group; and Barnave, Alexandre de Lameth, Duport, Buzot, Pétion, and Beaumetz from the September 23rd group.4

These men were among the most active members of the National Assembly in both public affairs and through participation in the Assembly’s work. All but three (Démeunier, Duport, and Buzot) served at least one term (a fortnight) as President of the National Assembly and
Thouret served four terms. Thouret was also the most influential and assiduous member of the Committee of the Constitution, the "veritable chef" according to Michaud. And it was he, who as president of the Assembly, presided over the king's oath to the constitution. Several of the fourteen were premier orators of the Assembly including Thouret, Target, Rabaut de Saint-Etienne, Chapelier, Barnave, and Beaumetz. These men were often found debating proposals before the Assembly and presenting reports from the committee. Talleyrand, Sieyès, Démeunier, and Lameth worked equally as hard on the committee on various projects, while Tronchet and Duport were active mainly in regard to a few important judicial related issues. Pétion and Buzot participated least in the committee's work, however, they eventually became quite active during the first republican years of the Revolution as members of the Convention.

Talleyrand and the Committee of the Constitution did not generate educational ideas in a vacuum, far from it. First, there were educational ideas contained in the cahiers. These were the records of grievances and recommendations which members of the Estates General (most of whom joined the National Assembly) brought with them representing the views of their constituents. Then between the years 1789 and 1791 numerous published works,
some quite detailed and elaborate in nature, as well as handwritten suggestions, were submitted to the committee by teachers, professors, and a few lawyers. Also, Talleyrand, in his memoirs, noted consulting with numerous academicians to complete the plan in *L'Instruction publique*. Most important, however, there had been a plethora of educational reform literature dating back to mid-century which influenced men of educational affairs in 1789.

Considering the quantity of educational reform ideas existing prior to the Revolution, it is expected that there would be very little unique in *L'Instruction publique* that had not been said or written prior to its appearance. However, one thing sets it apart from pre-revolutionary reform activity, and that is those ideas it contains in regard to the new constitutional order both as event and as the ideation of the members of the Constituent Assembly. For *L'Instruction publique* was not only directly influenced by the ideas of the new constitution, it was designed as an appendage related to a specific provision for education in the constitution. A brief description of the constitution is therefore in order prior to examining the content of *L'Instruction publique*. 
The Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen, which was adopted by the Assembly 26 August 1789, served as a preface to the new constitution. Contained in the Declaration are the principles of the Revolution and with it the destruction of the ancien régime was completed. The legislative sovereignty claimed by kings under the old order was replaced by the rule of law as an expression of the general will of the people. Hence, sovereignty resided in the nation and no individual (e.g., the king) might exercise authority without the consent of the people. (Articles III and VI) Privilege was replaced by equality before the law, meaning appointment to public positions would be open to all citizens based on no other distinction than individual capabilities (Article VI), and in the eyes of the law all citizens remain free and equal in rights. (Article I) In this principled manner the Declaration laid the basis for political and civil rights to be institutionalized by the constitution.

What made the constitution of 1791 truly revolutionary was the subordination of the king to the Assembly and the civil rights it guaranteed in the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen. Real power under the constitution rested with the Legislative Assembly, to be made up of 745 seats in a unicameral system of few checks and balances. The king possessed
hardly any powers not subject to review by the legislature, including declarations of war or of making peace. Although he alone appointed ministers, their appointment could be vetoed by the Assembly. The king was granted only a limited veto through use of a "suspensive" or temporary veto that could delay adoption of laws for a period of up to four years. He had no power to dissolve the Assembly and his ministers were answerable in more ways to the Assembly than to himself.

This constitution was therefore quite liberal in the sense that the peoples' representatives held the most effective powers of state. It has often been criticized on this account for lacking the necessary provisions for an effective system of checks and balances. As it was, this issue and other specific provisions of the constitution were passionately and often bitterly debated in the early months of the Revolution. The first constitutional scheme offered to the National Assembly by the Committee of the Constitution was a more conservative design supported by Mounier, Bergasse, Lally-Tollendal, and Clermont-Tonnerre, the so called monarchists, who were enthusiastic admirers of the British constitution. They proposed a strong executive role for the king, a bicameral legislature, and an absolute veto for the king. But these proposals were defeated by the Assembly and as a result
the monarchists abandoned the Assembly, as previously noted. The new September 12th group represented the more liberal tendencies that were dominating the Assembly, however, even these revolutionaries were conservative in recognizing limitations to democracy, especially in regard to the franchise. Limitations on voting rights were the caveat to whatever radical movement the Assembly may have been interpreted as tending towards when they established the unicameral system of government and the limited executive role.

According to the new constitution, members of the Legislative Assembly were to sit for two years and their election was based on a two-tiered system designed to ensure that those of the lower classes would not gain entry into the seats of power. The right of suffrage, provided for in general terms in the Declaration, was based on a distinction between "active" and "passive" citizens. Those active citizens entitled to vote had to be male, at least twenty-five years of age, paying the equivalent of three days unskilled labor in taxes. Furthermore, this was the qualification to vote for electors who were the ones that actually voted for the deputies. To be an elector required that one be an owner or tenant of property at the value equivalent to between 100 and 400 days work, depending on the locality and
nature of the property. And to qualify as a deputy, a citizen had to be a landowner paying tax in the equivalent of the marc d'argent, worth about 50 livres. The marc d'argent qualification was dropped just before the constitution was passed but not soon enough for it to affect the legislative elections of 1791. According to Doyle, these arrangements enfranchised to varying degrees about 60 percent of French males and compared with the franchise for the elections to the Estates-General were in fact more restrictive. However, Rudé reminds us that the franchise of the French constitution was "far less stringent" than that of the parliamentary government across the channel to which the monarchists of the Assembly had aspired.

The role of active citizens was not restricted to choosing assemblies of national electors alone. Although power appeared to be tending to concentrate toward Paris, the reform of administration and local government was decentralized. It devolved according to a uniform design made up of 83 departments, subdivided into districts, which were in turn subdivided into communes and municipalities. These replaced the old system of généralités, intendances, bailliages, and sénéchaussées which were generally run by nominated officials. At the new district and commune levels any active citizen could
run for office and all public offices, including local administrators, judges, magistrates and councilmen, even clergy, were to be elective, excepting the ministers of the king. This meant that old hereditary offices acquired by purchase were abolished and their holders compensated. Compensation was no doubt adopted in lieu of the fact that over forty percent of the Assembly members were previous venal office holders.7

The framework of government and the political and civil rights associated with it are not the sum of all that is contained in the constitution. In a section of the constitution entitled, "Fundamental Dispositions Guaranteed by the Constitution," can be found a reiteration of many of the personal freedoms contained in the Declaration (equality before the law, free speech, religious toleration, equality of opportunity, freedom of assembly and petition) and other important provisions not specifically mentioned in the Declaration. One provision claims the inviolability of property except where public necessity requires its sacrifice. Another provision, relative to public assistance, virtually guarantees a right to work, and another concerns public instruction.

The provision for public instruction is stated as follows: "Public instruction shall be created and organized that is common to all citizens, gratuitous in
regard to that part of education which is indispensable to all men and it will be distributed in accordance with the division of the Kingdom." It was in accordance with this provision that the Talleyrand plan was created. The opening paragraph of *L'Instruction publique* affirms its close association with the new constitution. It proclaims public instruction to be a power in the new government equal in importance to the laws that protect liberty and equality and to the new foundations of private property. The functions served by public instruction are the preservation of the constitution, the perfection of political institutions, and the perpetuation of general prosperity. These functions of education, as treated in the report, are interrelated into a formal system of moral education based on a few overarching intellectual concepts of the age.

**Intellectual foundations of socialization processes in *L'Instruction publique***

The first function of education to be announced in *L'Instruction publique* is political in nature: the preservation of the constitution and the perfection of political institutions. This is to be accomplished in large part by socializing the young in the values and norms associated with the newly-established political and civil rights of citizens.
Preserving the constitution, according to *L'Instruction publique*, involves an education in political and civil rights guaranteed by the *Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen* and the constitution. Political liberties should be taught and understood in the context of the law as an expression of the public will (*la volonté commune*). In order to ensure that the public will is never at the mercy of the "tumultuous will of the masses often misled" and to prevent "individual usurpations," it is necessary that public enlightenment (*la raison publique*) be established through instruction. (3-4) Public instruction will also increase the sphere of civil liberty such that ignorant men will no longer exist who are at the mercy of charlatanism or who are forced to defer to the decisions of educated men who wield authority unreasonably. Because of the importance of this education that is common to everyone (i.e., primary education), it should be made universally available. Although no one will be compelled to attend, parents will strongly be encouraged to send their children to school. (27) This reluctance to provide for compulsory attendance is in keeping with the liberal nature of the Assembly for which any idea of constraint was anathema.

That the committee also made provisions for perfecting political institutions is one aspect of
socialization processes in *L'Instruction publique* indicative of the revolutionaries' faith in moral progress, a faith which can be traced to the optimistic thought of the Enlightenment. Talleyrand expresses this optimism by suggesting that although citizens will have taken an oath to defend the constitution, "we will not have renounced, neither for our descendants nor for ourselves, the right and the hope of improving it." (11)

Another overarching concept in *L'Instruction publique*, representing the political climate of moral opinion in 1789, is that which breaks down the barrier between public and private morality. Talleyrand refers to the separation of public morality and private morality as the "charlatanism of corruption" and an "insult to morals." He continues by noting that:

...although it is true that relations change with people and events, it is incontestable that moral principle remains unchanged, without which it would hardly exist. One can and must apply the rules of justice variously; but there are definitely not two systems of justice; why, it is unjust to consider that it is possible to have two types of justice. (101-102)

This universal concept of justice was intended to make the private virtues of honesty, courage, and selflessness applicable to public political relations and the elimination of venal relations, conflicts of interest, abuses of power, and the like that muddy the waters between ethics and strictly legal affairs.
The application of an ethical standard to government which can also pertain to any association of men constitutes a universal system of social ethics. In *L'Instruction publique*, this system is a necessary supplement to the new constitution. Aside from teaching citizens "to know the constitution, to know how to defend it and how to perfect it; before all else, men must be instilled with the principles of morality that are anterior to any constitution." (11) This broad conception of civic morality provides the basis for the second major function of education, the perpetuation of general prosperity.

Socializing the young in the values and norms of morality that are anterior to the constitution is "the safeguard and security of public well being." (11) Talleyrand refers to this moral education as a "social art" (*l'art social*) composed of several branches [not individually described] and as a science which has only begun to exist. (12) "It must not only be engraved in every heart by way of sentiment and conscience, but also taught as a veritable science, of which the principles will be demonstrated to the reason of all men, to those of all ages." (12) The intellectual basis for the application of both sentiment and science to moral studies is to be found in the faculty theory of mind, a conception
of mind peculiar to the early modern era. This theory as explained in *L'Instruction publique*, consists of dividing the mind into three separate faculties: physical, moral, and intellectual, with the later further divided into reason, memory, and imagination (with reason applicable to science, memory to history and languages, imagination to arts and letters). It is admitted, however, that these distinctions have not held up under close scrutiny and that with time a different scheme may be established. (13-14) What is important, however, is that the description of the moral faculty in the Talleyrand Report is purely secular in nature and makes provisions for both scientific and intuitive inquiries.

The moral faculty is explained as deriving from an "internal feeling" and an "active sentiment" independent of any reflection. (14) But science also has a role to play through the ability of humans to reason. Reason has several applications to moral education that are discussed particularly in relation to the methods of moral education explained later. For now it is significant only to consider that, in *L'Instruction publique*, reason pertains to the new science of morality through the application of logical and systematic thinking. For example, it is recommended that one way of establishing a new morality is to separate from morality that which does not pertain to
it. Abstractions in general are singled out as problematic:

Anyone can see, in fact, what abstraction makes of any system, of any opinion, and by considering only the relations of men with other men, they can be taught that which is good, that which is just, enable them to love, to find happiness in honest actions, torment in those which are not, and render them, one to another, sensitive to the least impression of anything that is harmful. (13)

This process reflects a dominant theme in the report, that of the need for economy, which is also apparent in recommendations to eliminate pedantry, unnecessary literature, superstitions, provincial dialects, and in a proposal to purify the national language. Science as a method of systematic thought is viewed as particularly useful to these endeavors to eliminate the superfluous elements of social relations.

Talleyrand summarizes the roles of science and sentiment in moral education by distinguishing different aims for each, one providing for justice the other for goodness. What makes men capable of moral progress is that nature (la nature) "has endowed men with reason and with compassion: by the first he is enlightened as to what is just; by the second he is attracted toward that which is good: this is the dual principle of all morality." (13)
The concept of the good is not delineated according to specific virtues in *L’Instruction publique*, rather it is given expression in social goals that are based on constitutional principles and the values of utilitarianism. The word *utilité* appears frequently in the Talleyrand Report, indicating the fundamental basis of utilitarianism as the doctrine which maintains that the useful is the good. For the utilitarians of the 18th century, Helvétius and Bentham in particular, the legitimacy of the state was based not on an original contract, as proposed by the natural law theorists such as Locke and Hume, but upon its utility, meaning its ability to promote general well-being and happiness. The emphasis of utilitarianism is upon judging an action based on its consequences rather than upon first principles which may take the form of natural rights. Although the educational design in *L’Instruction publique* is a plan based on rigorous deduction from principles, it also contains references to the general well-being and to economization based on the values of utilitarianism.

Both economization and utility have a direct relationship to the principles of moral education in the Talleyrand Report. "For although instruction must be universal, facilitating all types of education, at the same time it should favor particularly those types of
knowledge recognized for their present and immediate usefulness and most appropriate to the constitution and to national customs." (10)

The values of utilitarianism are also used in *L'Instruction publique* as a counter-ideology to ancien régime education where a contradiction existed "between that which a child was forced to learn and that which a man had to do." This pre-revolutionary education, according to Talleyrand, "constantly returned us to a time where all knowledge was concentrated in the cloister and seems still, after more than ten centuries to destine the majority of men to live in monasteries." (2) This rhetoric, which strays from the otherwise rational explications of the report, is based on the unfounded historical assumption that education prior to the Revolution was dominated by clerical orders and was only useful for the preparation of future clerics and as such neglected to prepare men for other positions and duties in society. The real problem in the minds of the revolutionaries was that religion and religious interpretations of text possessed little social utility and were given more weight than they should in the schools, not that preparation for a religious vocation was the sole end of ancien régime education, which it was not. On the other hand, such rhetoric was intended to have
profound effects upon curriculum reform where social salvation through civic action, not individual salvation through religious faith, was the primary objective of moral education for the revolutionaries. Social utility was thus intimately associated with secularization.

Utilitarian values were also applied to the issue of the selection functions of education as related to economic organization and the division of labor in society. One of the most often cited passages of the Talleyrand Report is relevant here:

Society can, in effect, be considered as a vast workshop; it is not sufficient that everyone work in it; everyone must also be in their place, without which there would be confusion of skills, instead of an arrangement which enhances them. Who does not understand that a small number distributed intelligently can do more and do it better than a great number, possessed of the same talents, but organized in a different manner. The greatest of all economies, being that of the economy of men, consists therefore of a distribution of men in their correct vocations. Now, it is incontestable that a good system of instruction is the primary means to achieve this state. (7-8)

The primary educational means of achieving this necessary division of labor, as indicated in *L'Instruction publique*, is through restrictions on access to education. And this is to be accomplished through meritocratic selection processes. Only those who qualify by means of examination scores and teacher performance reports will advance to the next higher level of education. Although everyone has the
right to compete, through the national universal primary educational system, to advance to higher levels of education; for most children, those "called by nature" or the "law of necessity" to agricultural and mechanical trades, their formal education will end at the universal primary level. (30) Such must happen for the social well-being of everyone.

Given that anyone may compete to advance through the educational system regardless of origins, it is logical that anyone should be able to compete to become a teacher also. "If everyone has the right to receive an education, then reciprocally everyone has a right to compete to spread the benefits of instruction. . . All privilege by its nature is odious: privileges in matters of education are even more odious and absurd." (9) With the destruction of privilege enters the reign of meritocracy and utilitarianism. Together, meritocratic and utilitarian values, as well as the conception of moral progress and the natural rights doctrines expressed in the Declaration form the intellectual basis of the new secular morality in L'Instruction publique. It is a secular morality based on social relations and a universal concept of justice.

Social morality, in being anterior to the constitution, means that laws and social morals are in
many ways indistinguishable and all encompassing. Talleyrand asks: "Can the constitution truly exist if it exists only in our code, if it does not cast its roots into the soul of all citizens; if it does not imprint forever upon it new sentiments, new morals and new customs?" (4) According to L'Instruction publique it is the role of education to accomplish this task through many different routes. "What does it not embrace?" exclaims Talleyrand, "from the simplest elements of the arts to the highest principles of public law and morality; from the games of children to theater performances and the most important national festivals." (5) It is beyond the scope of this study to examine the nonformal social activities designed to serve socialization functions in L'Instruction publique. It is important, however, to remind the reader that schools were not the only means of socialization that fit into revolutionary plans for public instruction. Our subject being formal school education, let us now examine L'Instruction publique in regard to the curriculum and methods of moral education that were designed for the schools, with attention to primary and secondary education.
The curriculum and moral education in *L'Instruction publique*

The organization of primary and secondary schools

*L'Instruction publique* is based on the administrative reorganization of France into cantons, districts, and departments. Each canton was to have a primary school. Secondary schools were referred to as district schools and beyond these were the departmental schools for professional education. At the summit, in Paris, was a national institute, much like a modern university, offering lessons and research in all fields of knowledge.

Primary schools (*école primaires*) were designed to offer gratuitous education to everyone beginning at the age of six or seven. (127) Since the entry age for secondary schools (*écoles de district*) was restricted to an age of eight or nine (131), the period spent in primary school may not have been expected to be long, but it could have been more than the two years implied above, as no formal leaving age is indicated for primary schools. The curriculum proposal begins with the rudiments of speaking and writing the French language, including arithmetic as applied to measurement. (27) Learning these basic skills was to serve only necessary social functions such as communicating ideas and sentiments and engaging in the daily affairs of life.
Beyond these basic skills, three subjects directly relevant to serving higher socialization functions are described in *L'Instruction publique*. First on the list are the "elements of religion." Significantly, this is the first time the subject of religion enters the discussion on education. Reference is made in some early passages of the report to inadequacies of education in the *ancien régime* resulting from religious influence. However, up until the discussion on primary education, twenty-seven pages into the report, there is no indication of the role which religion or religious principles are to play in the new educational system. Learning the elements of religion are justified "because if it is a mistake to ignore them, it is perhaps an even greater one to misunderstand them." (28)

The second subject relevant to socialization pertains to the "principles of morality," which are described as the source of "spiritual happiness," the source of security to men who are "united by need and too often divided by interest," and the "necessary supplement to laws." (28) This is obviously the social morality described in the beginning of the report as being anterior to the constitution. When teaching this subject special attention should be given to the relationships among men, with simple and clear instructions about the common duties
of all citizens and about the laws which are indispensable for everyone to know, including examples of virtuous actions. (128) Learning to write should include practice writing the rights and duties of all men. (128)

The third subject relevant to socialization deals with the "principles of the constitution." Some idea of the nature of this subject was offered early on in the report when it was suggested that a new catechism (un nouveau catéchism) be developed to be composed of elements and principles of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen and the constitution. (11) Also, in an earlier passage, it is stated that the principle goal of primary instruction is to "teach children to become citizens one day," initiating them into society by teaching them "the principle laws which govern it." (21)

Finally, the elementary curriculum should include whatever is required at this young age to exercise the various faculties of the mind: physical, intellectual, and moral. As for the intellectual faculties, a simple logic is called for so that reason can give children insight into the nature of science. To their memory can be offered historical, geographical, and botanical lessons about France, to increase their love of country. As for the moral faculty, it is not possible to yet determine how best to teach to it at this age. All one knows is that
"it is with special care, with a sensitive and continuous regard that it should be developed . . . this precious sense which provides charm to the good that is done and observed, and which imparts honnêteté [honesty and integrity] to sensibility through even the allurement of pleasure." (28-29)

This then is the plan for primary education, representing the minimum learning necessary to function in society as a useful citizen; it is thus to be offered gratuitously to everyone. The next level of education is intended for far fewer students. This secondary education is described as "the natural progression of primary school instruction," emphasizing further development of the faculties and should provide an indication of one's aptitude for serving "useful functions" especially those pertaining to one of the four professional vocations (law, religion, medicine, and military arts) of society. (30)

The secondary curriculum encompasses a seven-year venture to which no one will be admitted before the age of eight or nine, and may even be later in a student's life if he has not been sufficiently instructed in the subjects and skills taught in primary schools. (131) In these district schools (écoles de district) continued emphasis is placed on writing the langue nationale to which is added "knowledge of those ancient languages which preserve
the most richness for the human mind." Also offered will be other "living" languages relevant to local or international relations. (30-31)

To the simple elements of religion learned in primary school will be added "the history of this religion" and "the explanation of claims for which it commands belief." (31) (My emphasis: Catholicism in particular is not mentioned but is implied.) To the principles of morality, "of which the application is so limited in the early ages of life," is added an understanding of morality "in its private and public applications." To the principles of the constitution, "which can only be identified for [primary aged] children," is added "an expanded exposition of the declaration of rights and the organization of the diverse powers." (31)

When discussing the enhancement of intellectual faculties, that of memory includes "the history of free peoples, the history of France, or rather of the French, when one will have been created, and examples of all types, both from the ancients and the moderns." (31) Exercising the moral faculties becomes more fruitful at this age where sentiments are affected by reasoning with oneself and where the methods of imparting honnêteté have a powerful effect on men. (32)
The subjects described above are meant to be integrated in a secondary curriculum that is divided into four segments, beginning with two years at the "grammar" level, followed by two years at the "humanities level," then two years of "rhetoric and logic," and a final year of "math and physics." In the two year grammar level will be taught religious history (Histoire sacrée), mythology, works of French and Latin authors and an abridged course in geography. Students will learn the Declaration by heart; morality will be made relevant through historical examples and the application of the rights of man; the conscience of youth will be developed through an understanding of the concept of justice as both idea and sentiment. (131-132)

At the humanities level will be included the study of Latin and French languages, Greek and Roman history, and versification (through the study of poets, historians, and moralists). In addition, a knowledge of the constitution and the Acte constitutionnel will be acquired. In the rhetoric and logic course the principles of logic and metaphysics, and the art of oratory will be studied concurrently during the first year. In the second year efforts will be concentrated on exercises in eloquence and deliberation (genre délibératif). Written and oral discourses concerning law, morals, metaphysics, and the
constitution will be required of students. Attention will also be given to the comparative principles of government comparing that of ancient government with the French constitution. Also included will be the application of the moral principles of the constitution, and the epochs of French history with particular attention to the Revolution in the government. (132)

The final year is reserved for math and physics. Included here are geometry and that part of algebra necessary for understanding mechanics (la mécanique) which will be applied to ordinary usages in life. The elements of physics, chemistry, and botany will be taught in such a manner that they may be applied during the promenades, or outdoor learning experiences. (134) This then concludes the curriculum of secondary education.

Beyond the district schools it is expected that some, among the most talented students who have completed their studies, will advance to the department schools (écoles de département). The department schools provide professional training in law, medicine, theology, or military arts. Beyond the department schools is a National Institute (Institut National) that resembles a modern university where all subjects of learning, in both theory and practical application, are taught, researched, and improved upon. Only the most talented and academically
inclined will make their way into its halls. The Institute is where the perfecting of knowledge will happen, including the science of education.

Primary schools, district schools, departmental schools, and a national institute make up the hierarchy of a national system of education intended to provide all the subjects necessary, including moral values, to conduct the business of the nation. The nation, according to *L'Instruction publique* is not to have a monopoly over education and so other schools are free to compete with or supplement the education offered by the national system. However, it is obvious that such a national system would be hard to compete with. Following the description of the various institutions of education and their curriculum offerings, Talleyrand turned attention to the resources and methods of public instruction, most of which are particularly relevant to moral education.

**Scientific methods of moral education in *L'Instruction publique***

The means (*moyens*) or methods (*métodes*) of instruction are described in *L'Instruction publique* as "veritable instruments of the sciences," pertaining less to any science in particular than to the foundation and aim of all sciences. (89) Instructional methods are intended to fulfill three objectives: to provide a means
of disseminating and perfecting reason, to facilitate the communication of ideas, and to remove the obstacles to a moral life. (90) Reason and language, which figure prominently in the first two objectives, pertain to the third objective as well.

Most interesting in regard to methods for perfecting reason is the discussion of the role of interest and discovery in the learning and reasoning processes. In order to motivate students to concentrate their attention upon an object of study it is of the utmost importance to interest in some manner the consciousness of students in the pursuit of truth. This can be accomplished by an appeal to their curiosity, by enabling them to assist in the creation of the knowledge with which they are to be enriched, for "it has been a thousand times proven that one knows truly, that one sees clearly, only that which one discovers, that which one invents in some manner himself." (93) This discovery approach to learning remains today a challenging concept in educational methodology.

Methods of reasoning, in particular those related to analysis and mathematics, led logically to the subject of communication, according to Talleyrand. This is because analysis and mathematics add to our understanding of the world through precise communication in a symbolic manner.
How then to apply this rational scheme to the human sciences? (94) Talleyrand responds with several recommendations. First, thought through language must be made consistent and understandable everywhere, thus local dialects, "relics of feudalism", should be banished from primary education and "the language of the constitution and the laws will be taught to everyone." (95) The Revolution itself has provided a multitude of new concepts which will endure forever. (96) With the acquisition of these new "signs" it is important that their meaning be determined well and that the language deliver itself from "an excess of words and from obsequious forms which signify a fear that the truth might be revealed." This "servile extravagance disappears in simple language that is bold and quick, for the true richness of a language consists of being able to express everything with vigor, with clarity, and with few signs. Here where thought is free the language becomes prompt and sincere and modesty alone is preserved within its veils." (97) The purification of language has political as well as social importance, because:

it is just, it is constitutional . . . that ordinary reasoning claim the right to be expressed with nobility . . . that the French language become purified to such a point that one will no longer be able to aspire to eloquence without ideas just as it is no longer permitted to aspire to a position without talent . . . that it acquire for everyone a new
character invigorated, in a manner, with liberty and equality. (97)

Although the powers of reasoning and of communication are very important, "it is not enough to teach a reasonable being how to think, to teach a social being how to communicate ideas, it is particularly necessary to teach a moral being how to do good." (101) The link between language and action here is strong because "the methods for learning to communicate what one thinks must be regarded as indirect means for attaining moral rectitude, which is the highest achievement of any society, for disorder is often only the result of errors in thought, while virtuous habits are often the natural result of the communication of minds." (101) These passages referring to the power of language in *L'Instruction publique* indicate that for the revolutionaries virtue possessed linguistic qualities equated with communicating clear, reasonable thoughts, as well as possessing qualities associated with behaving virtuously.

In addition to the scientific methods of education based on principles of reason and linguistic analysis, more practical methods of classroom procedure are also dealt with in *L'Instruction publique*. The first of these methods is to make of childhood a "true apprenticeship" in social virtues by "organizing this young nascent society
according to the principles of the larger social organization." The second is to "constantly provide in the environment of individuals, and through satisfying their affections, the most determinative incentives for doing good." The third is to make "virtuous and profound impressions upon the senses and faculties of the mind so that morality which at first may seem only an abstract product of reason, or a vague notion of sensibility, becomes a sentiment, a form of happiness, and by consequence a strong habit." (103) This tripartite scheme composed of a model apprenticeship, determinative incentives, and the inculcation of habit will not preclude individual choice, however. There is still room for individual glory which "comes from beneficial actions when they require courage," but the "duty of society is to transform them into habit so that rarely is the employment of courage necessary." (103)

The idea of a model social apprenticeship where students "practice" social virtues prior to the conclusion of their education is noted, by Talleyrand, as originating in primitive form in the ancient institutions of Persia and to some degree in a few Swiss cantons. (104) Now with the advent of constitutional government there is even more reason to assume the importance of a social apprenticeship to "reproduce" the likeness of this government "in the
enclosure of instructive communities." (105) This new
method of moral training will not replace the ordinary
means of instruction to the extent that these traditional
means are called for by the immaturity and inexperience of
youth. But it will be added wherever students regularly
congregate under the eyes of their instructors. (104)

Trust can be placed in students to participate in the
governing of a school because the will of young people,
imperfect as it is, "inclines easily towards that which is
ture and just because it is free of prejudices." (106)
The student government proposed in L'Instruction publique
provides for regular elections:

such that a small number will become
representatives of all and meet to practice the
diverse administrative and judicial functions
which the maintenance of any society requires.

. . . Students will participate as judges,
juries, arbitrators and censors, accountable to
their equals, charged with preventing offenses,
judging them, rendering punishment for them,
dispensin blame and praise, practicing all the
domestic and public virtues with respect for
law, morals, and general order in a manner
analogous to the universal constitution of the
Empire. (107)

The objective here is to apply the radical concept of
school democracy to disciplinary practices alone (le
régime des écoles); there is no mention of student
participation in matters affecting curriculum.

The instructors for their part will exercise only a
very general surveillance over these social activities;
however, they will maintain their status of authority in regard to instruction of their subject matter. (106) The students for their part, "at once free and submissive, will endure without difficulty a bondage of which they will feel the necessity, but will endure only that which is necessary." (107) The bondage that is necessary is obviously the yoke of subject matter to be administered under the academic authority of the teachers and school officials.

The second practical method of moral instruction, that of providing motives for virtuous action, includes the following list of incentives. First is the concept of reciprocal interests where men can be shown that in doing good to others they guarantee themselves to be recipients of more than they give up. Appeals to honor and to conscience are noted as strong motivations for correct behavior. And above all, virtuous acts must be stimulated by appealing to the reasoning faculties of men. "All other powers of motivation must sooner or later submit to its judgment and be revised by it." In this way, "reflection more than sentiment, conviction more than interest, demonstrate that truths of a moral order are founded upon indestructible bases that cannot be disregarded without renouncing all reason." (108)
Also important among incentives is motivation by example. And it is from history that these must come "because man's arrogance always defends itself from the task of his contemporaries." (108) But what history is worthy to provide this moral perspective? Perhaps none that currently exist can serve this purpose because they are about a small number of leaders when what is needed is a "history of peoples." (109) Inspired by a love for men's rights the new history will denounce all the crimes which it recounts, it will recognize "those who have served humanity with courage," it will consider the multitude of facts to disregard rights of men that are not well founded and discover those worth defending. In this manner, history becomes un système moral. (109)

Following the discussion of the "internal" motives, or incentives, for motivating men to lead moral lives, the third practical method of moral education is described. It pertains to that which makes impressions upon men by "exterior" means, through social festivals, through the arts, and theater. These forms of public instruction which extend beyond the walls of formal classrooms indicate that revolutionary education is intended for adults as well as for the young.

Finally, the role of the print media must be noted as serving an important educational role in general, relative
to all subjects. Especially important are elementary books (livre élémentaires) which should be "clear, precise, methodical, distributed profusely, rendering universally familiar, all the important truths, and which avoid unuseful efforts for learning them." (115)

The revolutionary curriculum *L'Instruction publique*, divided as it is into primary education for everyone and higher forms of education for a few, indicates not only a restriction on access to secondary education. It also indicates restrictions from access to moral education of a type where the maturing faculties of reason were to be applied to a thoughtful understanding of moral behavior and civic virtues, where democracy was to be practiced and not just learned in rote catechistic form as in the primary school. This means that only a few were to be socialized in the art and science of the new secular morality. It is therefore in order to consider the nature of the selection process in *L'Instruction publique* and the reasoning behind restrictions on access to secondary education.

**Selection processes and *L'Instruction publique***

Ultimately, any understanding of socialization processes is incomplete without an understanding of selection processes. Selection processes function to both
provide and restrict access to education for certain members of society based on specific criteria. For this criteria to be socially acceptable it is useful that the values upon which the criteria are based be part of the socialization process or at least compatible with the values of the socialization process. By socializing students to accept the values of the selection process they indirectly accept their own fate within the school system and hence criticism of restrictions on education is reduced. In order to explain the dual system of education in the Talleyrand Report, or for any type of selection process in education, it is necessary to examine the relationship between education and the division of labor in society. Some explicit and elaborate assumptions about this relationship are provided in *L'Instruction publique*.

First, Talleyrand explains that the distribution of men according to their "correct vocations" requires a universal education that can be applied to all types of vocations, and also requires additional types of education that, in being preparatory for select vocations, are more restrictive in nature. "For all men there must exist a primary instruction common to everyone. For a large number there must exist instruction [i.e., at the district school level] which is conducive to providing further development of the faculties, and which will indicate to
each student his particular destination. For a few (certain nombre) there must exist a specialized and thorough instruction [i.e., at the department school level], required for diverse professions from which society accrues great advantages." (14-15)

The most important distinction in the educational system as designed in the Talleyrand Report, is that between the primary and district schools. Primary school is not intended to indicate the exact vocation one will one day take up in society, rather it is to prepare children to be "good citizens," and "useful" members of society. (15) Primary schools are intended for the greatest number, most of whom include "those who, in being called by the law of necessity, must assume a promptly productive state" (meaning one that is agricultural in nature). In addition, those who are called by nature to the mechanical professions (professions mécanique) are encouraged, with a few exceptions, to return to the paternal home, where they will be trained in workshops. Thus for most citizens "it would be considered a veritable folly, a type of cruel beneficence, to want them to follow all degrees of instruction, which would be useless and by consequence harmful to the greatest number." (16)

Primary instruction has as its goal to provide to the great majority of men, according to their faculties, the
following: a physical condition that will have "usefully prepared them for work; their minds will have acquired sound thoughts and elementary knowledge; their soul will have received the germ of honest sentiments and virtuous actions." (30) These ends make for national instruction (l'instruction nationale) for everyone of which secondary education is the complement, but intended for far fewer citizens.

The district schools, or secondary schools, which Talleyrand also refers to as the "écoles moyennes," are open to everyone, but destined nevertheless, by the nature of things to serve only a small number (petite nombre) of students who complete primary school. Secondary instruction is intended "for those who, in being called neither by inclination (gout), nor by necessity (besoin), to mechanical or agricultural trades, aspire to other vocations, or who seek solely to cultivate or to embellish (ornier) their intelligence and to acquire a greater development of their faculties. (16) In contra-distinction to this last reason given for continuing one's education, but compatible with the prior division of labor justification, it is emphasized that secondary education must also indicate each student's disposition for a particular profession through recognition of those faculties by which an individual has distinguished
himself. This also indicates "the will of nature" (voeu de la nature) for the choice of a profession preferable to any other. (16)

Secondary education is therefore preparatory for some vocations in society not directly related to agricultural labor or work in the trades, and particularly it is preparatory for continuing education at the department schools to which a few from the district schools will have the opportunity to attend. Department schools for law, medicine, religion, and the military arts are the only professional schools to be included in the national system. These professions more than any others, according to Talleyrand, are professions which require an understanding of elaborate theories and of which errors in practice can be disastrous to society. (17) An important point to be made here is that restricting access to secondary education is also tantamount to restricting access to the major professions of society, and also, by implication, it applies to restricting access to other vocations for which a secondary education in language arts is useful, including those lesser vocations associated with the four major professions of the state.

The importance of restrictions on access to secondary education is explained as follows in L'Instruction publique. The subject is broached in a passage critical
of the gratuitous nature of secondary schools of the ancien régime. Talleyrand explains:

It has been said a thousand times, that among the multitude of students thrown inconsiderately by the vanity of their parents into our old schools open free to everyone, a large number upon reaching the end of the studies to which they became acquainted, were no longer suited for the occupations for which these studies were preliminary, and that they acquired only an insurmountable distaste for honorable professions and disdained those to which nature had called them; in this manner they became an embarrassment to society. (22)

This situation is to change with the new order so that "parents will no longer be tempted to become the victims of misunderstood vanity, and that to agriculture and the trades, which are repudiated by a foolish eye, will be returned and kept all those who are truly destined to cultivate them." (22) The sense here is that the revolutionaries felt too many students were obtaining a secondary education to the detriment of themselves and to society.

The national government, according to Talleyrand, is neither obliged nor has the right to interfere with the choices for education that parents and children may make. But an "honorable exception" [to unrestricted access] can be sanctioned by the state; "it is that which nature itself has seemed to provide in bestowing talent."

Although talent must be encouraged and nurtured, only those poor students at the primary level, "who have
displayed worthy minds (dispositions précieuse) will be eligible to continue beyond primary school at the complete expense of society." (23) All others predisposed to attend secondary school will pay for part of this education. The state will cover the basic costs of providing educational resources, while students will pay fees that will supplement part of the salaries of teachers. (24) The following schedule of fees is given: 24 livres from each student during the grammar and humanities years, increasing to 36 livres a year for the rhetoric and logic courses. (146) Therefore, student fees provide an additional means, along with merit, of restricting access to secondary institutions.

Instead of considering that expanding access to education might generate more happiness, or prepare more people to participate in the new democracy, the revolutionaries concluded that such an expansion had been taking place progressively under the old regime, and had in fact created less happiness as well as dysfunctional citizens.

In summation, L’Instruction publique provides justifications for restricting access to education based on merit and social utility. To know what is one’s most useful path in society is indicated by a law of necessity and by a law of nature that provides an unequal
distribution of talent. This means that selection is to ultimately be based on standards of evaluating student performance with vague assumptions about just how much talent will be needed in society. No provision is made directly, in *L'Instruction publique*, for methods of teaching acceptance of this selection system because the righteousness of the arguments of meritocracy and utilitarianism appeared self-evident to the revolutionaries and it was assumed that selection processes would be naturally accepted. It can also be assumed that the values of such a system would be reinforced in discussions of history and the *Declaration of Rights of Man and Citizen* where examples of meritocratic virtues could be juxtaposed to the abuses of privilege under the *ancien régime*. Values associated with selection systems are also very effectively inculcated through the school culture, in the attitudes of teachers and the system of rewards offered.

The greatest amount of space taken up in *L'Instruction publique* in regard to explicitly defending restrictions on access to education is in the area of education for girls. And it is here that the logic of 18th century utilitarianism is used most forcefully and completely. At the beginning of the report educational opportunity for women is stated as a matter of principle.
Since there exists a public instruction common to everyone from which society and the individual obtains an advantage it is only logical that "instruction must exist for both sexes." For, "by what principle would one sex be disinherited by a society that is protective of the rights of everyone?" (9)

It becomes clear, however, at the end of the report, that although girls will be invited to acquire a primary education, they should not expect to be provided with the opportunity to compete for entry into the secondary schools. The justification for this is as follows:

To begin with, questions relative to their education cannot be separated from a consideration of their political status; because in raising them, it is necessary to understand that which is their destination in life. If we acknowledge that their role must be to provide domestic tranquility and duties of domestic life, they must be trained early in order to fulfill this destination. (118)

Talleyrand continues by examining contradictions in the political status of women and why they are to be restricted from political participation.

One half of all human beings excluded by the other half of all participation in government; indigenous people by fact and foreigners by law in the land which nevertheless gave birth to them; proprietors without direct influence and without representation; this is a political phenomena, which according to abstract principle, it seems impossible to explain: but there is a mode of thought in which the question changes and can be resolved easily. The goal of all institutions must be the happiness of the greatest number. All that deviates from this is
an error; all that leads toward it, a verity. Considering that the exclusion from public employment pronounced against women is a means of augmenting for the two sexes the sum of their mutual happiness, this claim is in this regard a law that all societies have recognized and consecrated. (118)

It is implied in the Talleyrand Report that aside from a very few talented farmers, laborers, and artisans, the same law of mutual social happiness applies to restricting their access to secondary education as well.

Inquiries about socialization processes in the Talleyrand Report

For readers unfamiliar with 18th century educational history several general questions about the socialization and selection processes in *L'Instruction publique* are prompted by the above description. For example, why was so much emphasis placed on the humanities in secondary education and what might we assume would be the nature of a constitutional catechism? Particularly important in any document about reform or revolution is the identification of continuities and discontinuities. From a late 20th century perspective some elements in the plan appear very conservative, such as the inclusion of religion in the curriculum, the short period of elementary education, and the restrictions on access to secondary education. Other proposals in *L'Instruction publique*, such as a secular science of morality, meritocratic selection, the discovery
method of learning, and the apprenticeship in democracy seem almost contemporary or even radical in nature. It is natural to assume that the more radical elements of the report are more likely to indicate discontinuities with the past, while the elements which seem conservative more likely to represent continuities with the ancien régime. Only an understanding and knowledge of education prior to the Revolution can guide us to answer these questions.

For readers more familiar with education during the early modern era questions are likely to be raised in regard to the changes that took place in socialization and selection processes leading up to the Revolution. This way the specific nature of discontinuities can be detected so as to provide a key to understanding the revolutionary intentions of the National Assembly and just what real breaks with the past they aspired toward. Once the discontinuities in L’Instruction publique have been identified a socio-cultural analysis can be applied to these discontinuities so as to provide explanations for revolutionary proposals in education.

First, however, the socialization processes of ancien régime education must be examined so as to clearly define the revolutionary nature of L’Instruction publique. The following questions about education prior to the Revolution are most pertinent. What was the nature of
socialization processes in elementary and secondary education prior to the Revolution and what changes took place in these practices during the early modern era? What antecedent factors in revolutionary designs for education can be found in the early modern era schools and which concepts in *L'Instruction publique* can be disassociated from actual school practices of the ancien régime? This discussion will include consideration of the curriculum and the methods of learning and discipline in school culture of the old regime.
CHAPTER III
MORAL EDUCATION IN EARLY MODERN FRANCE

Q. What are the principle characteristics of Louis XV?

R. One can point out primarily in the person of Louis XV, a spirit capable of the most noble sentiments, of virtue, a character capable of the greatest acts and a natural inclination for the humanities.

Père Claude Buffier

It is true that, even under the empire of the most absolute masters, chefs-d’oeuvre have been created; but this only happened by deceiving tyranny, the authors knew how to take refuge in a foreign land; they transported themselves, they rushed to Athens, to Rome, as far as Olympia; and it is there that they found this liberty and the courage of thought of which they conserved the imprint.

L'Instruction publique

The structure and organization of knowledge in the eighteenth century

Formal knowledge in the 18th century was bifurcated into arts and sciences. The arts were generally preparatory and practical in nature while the sciences were theoretical and usually involved the application of knowledge acquired in the arts. The arts were divided into liberal arts and mechanical arts. The liberal arts consisted of language arts, or humanistic studies,
related to Latin, some Greek, and increasingly, vernacular literature, grammar, and rhetoric. Moral education was prominent within this curriculum. The mechanical arts, which are not treated in this study, were provided for in apprenticeships and a few specialized schools. The sciences, which were divided into moral and physical sciences, were taught in schools of higher education and consisted of theology and law (the moral sciences) and medicine (a physical science). Physics, ethics, and metaphysics, which made up a general philosophy course required for study of the moral and physical sciences at the university, were introduced in the upper levels of the secondary curriculum in those schools that offered the "complete" secondary curriculum.

Students completing the highest level of course work offered at the secondary level could receive a master of arts degree by taking an examination given by the universities. The exam, which generally covered studies taken in the philosophy course in the final year of secondary education, was generally prerequisite for entry to the universities. Upon completion of a university course in one of the specialized fields of law, medicine, or theology, a bachelor of science degree could be obtained. The most prestigious positions of responsibility within 18th century society generally
required a higher education in the sciences and procurement of a bachelor's degree. This was especially so in theology, the largest of the faculties, as most ecclesiastical dignitaries possessed the bachelor of science degree in theology. In addition, episcopal officials had to be licensed, which generally required a doctor's degree granted by the university after a lengthy period of probation and study following the bachelor's degree. Medical physicians were also required to have a doctor's degree, while lawyers and judges generally were able to practice having obtained only a license following completion of the bachelor's course in higher education.¹

**Schools for the liberal arts**

Primary and secondary schools of various types existed in France by the second half of the 18th century. They maintained a rather ill-organized relationship to each other, that nevertheless provided a sequential path of study and for some offered preparation for entry into the university professional schools.

Formal primary education began either in the company of a private tutor or upon entry into one of several types of elementary schools or a combination of both. The age of entry was around age six to eight and elementary schools could include children as old as ten or eleven.
In general, primary education lasted about two to three years depending upon the extent of the courses offered at the primary school and the progress of the student. Some primary schools offered only the rudiments of reading, while others included reading, writing, simple math, and in a few cases, even the early grammar courses found in the secondary schools.

Until the end of the 17th century all elementary school children learned to read first in Latin, then later in French. At the end of the 17th century bilingual texts appeared with captions in Latin and French for each image. And by the mid-18th century French was taught first in many schools followed by learning to read in Latin. But acceptance of the vernacular into the curriculum never replaced Latin as both were taught to just about everyone who learned to read up to the end of the old regime.²

The most well known of the primary schools, the "little schools" (petites écoles) were generally found in cities and larger towns with an occasional appearance in rural areas. In general, one teacher alone was in charge of the school. The municipalities contracted with individual teachers (maîtres d'école) who might belong to a corporation of elementary teachers or who could also be independent. Existing in some of the same locations and often competing with the little schools were "writing
schools" that offered a curriculum similar to that of the little schools. The writing schools were maintained by the Guild of Scriveners whose primary function was transcribing legal documents.

Parish schools or "charity schools" were founded and maintained by the church in rural areas where, for lack of funds, a little school or writing school had not been established by the community. Sometimes charity schools were maintained by private individuals or religious orders, among which the Ursulines (300 schools in the second half of the 18th century), the Congregation of Notre Dame, and especially the Brothers of the Christian Schools (125 schools in 1790), figured prominently. At a minimum, in communities without even a parish school, "Sunday schools" (écoles dominicales) taught catechism and the bare elements of reading.

Secondary schools existed in even more variation than did primary schools, and in some cases the distinction between primary and secondary schools does not appear very clear. In general, however, it was in the secondary schools that the basic knowledge of reading and writing learned in the primary schools was applied to the study of Latin grammar and the liberal arts. Most students began their collegiate studies between the ages of ten to twelve.
At the summit of secondary schools were the full-course colleges (collèges de plein exercice) offering the complete liberal arts curriculum. This curriculum consisted of an eight-year course of study, four in Latin grammar, one in humanities, one in rhetoric, and the final two years in philosophy. The most prestigious of these full-course colleges were those associated with the arts faculties of the universities. The arts faculties of the universities did not themselves run these schools but they examined students who had completed the philosophy course for the purpose of granting them the master of arts degree. Generally, a student had to have completed the philosophy course in a college associated with an arts faculty to be eligible for such an examination.

There were 33 full-course colleges associated with universities in 1789. Among these were the ten "secular" colleges associated with the University of Paris faculty of arts, eight of which had origins in the Middle Ages. The rest were run by teaching congregations including the Jesuits, Oratorians, Benedictines, Doctrinaires, and Barnabites. Another 140 full-course colleges existed with curricula very similar to those of the full-course university arts faculty colleges but were unaffiliated with a university, being in most cases maintained by religious orders.
In addition to the 173 full-course colleges were 174 humanities colleges (collège d'humanités) that offered a shorter course of studies which terminated at the sixth year with the rhetoric class, not offering the two year philosophy course. These were most likely to be found in the more sparsely-populated regions of France, while the full-course colleges tended to concentrate in the cities. The full-course colleges and the humanities colleges were public schools in the sense that they were generally subsidized by teaching orders, town councils, endowments, foundations, or a combination of these.

Other secondary schools, about which we know less, cropped up in small towns and large villages and claimed to prepare students for the better colleges. These little colleges (petits collèges), were popular with the middle class and were usually financed by ecclesiastical or secular endowments, scholarships, and foundations. Some of these little colleges, those known as écoles latines or régences latines, offered introductory courses in Latin, much like those offered in the first three years of grammar study in the regular colleges. Viguerie claims the little schools rivaled their more comprehensive counterparts in numbers of students and even in some cases offered the entire selection of courses found in the humanities colleges.4
Private schools known as *écoles particulières* existed to meet special needs that had developed toward the end of the *ancien régime*. As in the case of the little colleges, inadequate records and research do not allow us to gauge the extent nor importance of these schools other than to say they appeared to be growing in popularity up to the time of the Revolution. Possessing neither public nor ecclesiastical support, they were relatively expensive and acquired patrons by offering more modern, practical subjects than did the colleges. Some were vocationally oriented offering commercial subjects such as bookkeeping and courses in navigation. Others offered Latin and literature courses in addition to vocational subjects but with emphasis upon science, arithmetic, geometry, and botany. A few of these schools offered a quasi-military, secular atmosphere requiring boys to wear special uniforms and to practice drills, but without the trappings of religious instruction nor compulsory attendance at mass.

The public sector, generally through endowments, also provided opportunities for specialization in vocational subjects. Leading the list of these were ten military schools (*écoles militaire*) funded by the royal government and put into the hands of religious orders, mostly Benedictines and Oratorians. These schools offered Latin as well as courses in mathematics, engineering,
topography, and drawing. Students wore uniforms and drilled in military maneuvers and in general were prepared to continue training in one of the branches of the armed forces as potential officers.

Drawing schools (écoles de dessin) were publicly funded schools "founded on the belief that science could profitably be applied to the practical problems of business, commerce, and the trades." These schools, geared for the training of artisans and businessmen were founded in urban centers all over France beginning in 1741. Founded, financed, and directed by laymen these were generally small inexpensive schools to operate. Mathematics applied to industry and commerce, applied geometry, and mechanical drawing were popular. Applications could be made to surveying, furniture-making, textile design, carpet-making, tin-smithing, stone-cutting, and jewelry-making depending upon the school.

Work schools (écoles de travail) founded by benefactors interested in the working poor, were also closely related to occupational training. Intended as diversions from mendacity, indigence, and vagabondage, these schools might offer training in manufacturing for boys, or offer courses in how to spin wool and sew (école de filature) for girls. Aside from teaching trade skills the design and work schools also often taught reading and
writing. Religion was more frequently taught in the work schools than in the design schools, especially in cases where the benefactors were religious orders. Religion, though respected in the drawing schools, was not generally a requirement.⁶

Considering the variety of secondary schools that offered Latin and humanistic studies at little or no expense, many opportunities were available for learning Latin and the humanities at the end of the old regime. Anywhere that Latin and the humanities were taught lessons in moral education, including religious indoctrination, were to be found, except in a very few special cases as noted above. Supplementing moral lessons, particularly in the little schools and the colleges, was a school culture that reinforced some behaviors and provided for disciplining others in a manner peculiar to the early modern era. The following sections examine moral education and its relation to curriculum and school culture in elementary and secondary education.

Moral education and the elementary school curriculum

In the wake of the Protestant Reformation, mass religious education assumed a greater role in Catholic France than ever before. A vigorous educational campaign, in the churches and in the schools, was initiated so as to
provide French Catholics with sufficient doctrinal knowledge in the science of salvation to be able to defend their faith against "false" Christian beliefs and against secular ideas that threatened the faith. This indoctrination, which was to begin as early as possible in life, was adapted to new methods of teaching children that arose in the early modern era.

Up until the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, little consideration was given to the formal education of young children as children. Then, at the beginning of the early modern period of Western history a transformation took place in the conception of childhood. This theory which was developed by Philippe Ariès has particular relevance to moral education.7

Prior to the early modern era, children were considered adults at the age of seven or eight, and so at school younger children were mingled with older children and adults whether in Latin grammar schools, cathedral schools, or at the university arts schools. Schooling in this medieval tradition was intended to make choirboys at the elementary level and at the secondary level where the seven liberal arts were taught, to prepare for entry into ecclesiastical, legal, or medical studies. Most important was religious indoctrination and preparation for ecclesiastical studies. According to Ariès, it was not
until the 16th century that a "positive moralization of society" took place where "the moral aspect of religion was gradually triumphing in practice over the sacred or eschatological aspect."\(^8\) Compatible with this change were changes in the curriculum, some of which can best be understood in relation to specific changes in school culture.

A generalized indiscipline reigned in the medieval classroom, evidenced by the fact that monastic retreat became a popular means of achieving spiritual knowledge. In the schools of early modern times, disciplinary measures of various types were introduced, beginning with corporal punishment. Later, to lessen reliance upon harsh physical punishment methods of surveillance, emulation, and humiliation were used to normalize classroom behaviors. Most important from a curriculum perspective, these disciplinary changes were adopted by reformers who also introduced curriculum innovations compatible with the new disciplinary regimen. As educational reformers of the Reformation became interested in moral education, they, unlike the traditional humanists, expressed the need for a separate education for children. Out of regard for the special needs of children, religious education and humanistic studies in Latin and Greek and were organized according to learning difficulties and in different ways
applied to issues of conduct. In the changing schools of the Reformation, children studied in same-age groupings, and not just the mind, but moral and spiritual aspects of being were to be molded. The development of the catechism exemplified the new emphasis on age appropriate instruction and discipline. It is the keynote of the formalization of moral education.

The first catechism was composed by Luther in 1529. That it was not appropriate for young children led John Calvin, in 1541, to write the first children's catechism. It was composed of a succession of questions and responses capable of being committed to a young child's memory. In 1563 the Jesuit, Edmond Auger, published the first Catholic catechism in reaction to the popularity which Calvin's catechism had received in French schools, and it included a refutation, point by point, of Calvinistic claims. The Counter-Reformation in France, with the aid of the catechism, made the primary school teacher an auxiliary clergyman. Aside from teaching the ABC's, the school master was in charge of the recitation of the catechism, Bible readings, and teaching the fundamentals of the faith.

The value of the catechism, aside from providing doctrinal ammunition in the defense against "heretics," was its usefulness in making Christian doctrine
understandable to all believers by use of the vernacular. It made theology popular by giving it moral appeal and, in addition, could produce rousing melodrama. Moral guidance provided in lesson form by some catechists, especially those in the heroic age of the Reformation, could be imaginative and indulgent of superstition. Viguerie offers several accounts. One is of a catechist who divided children into two rows, one group the living, interrogating the other group, the damned, about their condition. The latter in lugubrious responses told of the terrifying punishments which tortured them. In a lesson from another catechism is the story of a man who had such an aversion to the word of God that he left the church whenever the preacher approached the pulpit. Upon his death, at the moment his body was taken into the church, the crucified Christ pulled his hands from the cross and placed them over his ears.9

The extent to which imaginative catechisms such as these were used is difficult to gauge. However, church authorities under the influence of the Enlightenment must have worried about them, as episcopal regimen advised precise days and hours for catechism, the appropriate manner in which to pose questions and to respond, and how to explain difficulties. Viguerie notes that the
histoires began to disappear from the catechisms after 1660.¹⁰

The catechism, which became a part of the formal school curriculum, also provided a means of community education. It was provided with general regularity on Sundays, holidays, and particularly during Lent in parish churches. No one, children and adults alike, were exempt from reciting the catechism in public, each individual being called on personally at some time during the sessions if at all possible. In the school curriculum, religious indoctrination took other forms as well. Episcopal discourses indicate that above all else the little schools were expected to provide lessons in the doctrines of Christianity. These lessons to be given by the teacher were recommended as frequently as once a day or at least twice a week, to consist of teaching le Pater, l’Ave, and le Credo in Latin and in French, the commandments of God and church, the mysteries of the religion and ritual exercises. In addition each school day was to begin and end in prayer.¹¹

Three levels of catechism became standard, indicating pedagogy by degree with forethought to the different capabilities of age groups. For very young children there was the petit catéchisme containing the simplest elements of the faith to be learned by memory. Next was the
catechisme moyen directed to students in preparation for first communion, and it was also used by ecclesiastics to explain Christian doctrine to the masses. The third catechism was the grand catéchisme which was especially useful for catechists and clergy because it was addressed strictly to adults about the finer points of the mysteries of the religion. The catechisms offered above all else, instruction for daily prayer, containing a formula for morning and evening prayers and oraisons mentales for dispelling temptation.

The degree to which catechisms were used as a means for teaching reading and writing is uncertain. Episcopal documents concerned most often about content speak only indirectly to issues of reading and writing. What troubled ecclesiastical authorities the most were that inappropriate texts might be used to teach reading and writing. A statute from the diocese of Angers (1677) admonished curés to banish from the little schools various types of reading material including "les livres de fable, les romans et toutes sortes de livres profanes et ridicules dont on se sert souvent pour commencer à leur apprendre à lire." This prohibition indicates that, not just secular literature, but secular literature incompatible with church doctrine was frequently used to teach reading. To what extent this type of printed
material was used is unknown, but it seems unlikely that it was used for lack of texts, as pedagogical literature with religious themes abounded and were recommended by vigilant bishops.

Traditionally, students brought from home the family psalter or other documents which were used to learn to read when books were scarce. But by the 18th century various elementary primers, many with religious themes, were used widely. A popular abécédaire in Latin, dating from the 16th century, was *La Croix de Dieu*. It contained an eclectic assortment of all that generally made up introductory reading material, including an alphabet, a syllable reader, *le Pater*, *l’Ave*, *le Credo* and other prayers. One of the most popular abécédaires was quite secular in nature. Entitled, *le Rôti-Cochon* (Pig on a Spit), it innovated in using pictures of pleasures of the table to teach Latin and French simultaneously. Another innovation was the syllabaire, a "phonics" book of syllables to be sounded out as one learned to read words. One of the most popular of these was the *Quadrille des enfants* containing 84 pages of pictures and words. Twenty images were produced per page accompanied on the opposite page by the word for each image, with a syllable from each word printed beside it. One such page reproduced in *Histoire générale de l’enseignement et de l’éducation en*
France indicates how religious themes were worked into primers. Amid the majority of everyday words such as coin, apricot, finger, lawyer, and insects are religious words including "un christ" (depicted on the cross), "la bénédiction" (depicting a bishop among worshipers), and "la procession" (depiction of a procession of clergy). Quadrille des enfants indicates the growing popularity by the 18th century of learning to read in the vernacular. La Salle published the first syllabaire in French in 1698 with the ultimate objective of providing the masses with prayers and explanations of Christian doctrine in the language they understood best.

Although reading, religion, and writing made up the core curriculum of primary schools, another subject was also widely adopted in the little schools and it pertained to the civilizing mission of early modern education. As part of a vast enterprise of acculturation encouraged by secular and religious leaders, civility was taught through the use of various texts. The first modern piece on this subject, De civitate morum puerilium, written by Erasmus and published in 1530, was still very popular in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It described table manners, rules of propriety and decency, including some courtly manners discussed in treatises dating from the 13th century. Most importantly it introduced the term
civilitas (civility) into modern discourse, which in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries came to represent a social code of propriety (bienséance) and politeness that was the mark of a gentleman or honnête homme. What Erasmus did was to propose an imitation of the best of the manners of courtly society and the upper classes. His work, in appealing to the gens du monde, added to marks of distinction between the upper classes and the commoners.

Beginning in the 16th century civility was taught in the little schools and hence came within the grasp of the lower classes in attendance. It was generally considered a purely secular concern until La Salle, in 1703, included in the title of a work on civility a religious reference. In his preface to Règles de la beinséance et de la civilité chrétienne, he noted how surprising it was that the majority of Christians regarded propriety and civility as purely secular humanistic traits and did not elevate their thoughts beyond these concerns to the spiritual realm, failing to consider anything that relates to God as a social virtue. It was La Salle’s goal to teach that all actions are of significance to God and that social virtues are even more rewarding when carried out in the spirit of Jesus Christ.

La Salle’s efforts are indicative of the pervasive influence of religion in French education, particularly in
elementary education. And religious education was not only deeply ingrained in the curriculum but in the school culture as well. Ornamenting the classroom, when any picture could be found at all, was an image of the crucifix. This iconography represents the two poles of Christian doctrine in which the ecclesiastics were eager to initiate children. On the one hand the concern and anxiety for salvation and eternal life based on apprehension, and on the other hand, the mystery of the incarnation of Christ and devotion to the merits of his life through piety and faith.

Moral education and elementary school culture

Once adapted to Christian doctrine, the egalitarian nature of Christianity brought about the attempts of religious educators to universalize civility. Here the goal became one of reducing the spontaneity, passions, and casual disruptions in classrooms and other public places produced especially by children of working and peasant classes. The attempt to do this was based on the belief that the norms of middle class propriety and decorum could be imposed from above. This civilizing mission also enhanced the school's parental and preceptorial roles in society.
As part of the civilizing mission of elementary education there existed a suspicion of the corporal nature of man and a masking of the influence of natural functions in the maturation process. This attitude can be traced to the spiritualism of the Catholic Counter-Reformation and then later to the Enlightenment which gave preeminence to the spirit guided by reason. With the Enlightenment, however, new methods of disciplining children were adopted, which were less physically harsh than corporal punishments. What arose was a regimen affecting the mind, the body, and the soul in order to create a complete moral and civilizing effect. The intent was not just to inculcate religious morality and civility, which the catechism and manuals on manners reflected, but to also counter idleness, to accustom children to labor, and to teach them a regularity in the use of time. This transition in classroom management, which was duly noted by Ariès and which is part of Foucault’s theory of bio-power as explained in *Discipline and Punish*, is summarized below. It represents what Foucault referred to as disciplinary technologies derived from the objectification of the body in order to forge a docile body that may be subjected, used, transformed, and improved.\(^{15}\)

The traditional form of classroom management in the little schools of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries
was one of individual relationships between the teacher and each of the students. The school master questioned students individually, one at a time, under the threat of punishment by the rod, while the other students of various ages and sometimes including girls, were dispersed about the room, in corners or at tables, playing or writing, reading or squabbling. There was very little regulation of classroom behavior while individualized lessons were taking place. In these daily one-to-one encounters, the teacher could be a benevolent despot or a tyrant. At times the maître might show tenderness (caresses) and affection toward the child and his or her work; in other instances the teacher might deliver harsh blows with a rod or whip. Cajoling one minute, rendering bruises the next, the student-teacher relationship was based on spontaneity rather than prescribed methods of disciplining.¹⁶

The extent to which pedagogy was cruel and violent during the early modern era is difficult to ascertain. That it endured well into the 18th century is apparent from the testimony of Mounier in regard to the curé who taught him the elements of Latin. So severe were the punishments that he endured that he attributed this early experience to his lifelong hatred for all forms of oppression.¹⁷ Also, painters and engravers of the 18th
century continued to portray school masters questioning students with lash in hand.

The great change in pedagogical methodology is indicated by two works: *Escole paroissiale*, attributed to Jacques de Batencour and published in Paris in 1654, and a manual influenced by this work written by La Salle in 1720 (Avignon), entitled *Conduite des école chrétiennes*. These works in turn prompted the writing of other manuals by bishops and school reformers in provincial parishes. Batencour and La Salle emphasized above all else a reorganization of the usage of time such that idleness and voids in time on task be eradicated. Daily rhythms were recommended to occupy children at every moment by dividing the day into segments that included specific behaviors associated with arrival, prayer, lessons, lunch, catechism, and departure.

Instruction acquired a segmented, regimented pattern also. Learning to read, write, and to count were divided into an analytical scheme from simple to complex with different levels of advancement within each subject. The intent was to present material to students at a level at which they could accomplish a task and understand its meaning. In addition, time spent in idleness due to frustration over difficult material would be reduced.
Monthly examinations added further motivation to spend time on task.

Teachers were no longer to remain indifferent to the class while questioning a student. First the school masters were instructed to question students at random instead of in an order that would allow students to gauge how much time they had before their turn, hence, keeping them more constantly aware of needing to be prepared. Students were also to be separated within the classroom based on learning levels. At the most honorable level were students who had already learned to read Latin or who showed the ability to do so, and who could write. Next were students learning to write followed by students who were beginning to read, but who could not write.

Another innovation introduced in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was the simultaneous class method of teaching groups of children at once, instead of giving individual lessons one at a time. The simultaneous method, which can be traced to the introductory classes at certain colleges in the 16th century, was adopted during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries by the girls schools of the Congregation of Notre-Dame and in the boys schools run by La Salle's Brothers of the Christian Schools. It had the effect of regulating the topography of the class and keeping children on task as well as
teaching larger numbers organized according to the same level of pedagogical materials. (It probably also had the effect of causing the invention of the blackboard.)

Not only was learning regulated, but movements and posture were also addressed. Books were to be held upright with two hands, without resting them on the table or lap. Departure from class was to be in an orderly manner with each student reacting to a silent signal from the teacher to leave in pairs or rows, following the students who preceded them. Similarly, orderliness was to take place when conducting students to the church, when following the mass, or in religious processions. Everything within the school, including space, time, and student comportment was therefore to be regulated, leading to the internalization of control on the part of students.

In this well-organized school, surveillance was important and teachers were prompted to use various techniques to account for behavior at every moment. Among techniques recommended in manuals were venetian blinds in the door of the teacher's study if it adjoined the classroom, or venetian blind type wood slats in the floor of the teacher's room if it was above the classroom. Surveillance was also conducted by the most trustworthy students in the class, chosen by the teacher to report misbehaviors. In addition, surveillance was not to be
confined to the classroom; it was also recommended that those students of devout allegiance be sent out to make home inquiries questioning parents about children’s conduct at home and reporting back to the teacher. Knowing they could be watched and their behavior accounted for at any moment would have been a highly effective method of causing students to internalize control. As noted by Compère and Julia, this system was multifarious, automatic, and anonymous.18

Student participation in classroom management did not only entail surveillance, but included a hierarchy of other responsibilities. Students were involved in collecting and passing out materials, cleaning up after lunch, and tutoring other students. Being chosen to serve in some capacities in the classroom was no doubt a sign of status that was rewarding in nature. On the other hand, punishment often took the form of the imposition of unenviable tasks, that produced humiliation in front of one’s peers to evoke self-correction and repentance.

Overall, the transition in disciplinary practices in the early modern era was based on the rationality of the age which excluded the non-rationality of affective rewards and harsh punishments found in the "traditional" education of the times. The emphasis upon behavior fit in nicely with Christian goals. For La Salle, the rewards of
piety were greater than for all others and the rewards of diligence greater than those of ability. The extent to which the new methods of teaching and classroom management were adopted by the little schools is difficult to ascertain, as most of what we know about the new methods comes from manuals, edicts, and the testimony of a few. To the degree that it did exist it complemented a scheme of acculturation to catechize and to moralize students, which also, according to Compère and Julia, coincided with the concern of municipal officials to civilize the rowdy nature of youth and to ensure compliance with the laws of the city or town. Now, there was very little in the way of civic education in the elementary curriculum; therefore, it must be assumed that civil authorities viewed the general respect for authority promoted by the catechism and rational methods of discipline in the schools as transferable to respect for civil authority outside the school walls.

Moral education and secondary school culture

Changes in the structure of the curriculum and in classroom management that led to learning level gradations and a more organized disciplinary system in the little schools had been initiated first and with more necessity at the secondary level. The origins of the eight
sequential stages for learning Latin and reading the classics is traced to the 14th century reforms of the medieval *trivium* by the Brethren of the Common Life. (This group also introduced subjects of ethics and philosophy into the secondary curriculum which heretofore were taught only at the universities.) The establishment of disciplinary codes regulating all aspects of college life first appeared in France, in 1501, at the Jesuit college of Montaigu.\(^21\)

Modern developments in studies and in disciplinary practices reached full fruition in 1599 with the *Ratio Studiorum* in which were codified the rules of the Jesuit colleges. The University of Paris soon reformed the colleges under its wings after the Jesuit schools began successfully competing with them for students, in large part because parents favored the new regulated school life. What developed, in the words of Ariès, was a "genuinely juvenile system of education."\(^22\) Butts aptly summarized this change and the challenge presented to the educational community:

> During the Reformation the flexibility characteristic of the wandering students of the Middle Ages and Renaissance began to give way to order, discipline, regular attendance, a prescribed curriculum, and regular classification and promotion from one grade to the next. Constant attempts were made to make students "toe the mark," and innumerable rules were passed to prevent fighting, card playing, dicing, and even swimming, skating, fishing, and
birdcatching. Severe punishments were meted out in the attempt to enforce discipline. Part of the necessity for discipline was doubtless the fact that the Reformation secondary schools, especially in Germany and France, began to take over many of the subjects of the traditional liberal arts that had formerly been taught in the medieval university. The effort to teach difficult classical studies to young boys, who began the course anywhere from the age of seven to fourteen and finished at from fourteen to seventeen years of age, must certainly have taxed the ingenuity of the master in matters of discipline.22

Personal accounts and literature written about school life in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries testify to this challenge. Juvenile delinquencies included throwing fire works or ink-horns filled with putrid garbage at passersby on the streets bordering the school and eluding school authorities to roam the streets in bands to molest the bourgeois and to binge in taverns. In spite of regulations, students brought swords and daggers to classes which were used not only to engrave initials but for dueling with rivals. Some accounts from the mid-16th century tell of revolts by students, in one case armed with pistolets, against the regents, which often resulted in intervention by the civil authorities including arrest and jail time.

Gradually, throughout the course of the second half of the 17th century the more violent and disruptive behaviors abated and indiscipline took other forms such as voicing libelous and slanderous invectives, lampooning
authorities, and engaging in debauchery that included drinking and prostitution. This decrease in malevolence coincided with a decrease in corporal punishment. By the 18th century corporal punishment was recommended with qualifications that it be used infrequently and with discretion such that punishment should match the crime. By the second half of the 18th century it was considered antiquated with usage only in backward provinces and obscure schools not yet penetrated by the enlightened pedagogy.\textsuperscript{24}

It is difficult to ascertain whether the gradual reduction in violent student indiscipline was the result of harsh methods of punishment or the result of its diminishing use resulting in less resentment. New forms of punishment included privations (canceling desserts or promenades) and confinements (grounding one for eight hours in his dorm room). With greater frequency throughout the latter half of the 18th century, these lesser punishments were effectuated in response to even more serious offenses, such that Viguerie has suggested a situation of laxity or excessive indulgence appears to have existed in many instances in the couple decades prior to the Revolution.\textsuperscript{25} In addition to the evolving mollification of punishments, daily regulations of time usage weakened and the duration of classes decreased while
vacation days increased. In the 16th century the school day in most colleges lasted six or seven hours, this diminished to five hours during the 17th century and to four hours in the colleges of the University of Paris and others during the 1760s.\footnote{26}

In contradistinction to the negative forms of behavioral conditioning, such as corporal punishment or privations and humiliation, the most widely proposed method of motivation to inspire learning and good behavior was emulation. Among emulatory practices was the recognition of academic progress and good behavior in the form of notes sent home to parents. Even more important was the recognition of academic talent through scholastic competitions ending in award ceremonies with parents and public dignitaries in attendance. The latter practice is especially indicative of the tendency of the entire collegiate system to distinguish the truly talented from the rest of the students. Gifted and assiduous students were often segregated from the others into special classes or were given private lessons to enhance their potential to win a composition competition. In addition, the talented and most well-behaved stood out before their peers in the interior regime of the school as provisions were made for the better students to conduct surveillance and to tutor those at lower levels of learning. Thus, the
better students, the gifted students, were continually on display as models for the rest of the students based on their meritorious work and good behaviors.\textsuperscript{27}

The change toward more "humane" motivational and disciplinary practices in secondary schools is treated by Viguerie and by Compère and Julia as resulting from enlightened ideas in a tradition beginning with Erasmus and culminating in the injunctions of Rollin. Viguerie's view is that the disciplinary methods of the educational institutions of the ancien régime possessed a "realism" that the harsher and more spontaneous methods of the medieval period did not.\textsuperscript{28} Ariès, on the other hand, although agreeing with Viguerie's conclusion, traces the origin of humane realism not to liberal ideas but to a new concept of childhood. Children were no longer looked upon as immodest adults with a weakness. Instead there arose a mentality sympathetic to the need for careful, gradual awakening in the child of the adult sense of responsibility.\textsuperscript{29}

Educational historians of the early modern era, in their comparisons of early modern education with medieval education, have found it reasonable to conclude that the new methods of discipline which evolved from the 16th century led to more humane and realistic classroom management practices. This does not, however, mean such
practices did not have their own forms of ineffectiveness. It is helpful in this regard to compare early modern "humane-realism" with the progressive tradition of the late modern and contemporary era. By progressive is meant learning theories which suggest that individual competition for grades and awards cause widespread internalization of perceived inadequacies on the part of a great number of students. Progressive theories of discipline suggest that public humiliation internalizes resentment much as corporal punishment does. Progressive theories also suggest that student's attitudes toward learning are to a great degree based on peer pressures, social backgrounds, and self-perceptions more than upon official standards for academic emulation and proper conduct.

If we apply progressive assumptions to an analysis of early modern education we are inclined to infer that in the case of a great many students attending the French colleges that the practices of segregating students and rewarding the outstanding ones, while humiliating the lesser capable or the delinquents led naturally to the internalization of inadequacies and the breeding of resentments. Such invidious distinctions are likely to have led to the solidarity of peer groups within schools. This then would help to explain why the colleges,
throughout the early modern period, continued to have
disciplinary problems, especially those involving group
revolts and roving bands of students engaged in uncivil
behaviors in the towns. Progressive theories also provide
potential explanations for the rhetorical outbursts of the
revolutionaries against the abuses of ancien régime
education, and for why the colleges became, in the words
of Viguerie, "foyers of agitation that received the
Revolution with enthusiasm."30 Explanations based on
progressive learning theories stand in contrast to
Viguerie's implication that revolutionary agitation
resulted from the laxity which existed on the eve of the
Revolution in upholding the standards of the humane-
realism that had been established for two centuries. Most
often, however, it is not abuse associated with
disciplinary practices per se of the old regime that are
decried in *L'Instruction publique*, but the authoritarian
nature of school management as an abuse as well as an
inappropriate use of power. Therefore, this aspect of
early modern school culture requires further
investigation.

The guiding political force behind the system of
emulation, surveillance, and regulation at the colleges
was the hierarchical structure of administration which was
very much a top-down system of management. Brockliss has
concluded that the college and seminary "mirrored closely the absolute State in that government and administration were ultimately in the hands of one man: the principal, superior or rector." The authority of the principal (principal, primarius, or principalis) was not sovereign, however. Although he was in charge of running the college, he was answerable to either the superior of the order (at schools sponsored by religious congregations) or the municipal authorities (if a secular school) which could include a bishop or secular official.

Supervision over conduct and academic studies at the school resided with the principal. He visited both dormitories and classrooms unannounced. In the larger establishments an assistant principal (sous-principal) was considered the "regulations incarnate," who, according to Rollin, was to possess "the spirit of vigilance, attention, exactitude . . . observing everything within sight." The prefect (préfet), invented by the Jesuits and adopted by all the teaching congregations, was charged with surveillance over the pensioners (pensionnaires). The head prefect supervised the individual prefects in each dormitory, whose role there was to ensure that students recited their lessons and executed their duties. Students were never to be left alone at any time. If one prefect had to leave another substituted until he
returned. The head prefect, although neither in charge of governing nor administering the school, nevertheless, kept a watchful eye over the management of studies and ensured that public and private laws were observed by both professors and students. The prefect was also in charge of making academic decisions, based on end-of-the-year examinations or evaluations, in regard to determining which students should be passed on to their next level of studies and which should be retained.

Students, although serving no administrative functions in the colleges, did, as in the case of some elementary schools, participate in classroom management practices. Compère and Julia describe an example of a technique used by the Jesuits, which was recommended in *Escole paroissiale*. It is a model for student participation based on Roman literature. According to *Escole paroissiale*, students who excelled in Latin or writing were to be given responsibilities over the other students in accordance with titles and functions that were analogous to the Roman political hierarchy. These included an emperor, a censor, *prêteur*, consul, prince of the decurions, leader of the prodecurions, senators, decurions and prodecurions in an elaborate hierarchy where each officer was responsible for tutoring those below him and being tutored in turn by those above him. In addition
to this academic hierarchy were spiritual officers, prayer reciters, and readers chosen for their strong voice, diction, and capacity to read. The degree to which this particular scheme was initiated is difficult to ascertain, but the selection of individual students to serve as decurions (each supervising the studies of ten others) appears to have been widespread, and was no doubt more likely to be applied where classes were large. Along with these academic roles, select students were also chosen to function as doormen, classroom furniture arrangers, and attendance takers to note absences and tardies. Finally, in regard to surveillance, a vigile was selected to be the spy of the regent. All in all, Viguerie notes that by involving students in surveillance, tutoring, and other activities they were granted the "appearance of liberty."34

This liberty of appearances was not a liberty distinguished by choices (whether predetermined or real), but merely by functional, prearranged activities which allowed for student movement and a regulated movement at that, made up of physical chores and academic groupings. It was a liberty preordained according to an authoritarian system which reflected in many ways the political state of France in the early modern era. Ariès describes the changes in school management which took place during the
early modern era as an evolution "from a collegiate administration to an authoritarian system, from a community of masters and pupils to the strict government of pupils by masters." This observation by Ariès is also that of the revolutionaries of 1789. In their appeal to democratic liberties and "real" choices, the revolutionaries did not, however, have to invent a totally new system of government. For partial roots of their alternative vision are to be found in the education they received in the colleges of the old regime.

Moral education and the secondary school curriculum

The secondary curriculum of the colleges was dominated by Latin texts (or translations in the vernacular), both religious and secular in content, a few of which were consistently used in all colleges making the curriculum uniform throughout the country. Classical literature, often in the form of extracts from standard works, was relied on heavily as professors were expected to use illustrative models of Latin grammar and style, as well as texts which had moral utility. The pervasive and consistent use of particular texts is betrayed in the règlements of the colleges which included in their curriculum listings the following variety: several religious works including the New Testament, writings of
the church fathers, and histories of saints; most all classical poets, historians, and orators; and most every French author of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. These lists in the règlements were found by Brockliss to be misleading. By examining a handful of college prospectuses that survive for the period, accounts of a few collegians, and indirect sources such as sales catalogues of local libraries, college prize-lists, and texts set for the Paris agrégation, he concludes that what was actually studied was quite circumscribed.36

In Greek, Aesop and the Greek New Testament were frequently read by beginners progressing to Lucian’s Dialogue of the Dead and Xenophone’s Cyropaedia in the middle forms, while Homer (Iliad or Odyssey), Demosthenes, and Isocrates were used in the rhetoric class. Of the Greek works only Homer and Lucian were always used and occasionally Plutarch was read.

Among Latin literature which dominated the curriculum, dependence was upon writers of the late Republic and Augustan era, particularly Cicero. In the beginning levels (sixth and fifth forms) the following might be read singly or in compilations: Cicero (Litterae familiares), Ovid (Tristia), Cato (Distichs), Cordier (Dialogues), Erasmus (Colloquies), Phaedrus (Fables), Cornelius Nepos (Histoires), and Old Testament histories.
In the middle forms (fourth and third), Cicero’s *De officiis* was by far the most popular, being particularly apt for future members of a professional elite. Also read were Ovid (*Tristia* or *Metamorphoses*), Terence (*Adelphi*), Virgil (*Eclogues* or *Georgics*), and sometimes additional works by Cicero (*De amicitia* and *De senectute*). As the 18th century progressed Latin histories became popular. Most widely read were Livy and Quintus Curtius, with Justin, Caesar, Sallust, and Tacitus used occasionally. Poetry included Virgil’s *Aeneid*, used almost always, and selections from the *Odes* or *Epistles* of Horace. In the second form, or rhetoric course, the diet never changed, with Cicero’s orations (*Pro Ligario*, *Pro Milone, Pro Marcella*) dominating.

As for French texts used, the list is narrow once again, but the evidence is weaker. In the lower classes La Fontaine’s *Fables* and maybe *Characters* by La Bruyère were read. In the upper classes the lyric poems of J.B. Rousseau were read as was Voltaire’s *Henriade*. Examples of French oratory came mostly from the "morally redoubtable preachers" including Bossuet, Fléchier, Bourdaloue, Massillon, and Mascaron. In addition, d’Aguesseau and Cochin were the only *parlementaires* to be actually read in the classroom, although others, including some avocats and dramatists were frequently quoted in the
rhetoric class. Beginning in the 1760s, history and geography works in French were introduced into the curriculum, although in limited amounts of time compared with the attention granted to the core classical subjects. The study of geography included a mixture of physical, political, economic, and cultural elements, and natural history. History was considered the more important as it was to history that moral education accrued. A sequence was established such that the lower classes studied the Bible as history along with ancient and classical culture; in the upper classes French and European histories were discussed, while local history, universal history and even world affairs, including discussions of the American War of Independence, might be considered in the rhetoric class. The most popular texts used were Fleury's Catéchisme historique contenant en abrégé l'histoire sainte et la doctrine chrétienne (1683) (which headed the list of Rollin early in the century) and Bossuet's Histoire universelle (1681). In the former, moral and theological issues were explored, in the latter, divine providence was integrated into historical explanations. In addition to these, several other histories found their way into classrooms, some of which contained the word revolution in their titles, in particular, Histoire des révolutions arrivés dans le gouvernement de la Républic
This core curriculum of the colleges, which consisted of predominantly Latin texts, some Greek works, and the increasing introduction of French literature and translations throughout the 18th century, is dominated by secular authors, and in the writings of the ancients, republican themes were widely discussed. In fact, many of the Latin authors read, such as Cicero, Livy, and Tacitus who wrote between 80 B.C. and 120 A.D. when the golden age of the Roman Republic had passed, tended to idealize the republican virtues of democracy that preceded their own age. Democratic virtues of the republic which were recounted included the overthrow of tyrants (Tarquin the Magnificent) and usurpers (Julius Caesar), the election of chief officials and even of early kings, and the establishment of civil rights that protected all citizens from arbitrary arrest and which ensured personal liberty. In the Greek author Plutarch students would have read of the golden age of Athens and Sparta, of Athenian liberty and Spartan equality. And in addition to political themes of democracy were social themes. On the positive side the classical authors expressed adoration for social mobility founded upon hard work and talent which was equated with the golden ages of Greece and Rome. On the negative side,
they viewed the decline of their own ages as resulting from luxury, greed, indulgence, wealth, and the absence of selfless virtues. Parker succinctly summarized the moral high ground of these ancients as follows: "To the virtues which Sallust and Cicero attributed to this earlier age—a simple life, frugality, industry, temperance, self-control, courage, integrity, and justice—Livy and Plutarch added only two, a love of country and of liberty." How then to explain this curriculum in the midst of an age of privileges and extreme inequalities of wealth, in an age of Christian reform and revival, and in an age of political absolutism and monarchy?

Two paradoxes present themselves based on the literary themes which students encountered at the colleges and the nature of the social order within and outside the college environment. There was the contradiction of an education directed at instructing Christians in the language of pagan authors, and secondly, republican authors were read in a society where sympathetic use of the word republican was as heretical in political circles as was sympathetic use of the word atheist in religious circles. Mercier, in his frequently cited Tableau de Paris, noted the primary political contradiction this way: "It is an absolute king who pays professors to seriously
explain to you all the eloquent declamations hurled against the power of kings."

Before examining how pagan and republican sentiment was deflated by the pedagogues, it is helpful to understand that socio-educational contradictions which appear to defy the laws of social solidarity can exist in many contexts. For example, during the progressive era of our own age, American intellectuals in the tradition of John Dewey frequently pointed out that literature in the schools was abundant in themes of individualism, while the social order of industrialism demanded pervasive conformity. In order to keep this contradiction of education in a capitalist society from threatening the status quo, a school culture (resembling that which originated in early modern Europe) was established to reinforce the regimentation of working life, while teachers, although paying homage to the great men of American society, did little to inspire students to imitate anything other than the style or private virtues of Emerson, Thoreau, or Jefferson. And so it was in early modern French schools, the school culture and teacher interpretations limited imitation of the ancients to their linguistic style and private virtues.

Narrow interpretations of classical, secular literature would seem a natural approach for the college
teaching corps to have accepted, considering that teachers were in the large majority made up of secular and regular clergymen. These men, as such, belonged to a hierarchical Roman Catholic church associated with absolutist politics of the state. Thus, it is no wonder that the hierarchical regimentation of curriculum, disciplinary practices, and opportunities for student participation was more reflective of the Roman army than of the Roman Senate.

However much curriculum and school culture resembled a secular organizational hierarchy of the past, the pervasiveness of religious symbols and practices in the colleges ensured that Christian ideology and not classical republicanism or paganism was ingrained in the learners habits of thought and behavior. College manuals and regulations are prolix with references to pietistic practices including daily mass in the morning, vespers (saluts) in the evening, religious readings during the mass, with confession and communion taking place several times during the year. Pictures and engravings with religious themes embellished the chapel and the corridors, the refectory and the classrooms. These often depicted dogmas rejected by the Protestants, including the miracles of the Eucharist, the Virgin victorious over the heretics, and exaltations of the saints and martyrs.
Within the curriculum, catechisms ensured a rigorous dose of Catholic doctrine. Widely used in the classroom were two works dating to the mid-16th century, one by Pierre Canisius and the other by Père Auger. That of Canisius was divided into a *minimus*, in French, for students with no understanding of Latin, the *minor*, in Latin, for beginners, and the *major* for advanced students in Latin. (Lessons in French were conducted to about the fourth class and in Latin beginning with the third.) Christian dogma was analyzed to coincide with the liturgical calendar, and emphasis was placed upon the authority and primacy of the Roman Catholic church. Recitations by heart and public disputes were sponsored and accompanied by prizes. Sacred hymns and spiritual odes were often sung before and after catechism lessons. In general, the emphasis of religious instruction in schools was upon daily devotional practices rather than teaching the finer points of doctrine, as lessons on the Scriptures were left to Sunday sermons or public lectures given by a professor of *Ecriture Sainte*. For two centuries the catechism played a daily role in the routines of most college students; however, there were signs of decline in its usage during the last half of the 18th century. One example, offered by Viguerie, is of the Doctrinaires who discovered in 1776 that in some of their
provincial chapters, regents no longer conducted the daily or bi-weekly catechism in their classes, and that one college had eliminated even the weekly catechism.\textsuperscript{42}

Although Christian religious practices and texts provided a counter-ideology to pagan themes, censorship was still required. Some works were prohibited on the college curriculum lists, including the morally unacceptable Aristophanes and Aeschylus and the freethinkers Cyrano de Bergerac and Saint-Evrémonde. French dramatists, including Molière, Racine, Corneille and Raynaud never appear on the lists except at Sorèze. Some authors were expurgated, including Terence, Ovid, and Horace in whose works "either an offending ode was left out or particular versus were cleansed and rewritten."\textsuperscript{43}

Anti-republican ideology was inculcated in two fundamental ways. First there existed texts that either favored the monarchy or evinced reservations about republicanism. Secondly, the method of teaching provided for professorial exegeses wherein republicanism could be countered in different ways depending upon the fervor of the teacher.

French texts frequently used in the classroom, such as Voltaire's \textit{Henriade} or Bossuet's \textit{Histoire universelle}, were laudatory about monarchy. Even histories with "revolution" in their titles (mentioned above) provided
conservative interpretations of attempts to overthrow the state and usually concluded that revolution ended in chaos and anarchy. Even Millot's history of France, in which criticisms were leveled against Louis XIV's despotic tendencies and foreign interventions, showed no sympathy for attempts to overthrow the state. Finally, in classical texts, textbook editors and translators offered criticisms of the ancient authors, either critiquing their romantic views as inconsistent with fact (inequalities of wealth, social position, and political power certainly existed in republican Rome and can be gleaned from many accounts of the classical authors), or, the republican eras were compared less favorably with the times when kings ruled over the ancient societies.44

Professors, in their classroom teaching at the colleges, either criticized the political views of the ancients directly or at least refrained from exuding the same adoration of the golden ages of Greece and Rome as did the pagan authors. Their appraisals of the ancients was a natural part of the teaching methodology they used, which included scholastic methods that had traditionally been used in teaching philosophy and theology. In particular, the humanist praelectio, which borrowed from the medieval expositio, introduced interpretations of text to the students. These commentaries of the teacher began
with respectful praise of the work and practical benefit to the students, then specific literary characteristics, including essential themes and lines of thought were denoted, followed by examination of significant phrases, interpreting word by word, each element, considering also neologisms or archaisms and examples of elegant style. Following this basic analysis was the eruditio, which provided topical treatment of the work in question, including explanations of historical and geographical contexts and of mythological references. Most importantly, the eruditio was recommended by educationalists as a vehicle for moralizing.

When drawing out moral lessons two approaches appear to have been taken. The more religiously-inclined professors, in particular the Jesuits, would contrast pagan mythology and morality unfavorably with Christianity. Those less inclined to debunk the ancients stressed the personal virtues of the pagan authors, such as frugality, integrity, hard work, and patriotism while avoiding reference to political or religious themes. Students might then be required to write compositions in the style of Cicero, but treating themes related to Christianity. Brockliss has concluded that written exercises were not only geared to treat religious themes but to reinforce correct socio-political attitudes. For
example, themes were introduced that portrayed the compatibility between Christianity and the absolute state. Civic themes reinforced the virtue of patriotism, the belief that kings were divine and that conspiracy was evil. And professors who did not cling to the traditional themes could find themselves being reported to provincial authorities.47

In summary, professors offered self-censored commentaries and selective scrutiny of the values of the ancients providing models of virtue compatible with Christian morals and with monarchy. Ultimately, it was the style of the ancients which was to be imitated and the acquisition of fluency in Latin that was of most value, particularly for those intending to continue their education at the university.

Acceptance at the university facilities of law, medicine, or theology required that students acquire an understanding of philosophy in addition to the humanities. Philosophy, as previously noted, was taught at the full-course colleges during the final two years. By the mid-18th century, however, mathematics and physics became the dominant part of the philosophy course taking up at least one of the two years.48 Philosophy itself was taught as a science, beginning with an understanding of logic. Logic provided the means of explaining human behavior in the
study of ethics and the means of explaining religious truths and values through the study of metaphysics.

Like the humanities, philosophy was deemed morally useful and was very conservative in nature as taught. Professors expounded in Latin from a personal cahier with little student participation. The dictée continued to be used even in the 1760s when philosophy textbooks, printed in the vernacular, became widely used. Questions were proposed to which a series of arguments and counter-arguments were stated. Judgments regarding Christian dogma and general axioms were considered completely reliable while judgments from sense experience and historiography were viewed with skepticism. Students were taught that the best witnesses were those who had nothing materially to gain from presenting an historical account, thus apostolic witness, which emanated from a social condition of poverty, was considered superior to the accounts of deists and atheists.49

Aristotle, Aquinas, Justinian, and Gregory IX dominated the curriculum, although Cartesian and Lockean ideas were also introduced. Thomist Christianity deeply influenced ethical discussion of the good and the pleasurable, where the Stoics, Epicureans, and Platonists were each shown to have been led astray while Aristotle's reasoning was advocated as a way to attain the highest
good, which was identified purely with God. Classical
hedonism was condemned and, although not attacked
outright, writers like Rousseau and Mably were censored
for promoting eudaimonism. The moral relativism of Hobbes
and the moral determinism of Helvetius and Montesquieu
were also censored. Descartes' *Discourse on Method* was
used in defense against skepticism; however, by the time
of the Revolution, Locke, rather than Cartesian thought,
was probably the dominant epistemological doctrine held by
most professors. In the view of Brockliss, neither Locke
nor Descartes were taught to the extent of challenging
established political and religious convictions.⁵₀

In spite of the prevalence of narrow Christian
interpretations of text, religious indoctrination was
generally not austere in its approach. The Aristotelian
doctrine of moderation was taught such that strict
moralists, including Jansenists, were often censured.
Virtue was viewed basically as a matter of good habits
which should be cultivated so as to avoid concupiscence.
The rules for judging behavior were based on the natural
law theory of self-evident precepts, and hence, judgments
did not necessarily require the aid of the Scriptures as
the Jansenists propounded.⁵¹

Although philosophical wisdom was deeply influenced
by Christianity, it was not thoroughly dominated by
religious themes. The irony was that in teaching both secular and religious topics, students of the colleges ended up knowing the history of the late Republic and Augustinian era far more than that of their own recent past. This meant that fundamentalist religious testimony and republican (i.e. radical) writings of this time period had to be censored by teaching methods and curriculum selections so that Roman Catholicism and the French Monarchy might not be threatened. Based on this conservative education, Brockliss concludes that "neither the Richerism of the clergy, nor the radicalism of the Third Estate in 1789 can in any way directly be attributed to the instruction their members received in the colleges, seminaries, and faculties." And even if the revolutionary generation, which was schooled in the 1750s and 1760s, read authors following their schools days that were censored during their secondary educations, there still does not exist a direct link with republicanism. For although Montesquieu in his Considerations or L'esprit des lois, and Mably in Entretiens de Phocion, and Rousseau in Du contrat social or Emile were more favorable to the public virtues and republican institutions of the ancients than were the pedagogues, these authors still hesitated to advocate imitation of the ancient republics. Rather, in their view the ancients possessed virtues and institutions
that revealed the shortcomings of the present, and if republicanism was possible, it was only appropriate for small countries.

The revolutionaries and the influence of their classical education

Although there may not have existed a direct link between classical educational literature and republican sentiment, the revolutionaries of 1789 cannot be said to have been unaffected by their college studies, including themes of republicanism. In a study of the influence of secondary education upon the republican sentiments of the revolutionaries, Parker identified several classical authors cited frequently by the revolutionaries in their writings and discourses at the time of the Revolution. Those sources to which the revolutionaries turned most frequently for their picture of the ancient republic were Cicero's orations, Sallust's *Conspiracy of Catiline*, Livy's first three books, Tacitus' *Agricola*, *Histoires*, and *Annals*, and Plutarch's *Lives*.53

The references made to classical literature by the revolutionaries suggests that the influence of formal education was very strong during the 18th century. Particularly when considering that the revolutionaries "tended to cite in their maturity only those classical works they had probably studied in their youth."54 One
good reason to assume that the formal education of the colleges had a powerful influence on men's thoughts is that institutionalized education was of exceptional importance during the early modern era. This is because, as Brockliss notes, the "forms of cultural exchange," such as book-buying and "adult organs of cultural sociability," such as reading-rooms and scientific societies were only beginning to emerge by the late 18th century.55

Among the well-known revolutionaries such as Desmoulins, Robespierre, Danton, and Saint Just, mentioned by Parker as being sympathetic to republican antiquity, are three members of the Committee of the Constitution: Pétion, Buzot, and Barnave. Those on Parker's list who voiced a disdain of republican antiquity are lesser knowns except for Condorcet and a short term member of the Committee of the Constitution, Mounier. As noted in the last chapter Mounier abandoned the committee because of his conservative liberal views. It cannot, however, be assumed that a disdain for republican antiquity also coincided with a reluctance to accept the more liberal tenets of democracy. For those National Assembly members on the extreme right, Cazalès and Mirabeau, and for the conservative anglophiles of the Committee of the Constitution, Mounier, Lally-Tollendal, and Clermont-Tonnerre, this was partially the case. But for others, in
particular Condorcet and Brissot, who eventually supported republicanism, their disdain was based on the inadequacies of democracy in Greece and Rome. They knew too well ancient accounts of the internecine strife among city states and how often fickle were the citizens of the Roman Republic. Parker explains their resolution of the ambiguity they felt in regard to support for democracy but for which classical antiquity offered an inadequate model, in the following passage:

With an occasional tinge of critical disdain, publicists like Brissot, Pétion, Condorcet... explained that the disorder and the injustice to the wisest and best had arisen from the direct democracy of antiquity, from the division of the ancients into privileged and unprivileged, into conquering city and subject people, and from the nonexistence of periodical amending conventions which peacefully adapt constitutions to changing conditions.\(^5\)

That this view was widely accepted by the Constituent Assembly is apparent in the representative nature of democracy established by the new constitution and in the recognition in *L'Instruction publique* of the need to educate men to change constitutions when necessary. These views did not preclude, however, the recognition of classical antiquity on the part of the Committee of the Constitution.

This is indicated by the requisite references to classical antiquity in *L'Instruction publique*. One such
example begins with a reference to contradictions in education and government of the old regime where:

Constitutionally everything was out of place; where so many interests united to deceive, to debase human nature, where the disposition of government was to repel any principle that was not intended to flatter its errors, where it seemed necessary to teach men from infancy to live and die with prejudices, where they were accustomed to constraining their thoughts, since the law itself told them with threats that they were not the masters of it; and finally, a pusillanimous prudence, which dared to call itself virtue, was made a duty to distract their minds from that which one day might remind them of the rights it did not permit them to invoke: and such was the influence of public opinion itself under these conditions, that youth were presented the history of ancient free people, its imagination aroused by accounts of their heroic virtues, making them live, in a manner, in the midst of Sparta and Rome, without the most absolute power having to fear anything from the impression which these great and memorable examples must have produced. (2)

Other references to classical antiquity in L'Instruction publique are similar in tone to this one in that they represent a source of revolutionary inspiration but do not express unrestrained adoration of, nor regret for, republican antiquity. This is the case even though some members of the Committee of the Constitution, Pétion, Buzot, and Barnave in particular, voiced strong sentiment for the ancient republics. As it was, these three members represented the left within the committee and had always maintained sympathy for republicanism, while nevertheless supporting the constitutional monarchy.
The Committee of the Constitution, in responding to the dominant influences within the Assembly, where clearly there existed a skepticism as well as distrust of republicanism, sought out the ideological and rhetorical uses to which could be put recollections of the classical literature of their school days. In this manner, they achieved a balance between regret for republicanism and neglect of it all together. And certainly, the classical authors were valued as educational material, for even with emphasis upon the langue nationale, the literature of ancient Greece and Rome was still very much recommended in L'Instruction publique. In fact, the general organization of the curriculum of the old regime was more or less reproduced in the Talleyrand Report, but with some changes in the emphasis of certain subjects and the addition of new subject matter. The discontinuities that are most striking in L'Instruction publique are the concepts and subject matter for secular moral education, including civic education, and the subordination of religious lessons to this new secular morality.

Discontinuities in the National Assembly's plan for education

Not only did the Committee of the Constitution, in L'Instruction publique, recognize fundamental contradictions between classical literature and the
Christian and absolutist doctrines in the secondary curriculum of the old regime; but they also recognized the school culture of their past to be inconsistent with the new constitutional government, as indicated in the following passage:

It happened that in the old order of things the interior regime of each school appeared to take its form from the tyrannical regime under which France was oppressed. A multitude of incoherent regulations, evaded through favoritism, changed by caprice; arbitrary will perpetually taking the place of law; punishment that tended only to blight the mind; humiliating distinctions which insulted the inviolable principle of equality; a constant blind submission; finally no relationship of trust between the governments and the governed; such were the houses of instruction, such was all of France. (105)

The recommendations made in *L'Instruction publique* to establish a school culture compatible with the new constitutional government are found in the provision for the development of a constitutional catechism and the provision for school democratic apprenticeship activities. The description of the apprenticeship proposal is prefaced in *L'Instruction publique* by the following claim:

Now that representative government has taken rise among us, that is to say, the most perfect government that is granted to men to conceive, should we not endeavor to reproduce its likeness in the enclosure of instructive societies since nothing there opposes, what reason demands, in order that morality particularly find infallibly the means of extending and establishing itself in the souls of men? (105)
This concept of school democracy, along with the secular science of morality anterior to the constitution, the proposal to establish a constitutional catechism, and the scientific educational methods proposed in *L'Instruction publique* are what most distinguish formal educational socialization processes of the revolutionaries from *ancien régime* socialization processes. Aside from these proposals, the curriculum design in the report was very traditional in nature, indicating that much of the revolutionary rhetoric found in *L'Instruction publique* must be considered an expression of spurious discontinuity. The shortcomings of this rhetoric can be examined by referring back to the first passage from *L'Instruction publique* cited in this section.

To accuse old regime education of being capricious and arbitrary does not fit with the changes that took place in schools of the early modern era, particularly the institutionalization of daily regulations and standardized curriculum practices. To accuse the old regime schools of being pervaded by favoritism and privilege is not very near the truth either. In fact, old regime schools, were highly meritocratic, possessing exams and scholastic competitions based on the spirit of emulating the best and the brightest. It was not schools, but the social order that was invested with privileges and occasionally
capricious favoritism displayed by royal authority. What the schools of the old regime did possess was an authoritarian culture much like that under which society was ruled by church and Crown. The difference is that schools appear to have been more rationally consistent in their organization and treatment of subjects than often were church and Crown, since the latter fostered customs of venality and privilege.

Another criticism rhetorically stated in the passage above refers to old regime education as including harsh punishments that "blight the mind" and using "humiliating distinctions." In regard to corporal punishment, although it still existed in isolated cases, the criticism is unfounded because of the humane-realism which was advocated and practiced widely by the 18th century. It is more likely that humiliating distinctions were created in ancien régime schools through the use of various forms of punishment and rewards that resulted from a system of close surveillance.

It is implied in L'Instruction publique that if the old system of discipline is discarded, scientific methods of learning will be sufficient to inhibit disruptions and delinquent behavior. As discussed in the previous chapter the scientific methods of education proposed in the report include all manner of positive incentives; including the
discovery approach to learning; recognition of reciprocal interests; appeals to honor, conscience, and reason; positive historical examples; language purification; social ritual; and analysis of communication. There is very little discussion, in *L'Instruction publique*, of negative practices in education, except when the constitutional catechism is addressed and it is recommended that students understand the punishments that await those who transgress the public laws that are being legislated. The overall optimism expressed in the report has a Lockean and Rousseauian tone which might be stated as follows: Present to the blank slates of children’s minds positive examples and positive reinforcement and their natural inclinations will rarely be confronted by harmful prejudices derived from corrupted institutional habits of thought and behavior. And what rules and regulations and authoritative judgments are to exist, will be spontaneously and thoughtfully derived at each school through the practice of democracy within its walls.

Another criticism leveled at old regime educational institutions in *L'Instruction publique* is that they used "gothic methods" and were possessed of "alarming superstitions of all types which exercised over reason a long dreadful dominion." (90) This reference is in large part to the pervasive influence of religion in the schools
of the old regime. Yet, as has been shown, the excesses of the Catholic counter-reformation movement in education, particularly those that showed up in the early catechisms, had been fairly well exorcised by the 18th century, although fundamentalist-minded preachers abounded in society. Reason certainly was captive to Christian doctrine in the schools, but reason was valued nonetheless. The real discontinuity to be noted here is that between the revolutionaries' conception of a secular science of society and old regime religious influence over issues of morality taught in the schools.

It is significant, however, that the revolutionaries would rely on a favorite Christian method of teaching, the catechism, in order to teach students the essential nature of the constitution. The quote opening this chapter indicates that the clerical pedagogues had already begun to construct secular catechisms. The power of the word, whether secular or religious in nature, was just too strong in the minds of the revolutionaries to abandon its repetitive use before the blank slates of childhood. Likewise, the central role of language and communication in the science of education, as proposed in *L'Instruction publique*, is derived from the value which old regime education placed upon language arts in the formation of men's thoughts and behaviors.
Another prominent theme in *L'Instruction publique* relative to the religious control over schools is that related to utilitarian values. The inculcation of Christian dogma, the time spent in religious observances, and the Christian/monarchical biases in interpretations of text could rightfully be claimed to be unuseful for pursuing a vocation in society, except for those entering the priesthood. However, it is a revolutionary exaggeration to claim that schools, in general, purveyed useless knowledge and failed to train men for practical vocations and professions. After all, the revolutionaries themselves were, in the majority, men of the legal profession for which the colleges had prepared them quite well. And of the professional schools for which secondary education is to be preparatory, *L'Instruction publique* provides for only one addition to the three professional schools of the old regime, professional education in the military arts. And neither does this indicate much of a discontinuity as the old regime did possess schools for the military arts, only they were established in colleges rather than at the level of higher education.

The intent of the revolutionaries may have been to prepare more lawyers than clergymen in the new social order, which would be the reverse of that prior to the Revolution. What is equally significant, however, is that
as far as state provisions for education are concerned, there is no plan in *L'Instruction publique* for vocational-type schools, like the kinds that had begun to develop during the course of the 18th century. Attention is given in *L'Instruction publique* to the development of books and manuals (*livres élémentaire*) in agriculture and the mechanical arts. (115-118) But only books are mentioned for educational purposes in this regard, not schools. To question why vocational schools, or vocationally-related subjects, were not to be part of the state school curriculum brings up the issue of the division of labor in society and restrictions on access to secondary education.

With the growing number of Latin schools of various types prior to the Revolution, there existed increasing opportunities for youth to dabble in the humanities and perhaps acquire aspirations for further college instruction and even professional education. As previously noted, *L'Instruction publique* contains caustic words about the acquisition of an education not suited to one's destiny in life. Could it be that the members of the Committee of the Constitution planned to promote the use of practical guidebooks on agricultural and mechanical arts so that children of laborers and tradesmen, who after attending elementary schools to learn to read, would be prompted to apply their elementary learning to books at
home, rather than to future schooling? That there is no
mention of Latin in the elementary school curriculum
indicates that the elementary education meant for everyone
was not as completely preparatory for secondary school as
Talleyrand would have us believe when it is stated in
*L'Instruction publique* that secondary schools are a
natural progression of elementary education.

What is said about the elementary books in
*L'Instruction publique* is that they should be "clear,
precise, methodical, distributed with profusion, rendering
universally familiar, all the important truths, and be
sparing of useless efforts in order to learn them." (115)
Could "useless efforts" be in reference to acquiring a
little Latin as one learns a trade, as well as pertaining
to an economization and efficiency of knowledge?

In the plan for selection practices and policies in
*L'Instruction publique* there are strong indications, as
regards restrictions on access to education, that there
should be less and not more secondary education in the new
regime. Meritocratic values as well as conservative
utilitarian values associated with a vague concept of
social necessity form the basis of the new ideology of
exclusion. Where once meritocratic values reigned within
the school environment for the distribution of academic
rewards, now they will pervade the school and social
organization of society and by implication become values associated with the division of labor in society. There appears to have been no real policy in regard to access to education during the ancien régime other than the value which pedagogues placed on spreading religious knowledge to as many people as possible, which opened up access to schools. The revolutionaries found in learning standards an economic purpose associated with the distribution of labor in society, which gave rise to the application of meritocratic and utilitarian values to policies of restriction. Therefore, in addition to the discontinuities of socialization that include the constitutional catechism, the secular science of morality anterior to the constitution, the positive methods of the science of education, and the apprenticeship in democracy, to be found in L’Instruction publique, must be added the discontinuity in selection processes based on a synthesis of meritocratic and utilitarian values. To explain these changing conceptions in socialization and selection practices in education requires a socio-cultural understanding of actors, events, reform movements and intellectual history pertinent to education prior to and during the early stages of the Revolution.
CHAPTER IV

SOCIO-CULTURAL HISTORY AND THE TALLEYRAND REPORT

I thank you for proscribing study among day-laborers, I, who cultivate the earth, petition you to have laborers, not tonsured ecclesiastics.

Voltaire to La Chalotais

Education and social forces of the early modern era

The particular manner in which meritocratic, utilitarian, secular, and nationalistic values were applied to the revolutionary design for education in *L'Instruction publique* was the result of complex relations between social institutions, social class structures, an educational reform movement, including intellectual ideas of the Enlightenment, and economic conditions prior to the Revolution. Each of these social forces and their relationship to education at the end of the ancien régime will be examined in this chapter in the above order. Particular attention will be given to their relevance for understanding the continuities and discontinuities in the Talleyrand Report.

Important continuities to be found in *L'Instruction publique* are related to old regime concerns about social control and moral regeneration. These concerns resulted
in large part from the socio-economic class structure of 18th century society, as well as the relationship between education and social mobility in the 18th century. Economic conditions related to sources of wealth and the lack of a concept of economic development tended to reinforce continuities associated with old regime restrictions on access to secondary education. In fact, the revolutionaries appeared to have intended to apply even more restrictions in this regard.

Important discontinuities of importance in the Talleyrand Report include the rise of nationalism and the separation of ethics from religion which brought many 18th century educational reformers into conflict with the church. In addition, economic conditions, in the form of a lack of educational resources outside the domain of the Catholic church, caused many reformers, and particularly the revolutionaries, to conceive of some type of centralized state control over the church and education as the only viable alternative to provide funding for education. This of course, represents a discontinuity that was only fully conceived and acted upon during the Revolution, in particular with the presentation of *L'Instruction publique* and other actions to be considered in chapter five. And it is only during the Revolution that we see values associated with democracy made a part
of educational reform. Most reformers prior to the Revolution spoke only of national education without implying the teaching of democratic ideas.

In this chapter the social history of education and the Revolution begins by considering the involvement of social institutions to finance and control the schools. These institutions, in France of the early modern age, included the Catholic church, the state, and local governmental bodies. The most important change in education that took place at the beginning of the early modern era was the drive to expand literacy which in different ways involved all three institutions.

Social institutions and education prior to the Revolution

The drive to extend literacy to all regions of France, both rural and urban in nature, began at the time of the Reformation. The primary motivating force was the threat of Protestantism which prompted the Catholic church to engage in elementary education for the masses. At the Council of Trent, in the mid-16th century, Catholic authorities decreed that elementary education should be added to the pastoral work of parish priests. Initially, this meant the teaching of the catechism within the parish church. Soon, however, schoolmasters (maître d’école) were hired as subordinates to the priest, and town and
village schools under church control began to proliferate throughout France. In this way reading, writing, and Catholic doctrine could be taught more efficiently.

Throughout the 17th and 18th centuries the church and its affiliated religious orders took the lead in providing and accounting for education of the "people." The General Assembly of the Clergy, the church's secular wing designated to deal with matters of state which affected it, continually exhorted bishops to design regulations for schools, curés and vicaires to establish more schools, to seek donations and bequests, to ascertain sentiments of piety and progress in the schools. And if priests could not recruit a schoolmaster themselves, they were encouraged to assume personal responsibility for primary schools in their parish.¹

Talleyrand, serving as Agent-General of the General Assembly of the Clergy, attempted a thorough investigation of the Catholic educational network in 1780.

In nine question he requested a wide range of opinion on the "plan of education most proper to make religion loved and respected, to conserve the purity of morals, to encourage competition, to give a taste for sciences, and to render pupils capable of fulfilling in society the function to which they may be destined." He asked for the number, quality, and classes of schools and universities in each diocese; the selection and merit of their programs of study, teachers, and administration . . . the prudence of increasing clerical control over education; and suggestions for a system of recruitment of teachers and principals.²
This inquiry was initiated at a time when reformers began to call for a system of national education of some type, and the Catholic church, owing to its historical involvement in education and its near monopoly on educational resources was in a prime position to assume such a role. This was not the case for the state whose involvement in educational affairs in the early modern period was not as clearly defined nor very extensive in nature. Nevertheless, it did have a history of influence.

The state was often inclined to intervene in educational affairs on the church’s behalf, especially when the surge to counter Protestantism developed. The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, which led to the persecution of the French Protestants, the Huguenots, also reinforced the drive to extend Catholic education. In its wake a compulsory attendance decree was formulated by Louis XIV in 1698, mandating parents to send their children to school. The follow-up to this law appeared in 1724 which authorized the raising of a special tax in cases where financing the schools became difficult. Yet as Counter-Reformation fervor weakened throughout the course of the 18th century, the royal administration, through its intendants, took little action to enforce its edicts. It also showed a lack of interest in mass
education, frequently displaying suspicion of it for reasons to be explored later.

Generally, the role of government agents was limited, discrete, and usually displayed hesitance to encroach upon the educational functions of the church. However, the intendants, for whatever reasons, could enhance or impede the progress of education by paralyzing initiatives of the church or community. This is because the intendants acquired the authority to ratify or sanctify important initiatives including contracts between communities and regents, the imposition of special duties to pay teachers, and contracts for maintenance work on schools.3

The promotion and imposition of mass education from above was only partly responsible for the expansion in schooling in the early modern era. There was also a groundswell of support from below. The signs of popular impetus are apparent enough to warrant the claim that by the 18th century, "the major force behind the development of schools was constituted by the urban and rural communities."4 Although the schoolmaster had to be approved by ecclesiastical authorities (usually the parish priest), he was generally chosen by municipal councils in the cities, or, in rural areas, by the inhabitants of the village or their representatives in local assemblies.5
Furet and Ozouf trace this push from below to the "scholastic foundations" and "pious legacies" of the 16th and 17th centuries made by the respectable, mostly urban, bourgeoisie. But they imply that the initial prompt for the spread of mass literacy came from opportunities made available to the urban bourgeoisie through the Counter-Reformation activities of the church in its drive to educate the people. This view, however, overlooks a brief but important role which the urban bourgeoisie played prior to the Reformation in the establishment of schools, which in fact, generated conflict between the municipal bourgeoisie and the church authorities.

Hundreds of public colleges were established between 1530 and 1560 in municipalities throughout France, including large cities such as Bordeaux, towns such as Draguigan, and in small towns such as Briançon. These schools were highly secular in nature due to the influence of Renaissance humanism, and they were open free to all city inhabitants. Therefore, they came into conflict with church authorities who prior to these events controlled almost all institutions of education. These colleges were funded from general municipal revenues in most cases, and were able to attract high quality lay teachers. They accepted young children and so offered special beginners classes in the ABC's. Humanistic standards of propriety
(to which Montaigne suggests as example) allowed only the ancient classics to be listed on the college programs, even though various shades of Christian orthodoxy appeared, especially as the ideological battles of the Reformation heated up.\textsuperscript{8}

Initially, municipal funding for these colleges was provided as seed money with the anticipation that other benefactors would step forward. In particular, the church was looked to, to provide such aid. However, the bishops balked, fearing a threat to Christian orthodoxy. When lay authorities of the towns attempted to force the church to provide assistance, conflict broke out. In 1560, at a meeting of the Estates-General at Blois, the deputies of the Third-Estate anticipated the revolutionaries of 1789 by displaying vehement anti-clerical sentiment and conceiving projects for nationalizing the church in its entirety.\textsuperscript{9} But this period of tension was brief. The ideological power of the Counter-Reformation, through diocesan inquisitions of lay teachers and the creation of the religious teaching orders, overtook the Renaissance colleges.

Thus it happened that throughout France the religious teaching orders generally took over existing schools that had previously been established by local demand. And local demand remained constant throughout the 17th and
18th centuries, even though the municipal laity was forced to hire clergymen or monks to teach in their schools. Huppert has found that quality suffered in many cases where religious orders and monks were hired, but the townsmen still demanded the schools be retained.\textsuperscript{10}

The colleges themselves went through transformations at this time which included dropping the lower level grammar courses from their curriculum. This had the effect of creating a more or less definitive two track system of elementary and secondary education with the latter becoming, except for a few cases, the preserve of the non-laboring classes. General statistics on literacy and secondary school attendance on the eve of the Revolution indicate in rough manner the extent to which education was expanded and limited in the course of the early modern era.

Based on a survey of marriage registers throughout France conducted by Louis Maggiolo in the 1870s, a third of the men and an eighth of the women were able to sign their names in the late 17th century, and by 1790 there was an 18 percent improvement for men and a 13 percent improvement for women.\textsuperscript{11} Of course, variations existed with higher rates of literacy in towns and cities, in northern France, and among the upper classes. On the eve of the Revolution, in light of the proliferation of
revolutionary pamphlet and journalistic literature, it is important to note that most artisans and shopkeepers were able to read, at least in rudimentary fashion. The high degree of illiteracy which still existed was concentrated mostly in the urban proletariat and rural masses which made up the largest single group of the population.

Figures relative to the availability of secondary education indicate that approximately 48,000 students attended the colleges at the time of the Revolution, which represents one student in 52 between the ages of 8 and 18. Once again, urban, rural, and regional disparities existed, as well as class differentiations, indicating greater opportunities in urban and northern regions of France, with a preponderance of sons of the bourgeoisie and magisterial aristocracy attending college.

The extension of literacy and liberal education to a much wider audience than was the case before the 16th century was achieved by three different forces within society: the church, the city and town dwelling bourgeoisie, and to a lesser degree the state. The major single force behind the new institutions of education, the expansion of colleges outside the traditional university faculties, was the world of the early modern towns and cities articulately described by Braudel:

They appeared, or reappeared, from the tenth or eleventh century, as states apart, societies
apart, civilizations apart, economies apart. They were daughters of a distant past - Rome often lived again in them. But they were also daughters of a present which helped them to blossom: they were new creations - the product in the first place of a colossal division of labour (between town and countryside), of consistently favourable economic circumstances, of the revival of trade and of a re-emergent money supply.13

This new urban force, or "society," as Braudel refers to it, took shape amidst a "pluralism of societies," that included the seigniorial society of nobles and peasants, the theocratic society of the Roman Catholic church, and the ever increasing power of the territorial state.14

The cement which held the various "societies" together was the hierarchical, restrictive, class structure of French society, which allowed for limited social mobility. Therefore, before examining further the interrelationships between these social forces in regard to changes in education during the 18th century, an understanding of the social class structure of 18th century French society is called for. Of particular interest is the relationship between education, internal variations within the classes, and social mobility.

The social structure and the division of labor in eighteenth century France

Social class distinctions in French society at the end of the old regime were many and they varied according
to a hierarchy that resembled a caste system, except that there existed limited approval of social mobility.
Traditionally, the most general class distinction, one that originated in the feudal order of medieval times, was that between the nobility (noblesse) and everyone else, identified as commoners or roturiers. By the early modern period, several internal distinctions of status and functions had developed within the nobility, most notably those related to the nobility of the sword and of the robe. Also, a major split had taken place among commoners, dividing them between the bourgeois and the lower classes, each with numerous internal variations of status and functions.

The highest status designations within the nobility were those of princes, ducs, marshals, and cardinals who claimed descendance from an ancient noble race or "nobility of blood." These positions were restricted to a select group within the nobility of the sword. The broader constituency of the sword was composed of nobles whose status derived from military service or immemorial possession of their titles. Beneath the nobility of the sword was the nobility of the robe (noblesse de robe), whose status was confirmed by law, and which derived its nobility from judicial functions of a high order.
The king was a nobleman who descended from the princes of nobility and thus maintained strong ties with this class. However, Louis XIV became notorious for including the bourgeoisie within his administration. He did this by greatly expanding upon the practice of selling royal offices (vénalité des charges or des offices). With the sale of many of these offices were included titles of nobility, and thus the venal policies of the Sun King became the most valued and acceptable way of achieving social mobility for the rising bourgeoisie. However, the tradition of selling offices to the bourgeoisie predated the expanded efforts of Louis XIV, such that most of the highest noble offices had already been sold by his predecessors.

The members of the bourgeoisie who were ennobled to the highest public offices became part of the robe nobility and served as magistrates and other chief officers within the royal administration and sovereign courts of the realm. The sovereign courts included, by the mid-18th century, fifteen local parlements (parlements) which were at the summit of the judicial hierarchy. They were the supreme and final courts of appeal in their regions. Other sovereign courts in which venal charges were established included nine chambres des comptes, supervising the king’s finances, four cours des
aides, appellant courts for taxes and commercial transactions, two cours des monnais, dealing with royal coinage and counterfeiting, and the Grand Conseil, an offshoot of the royal council involved with church-state relations and disputes over privileges. Within these courts the highest offices were those of first president, president, procureur or avocat-général, and councilor. All total approximately 2,000 such charges existed within the robe nobility in the mid-18th century to make up what may be considered the high robe or haute robe nobility.\textsuperscript{15}

Below the high robe nobility were other venal offices for which nobility was often conferred as well, either immediately upon possession of the charges or after two or three generations of possession. These were the type of offices which Louis XIV specialized in selling. They were much more numerous than the personnel of the sovereign courts and included "a fluctuating number of presidencies, lieutenancies, and councilorships in almost 100 présidiaux, 300 subordinate bailliages, and literally countless lower courts which provided their more prosperous members with excuses to purchase nobility."\textsuperscript{16}

To summarize, the internal differentiation within the nobility can be broken down as follows: first, the nobility by immemorial possession, then the nobility certified by royal letters patent; these sword
classifications were followed by the upper nobility of the robe, represented by possession of the highest venal offices, and beneath them the lower nobility of the robe, represented by possession of lesser venal offices. The entire nobility made up a small minority within French society comprised of royal ministers, military commanders, judges, churchmen (cardinals and bishops, in particular), poor rural nobles, and soldiers of fortune.

At the upper levels among the roturiers were the bourgeoisie. At the summit of the bourgeois class were the wealthiest of the middle classes (the grand bourgeoisie), composed of financiers (gros négociants), ship owners, industrialists, and men of commerce (négociants), including wholesale merchants and merchant manufacturers. Next came the professional class of men who held positions as lawyers, doctors, and lower clergymen. Included with these men, as part of the bourgeoisie moyenne, were non-noble office holders (such as those who dealt with state finances) and well-off merchants and shopkeepers.

The numerous and well organized lawyers, or avocats worked daily among the robe nobility within the judicial system and were as essential to it as were the magistrates. However, there existed dissension between the ranks of the often haughty magistrate and the well
schooled avocat which, in many cases, spawned resentments that were to show during the Revolution. When the magistrates interacted socially with the bourgeoisie, it was with the haute bourgeoisie, the wealthy merchants and financiers. In fact, the wealthiest among the nobility shared similar lifestyles with the wealthiest among the bourgeoisie, and it was from intermarrying with the latter that poor nobles often acquired fortunes.

Distinguishing the high and middle bourgeoisie from the lower levels of the middle class were those engaged in manual labor. In fact, the person who considered himself bourgeois generally viewed manual labor as incompatible with bourgeois status. Between the middle bourgeoisie and the common laborers existed the group of small merchants and shopkeepers (marchand, boutiquier) and the master artisans, which have come to be regarded by historians as making up the petite bourgeoisie. They cannot be considered part of the peasant or proletarian class because they did not sell their labor for pay. However, the line between the petite bourgeoisie and the "people" is difficult to draw, considering that artisans and shopkeepers mingled and worked closely with common laborers and peasants. In general, the petite bourgeoisie may be considered to be made up of shop owners, master-artisans.
Below the petite bourgeois were the masses of the lower class, the people (le peuple) known by many names including menu peuple, petit peuple, petits gens, sometimes pejoratively referred to as the canaille or racaille. At the upper end of this group was an artisanry of small masters, tradesmen, wage-earners (ouvriers), and journeymen who made up the heart and core of the sans-culotterie of the Revolution, a group idealized in the republicans' visions of popular democracy. At the middle of the lower class were servants, day laborers, porters, peasants living off the land in either a feudal relationship or in one where wages were earned. And at the bottom rung of society existed a persistent horde of beggars, hucksters, peddlers, vendors of lottery tickets, prostitutes, the frequently unemployed and impoverished criminals.

Social mobility and educational opportunity in the eighteenth century

Two important interrelationships affected social mobility for the rising bourgeoisie. First is that which developed between the bourgeoisie and the kings out of the needs of royal monarchs for increased revenues and an institutional base from which to consolidate the powers of state, often in conflict with local aristocracies. Second is that which developed between the bourgeoisie and
the traditional aristocracy out of the needs of the latter for an institutional base of power. This base was found in the wealthy and educated bourgeoisie who acquired high positions within the aristocratic parlements. The interrelationships between the bourgeoisie, the aristocracy, and royal power resulted in contradictions within traditional social structures at the same time the nobility began to consolidate and restrict mobility during the course of the 18th century.

During the 17th century, the highest robe offices, those which conferred hereditary nobility and judicial functions within the magistrature of sovereign state and local parlements were firmly established. Due to the hereditary nature of these charges they became closed to any further sale to the bourgeoisie. Generally, neither competence nor wealth mattered, only several degrees of nobility were required to obtain a magistrature in the 18th century. Only for the wealthiest of financiers was it still possible in the 18th century to acquire high robe status.19

This suited those who possessed these highest of venal offices fine, for it assured their sons of the same high positions of status and wealth that they possessed. Even more important, it caused the consolidation of robe and sword. The members of the old sword nobility relied
upon the more educated robe to represent their interests, and the robe nobility relished its honorific titles, its estates, and its privileges as the highest signs of status within a most status conscious society. This all reflected a well established tradition throughout Europe, with roots in the pre-Renaissance era, of the successful bourgeoisie rejecting their vocations and initial sources of wealth so as to partake in the world of the Veblenian leisure class. In such a society psychological factors even more than productive functions establish the patterns of economic and social behavior. The general trend was that after two or three generations of continued wealth merchants abandoned trade to buy up public offices and/or feudal estates.20

With the conservation of robe offices it no longer became possible in the 18th century for a lawyer or merchant from the middle class to aspire to a high robe position. There did, however, exist an immense variety of lesser offices to be bought up, especially beginning in the reign of Louis XIV, when the need to finance wars and other extravagant projects called for increasing the coffers of the state. A few offices which were created did entail nobility, or eventual nobility, but still these were of lesser noble status than the magistrature. More numerous were the lower judicial offices that came without
nobility. Though less significant and less expensive, they did allow one to dawn the robe and be a little closer to royal magistracy and to share in the "dignity of the whole corps of officeholders." It was these minor offices which remained open to the middle bourgeoisie and lawyers.

Equally important from the viewpoint of state power, the sale of offices in the manner of Louis XIV to the bourgeoisie, enhanced the creation of a loyal corps of men without connections to the provincial nobility, particularly the aristocratic parlements which often resisted royal reforms. The office of the royal intendant was particularly important in this regard. However, an important transition in royal policy took place in the 18th century. Administrative personnel of the royal court began to be recruited from the robe which was the case for almost the entire administrative personnel of Louis XVI.

This became indicative of a general pattern of restriction on access to offices as part of a "feudal reaction" to social mobility. Nobles (in the cahiers of 1789) demanded verification of titles and suppression of the creation of nobility through the sale of offices. They requested the king to "grant them a monopoly of employments compatible with their dignity, together with free education for their sons." Other examples include
the legal prohibition enacted in 1781 to restrict commoners from obtaining a commission in the army and the development of an informal policy of excluding commoners from high ecclesiastical office. Of the 130 bishoprics in France on the eve of the Revolution, one fourth were controlled by thirteen families. Thus promotion to high places within the church was rare, but given the intricate administrative hierarchy of the church, a parish priest could rise to minor and middle functionary positions just as lawyers had to be content to rise within the lower ranks of the judicial system.

It must not be assumed that because wealth and noble status played a large role in obtaining high positions in society that education was not considered important. Actually, everyone, from the petite bourgeoisie on up, attempted if they could, to send their sons to colleges. Part of this is due to the fact that various lesser and minor posts existed within the courts, royal administration, and the church to which all those below the robe could aspire toward. But another reason is to be found in the incessant drive from below for education as an enduring aspect of urban, bourgeois society. Thus we find attending the colleges in the latter half of the 18th century a mixture of students from various social backgrounds. The largest representation in the colleges
were the sons of upper and middle office holders, lawyers, and doctors; there were significant numbers of children from nobility and large landowners, and from merchants, shopkeepers, and artisans; even a few sons of farmers, tenants, and day laborers attended college. All of these mingled in the same classrooms.\textsuperscript{25}

It has frequently been acknowledged that bourgeois attitudes toward education were very strong, originating as we have seen with their rise in towns and cities during the Renaissance. It is also frequently assumed that the nobility did not share the same respect for education. However much this may have been the case prior to the Enlightenment, by the 18th century, due to the value given education by Enlightenment thinkers, many who were noblemen, education was felt to be equally important by even the highest nobility. This, even though most nobles by the 18th century "had an education that was mediocre, haphazard, and uncertain."\textsuperscript{26} The lack of education among the nobility as a class is attributed by Chaussinand-Nogaret to the expense involved in obtaining the type of education appropriate to noble status. This meant private tutors prior to attending college, attending expensive colleges, particularly Clermont, Harcourt, La Flèche, and Juilly, boarding their sons in single dorms with tutoring and valet service to be provided.\textsuperscript{27}
Thus it came to be that wealth, education, and culture divided those within the nobility just as it did those in other classes in society. Although proofs of nobility were a primary requisite for high positions within the church, military, local parlements, and the royal administration, a good education was expected as well. Without a proper education a nobleman was most likely to become at most a junior officer in the military with no hope of a distinguished career. The same could be said for the high posts within the church, available to aristocrats such as Talleyrand, who acquired the best college and university education available in his day.

For those in need, however, including poor aristocrats who might swallow their pride and stoop to accepting a scholarship (generally reserved for the poor) or other financial aid, many opportunities existed to reduce expenses to obtain a college education. To begin with, most students in the colleges, over two-thirds, were day pupils. Out of approximately 70,000 students accounted for by a survey conducted prior to the Revolution, 3,000 scholarships were recorded (over 500 intended specifically for the priesthood), and for another 7,000 students it was indicated that the costs of instruction were diminished by various foundations. In addition, nearly 30,000 students were recorded as
attending colleges where tuition was free. Thus for over half the students, according to this report, the costs of an education for parents was either totally or partially defrayed. Although the statistics from this contemporary report are considered inflated according to more recent historical analyses; it remains true that inexpensive educational opportunities existed to a degree that worried many educationalists. In fact, indications are that more opportunities existed prior to the Revolution than after the Revolution.

It must be kept in mind, however, that limitations certainly existed within old regime education that restricted access to education. First, not all scholarships ended up in the hands of the poor. Due to the fact that 85 percent of all Frenchman (peasants and artisans) had little surplus even in good years, it is not surprising to find that scholarships were often abused by granting them to the less than truly needy. Mid-16th century estimates are that only 5 percent of the student body must have been genuinely poor, and it may be inferred that this number would have decreased by the 18th century, given that the number of bourses tended to decline because of rising costs. In addition to rising costs of board and lodging, attending college required extra funds even in cases where tuition was gratuitous and scholarships
were provided, because fees were charged for entrance interviews and for degree conferment.\textsuperscript{33} In spite of these conditions, the drive from below persisted. It must be remembered that in addition to the colleges, quasi-secondary Latin schools and other private schools arose as described in chapter three. These would have allowed for Latin grammar to have been studied and enough proficiency to be attained that a student could enter college in the later forms and thus defer until necessary the expenses of a regular college education. The increasing popularity of secondary education was so strong apparently that educational reformers among the noble-bourgeois elite felt it a threat to the social order.

The educational reform movement in the second half of the eighteenth century

A reform movement in education began with the advent of two prominent events in 1762, the publication of Rousseau's \textit{Emile} (and \textit{Social Contract}), and the expulsion of the Jesuits from the Parlement of Paris, which led to their expulsion from France entirely by 1764. Between 1762 and the Revolution, some 64 known tracts on education were published by men of affairs, and as well other works were published by philosophes and literateurs that addressed educational issues in some manner. Much of
this activity was prompted by the need to fill the gap left by the abandoned Jesuit colleges which numbered over a hundred.

The need to decide what to do with Jesuit schools generated an outpouring of plans and designs addressing every issue associated with education. Most importantly, the issue of national education drew the most attention. Of interest to this study are the views of the reformers as they pertain to socialization and selection practices in the recommendations for national education, in particular, their address of the issues of mass education and the role of secularization in national education.

The most important reform plan, *Essai d'éducation nationale*, published in 1763, was the work of a royal attorney at the Parlement of Brittany, La Chalotais. This text was preceded, in 1762, by another influential publication of La Chalotais, *Compte rendu*. The latter is considered an important factor in the downfall of the Jesuits, while the former is compared with Rousseau's *Emile* in its importance to educational reform during this time.34

La Chalotais popularized the term "national education" and juxtaposed national education to that which was offered by religious orders and the church. He believed that one's loyalties should be to the state
first, and thus recommended that laymen rather than clergy should make up the body of teachers in the country.\textsuperscript{35} He expressed a need for more science and French literature in the curriculum, but also would retain the Classics. As for teaching religion, it should be done by churches and the family; as for ethical truths to be taught in the schools, he asks if it is possible to make a purely philosophical or national religion.\textsuperscript{36}

Astride his secular views toward the curriculum, La Chalotais adds the utilitarian view that the state should foster respect for that which is useful and helpful, "and that true religion consists in imitating Him who went about doing good . . ."\textsuperscript{37} What is useful to the nation and for the welfare of society, "requires that the education of the common people should not go beyond its occupations." On this count, La Chalotais is critical of the Christian Brothers who "teach reading and writing to people who ought to learn nothing beyond how to use a plane or a file, but are no longer willing to do so."\textsuperscript{38}

La Chalotais set the tone for all future reform tracts that followed up to the time of the Revolution. According to Palmer, "All wanted to produce more useful members of society, a doubtless perennial aim of schooling, which in this case meant to be more abreast of modern knowledge, proficient and reliable in one's
vocation, and a good citoyen, for la nation and la patrie." Clergymen as well took up the call to promote civic education as in the following passage by Father Navarre:

Should our children not learn from their teachers to be not only sociable beings and Christians, but also citizens... Why in France, as at Lacedemon and Athens and in China, should our colleges not become schools of patriotism? For the king and for France are two sentiments that education should unite and incorporate, so to speak, in the hearts of French youth as they are now in the national constitution.

This view indicates that the clergy were certainly not disinterested in civic education. In fact, patriotism and citizenship had a place in ancien régime education, albeit a limited one.

Abbé Sicard gives several accounts of the type of civic education that existed in the old regime. He begins by citing the views of educators in this regard. He presents Bossuet's claim that "whomever does not respect the civil society of which he is a part, that is to say the State in which he was born, is an enemy to himself and to the human race." He cites Rollin, in his famous Traité des études, as claiming instruction has three goals: to teach science, morality, and religion, for which morality includes "principles of honor and of integrity, in order to make good citizens." Fleury is cited to the effect of recommending that history should be taught as a
means of understanding public well being and the art of governing.  

Sicard acknowledges that no special course in civic education was established in any of the colleges, but he is able to site examples of civic education that did exist. One example is from the popular text, Géographie universelle (first published in 1727), by P. Buffier, which was used in the Jesuit college Louis-le-Grand. It contains, in catechetical form, a series of questions and answers about the government of France. It asks: What is the nature of the government of France?" and "What institutions aid the king in his governing?" The kings councils and royal courts throughout the land are then identified. In a public exercise set for the students of Sorèze in 1765, all sorts of questions about the nature of the government were posed, including those related to the divisions of France into administrative districts, the principle courts of justice, the principle Estates. Also included was the question of whether a law exists or not excluding women from the throne.  

Civic lessons of the old regime also included questions about public law (le droit public) with implications for the rights and duties of citizens. The text, Eléments d'histoire générale, by Claude Millot, published in 1772, gives us insight into the nature of
discussions about public rights and duties. He suggests that when studying modern history various topics be discussed, including the "legislation and governments of states, the customs and opinions of peoples, the causes of revolutions, the fundamentals of public law." This all sounds rather progressive until it is understood that this discussion is to take place in the manner in which ecclesiastical histories had treated political affairs since the time of Constantine. Most prominent in this civic education is the monarchical world of dual authority where the rights and limits of two powers must be understood in terms of "the necessity of obeying one for spiritual matters and recognizing the independence of the other in temporal and civil matters," including, "the duties of the citizen toward the church and those of the Christian and the Catholic toward princes, the government and the society."

These examples, although addressing the issue of civic education, point up the limitations of ancien régime civic instruction. It was civic education which placed the student in the larger context of Republika christiana. Sicard pointed out that "this education was patriotique without being political . . ." It was based on the belief that the "surest way to mold a citizen, was to form a man, and that the true method of making a man was to make a
The educational reformers of the 18th century meant something else by "national education." It was first and foremost secular; it subordinated religion to nationalism. Yet, the views of the reformers were certainly not political in nature, in the sense that they did not advocate education as a means of founding a new socio-political order, as happened at the time of the Revolution. There also existed another limitation in the writings of the reformers which indicated further conservative socio-political views.

Chisick, in an extensive study of the views of the reformers toward the masses, clearly shows the limitations of educational thought in the 18th century. In doing so he also points out the inaccuracy of the assertions of historians who have claimed that the proponents of mass education, including the philosophes, hoped for the creation of a generally enlightened citizenry. Although sympathies changed toward the masses in the 18th century, they did not change enough to conclude that reformers thought the lower classes should be very well educated.

Traditionally, the "people" were looked upon with suspicion and defined in encyclopedias as poor and ignorant, and capable of inhumanity, stupidity, and prejudice. But several works written between 1755 and 1789, by churchmen and educators (Coyer, Thomas, Baudeau,
Jaubert, Berenger) "assert the respectability and usefulness of the lower classes." In the minds of many of the reformers the people were no longer objects of mistrust and fear, but worthy of sympathy, viewed as victims of injustice, recognized as a necessary, and often, the most useful part of society.

So what type of education should exist for the masses? La Chalotais generally denied any education at all for peasants or artisans. On the other hand, Guyton de Morveau, another parlementaire (from Burgundy), did not fear teaching the laboring classes to read and write. He was, however, concerned about access to secondary education, fearing like many reformers, that it would create a depopulation of the country-side and disrespect for work. His view was that most shared by other reformers, in particular by Rolland d'Erceville, of the Parlement of Paris, and by Philipon de la Madelaine and Goyon d'Arzac, who were lawyers. These men found the concept of a "fitting education" useful. They emphasized keeping instruction within the bounds of social and economic utility, with moral, religious, and literate knowledge in keeping with one's social status.

Although reading and writing was held to be a universal requirement, especially since many of the rural peasantry owned property and would benefit from
understanding their civil rights, the reformers were quite explicit that education should be class appropriate. Industriousness was stressed and so was preparation for manual labor through physical exercise. Philipon recommended two tracks, simple primary education for the people and college education for the professional classes and the bourgeoisie. Goyon posited a third type of education between primary and secondary that was intended for the self-sufficient peasantry, wealthy artisans, and merchants.

Only two reformers, the Jansenists educators, Crétier and Rivard (senior professors at the University of Paris faculty of arts), suggested the people should attend college as a matter of course for at least a few years. But their reasoning was that of the Reformation, that the masses should be taught to read the Bible and other pious educational works, and that in the process it would make them better citizens.

Finally, among the reformers, even those most sympathetic to the living conditions of the people and who expressed an obligation to give them some type of education, there were strong reservations about the people's capacity for independent thought or political choice. In fact, "no where was it suggested that the
laboring poor were capable of governing themselves or of taking part in the government of the country."\textsuperscript{56}

This belief was given expression in the recommendations for catechisms of religion, morality, and rural economy. The nature of civil and political catechisms were to "set forth the natural and fundamental principles of social order and universal morality."\textsuperscript{57} The similarities between the Catholic catechisms as pedagogical tools which do not call for mastery of the skills of literacy was implicit in the assumptions of the reformers in their recommendations for civic catechisms.

Even the atheist philosophes, Holbach and Helvétius, and others such as Voltaire, Diderot, and Rousseau, advocated a religious education for the masses, as well as a social religion. For them as for the reformers, the concept of a secular morality based on scientific principles provided a method of social engineering, to not only achieve social reform and moral regeneration, but to ensure social stability through national utility as well. The intellectual foundations of the concept of secular morality are rooted in three interrelated theories of justice that arose during the Enlightenment.\textsuperscript{58}

The first theory is that justice existed prior to religion. This gave birth to the concept of natural religion where individual conscience, morality, and reason
exist independent of God. The second form of justice was conceived as existing prior to the human discovery of it, in the form of social interactions at the level of the individual and society. From this a social ethic was developed based on reciprocal relations. These relations were expressed in the form of rights and duties and utilitarian principles of general welfare founded in self-interest. The idea of self-interest as the basis of reciprocal relations evolved according to various views of the utilitarians.

Some early utilitarians postulated that people were naturally interested in other people's interests, hence, the "principle of the fusion of interests" based on natural mental inclinations of sympathy was developed. Others, less sanguine, postulated that only individual interests related to egoism were the source of moral behavior. In order to avoid hedonism these utilitarians suggested that the various egoisms harmonized while seeking their own particular interests, à la Adam Smith's invisible hand. This led to the "principle of the natural identity of interests." Finally, for those who believed that individual interests did not harmonize, the "principle of the artificial identification of interests" was developed which concluded that there was a need for legislators to identify the general interest.
This last view became the cornerstone for the representative democracy of the revolutionaries, although variations of the sympathetic and harmonizing egoisms views were also accepted to some degree as evinced in the scientific methods of education described in L'Instruction publique. The theory of representative democracy as an expression of a social ethic based on reciprocal relations and self-interest was not, however, the only theory of political justice to compete for the minds of the revolutionaries. For another, even more radical concept of justice, that which was developed by Rousseau, gave vent to the possibility of transcending self-interest while still remaining in the secular world.

For Rousseau, individual self-interest must be transcended, not by religion, not by reliance upon an invisible hand, nor even by legislators interpreting the general will. Rather, ideal justice is based on the abstract concept of the "unified will of the totally associated society." Given sufficient information and the elimination of private associations within the general association, the people themselves can make laws and then deliberately be obliged to yield to the general interest.

The formulation of philosophical theories of justice and the public interest led eventually to the creation of the constitution of 1791. But the political theories that
were deduced from the new secular theories of justice did not impact upon the reform movement in education, and especially not upon the curriculum in old regime schools. The reformers, including the more progressive teaching clergy, were more interested in the secular theories of justice as they could be applied to a development of a social morality that was compatible with nationalism and national utility. They were a long way from recommending schemes for complying with the contention of Helvétius that, "education is not a mere matter of schooling; it is coextensive with life, and especially a matter of government. Indeed, legislation is not merely a part of education, but legislation and morality are one and the same science." The reformers did not equate national education with legislation, and especially not with the participation of the people in a constitutional government.

This does not mean, however, that just because constitutional government had not yet arrived, there existed no basis for including political education in the curriculum of so called absolutist France. Although in principle, the King's power was unlimited, evinced by Louis XIV's statement that, "In my person alone resides the sovereign power . . . to me alone belongs legislative power . . . " in reality, there were many sources of
constraint which inhibited despotism. (Remember, however, that the pedagogues of the old regime emphasized these restraints as "aiding," not conflicting with the king's governing of the country.)

First, there existed established laws of the country. The Parlements, which were sovereign courts of justice, served as courts of appeal and considered themselves the guardians of the fundamental laws of the kingdom. Although the king exercised legislative power through edicts and ordinances, the parlements, through a system of remonstrance, could confront the king's authority directly by refusing to enact his edicts. The division of society into orders, the clergy or First Estate, the nobility or Second Estate, and the commoners or Third Estate provided a formal means of limiting absolutism through the Estates-General which dated back to the 14th century. This institution convened by kings in times of crisis, had been neglected however since 1614.

Overall, the governing situation in France, resembled that described by Guzot, in Traité des Offices, when he suggested that "although the will of the King is supreme, it is not arbitrary; although power is not shared, it is not despotic." In addition to the political institutions that existed to limit arbitrary authority, socio-political customs including privileged status,
customary deference to professionals, and varying degrees of liberty accorded municipalities also gave cause for limiting abuses of royal power. Ultimately, however, it was the calling of the Estates-General at the dawn of the Revolution that led to a direct challenge of the authority of the monarchy. Therefore, a closer look at the nature of the three Estates is required to understand the nature of this challenge and why the Revolution eventually went beyond the scope of reform that prompted the call for the Estates to assemble as a representative political body.

**Education and vested interests within the social structure of the old regime**

The division of French society into Estates was based on two different, but interrelated hierarchies, one social in nature, the other political. The Estates formed a social hierarchy in respect to the Second and Third Estates where, respectively, the distinction between nobles and commoners was made. The First Estate, made up of the clergy, consisted of mostly nobles in its highest offices and a large number of priests and functionaries who were comparable in status to the professional bourgeoisie.

The Estates, in the form of the Estates-General, also formed a political hierarchy. The clergy, by virtue of being designated the First Estate, was in close alliance
with the royal government and benefitted from many privileges, both fiscal and legal in nature, which had traditionally been bestowed by the king. The king also appointed members of the clergy to the highest positions of the church, in particular the bishoprics, which went mainly to the nobility. Thus the power elite of the church would have had little interest in any type of national education that challenged the king's authority. And because a threat to the king's authority was also a threat to divine elements in politics, the lower clergy also had a vested, spiritual interest in kingship, particularly the divine kingship of the Bourbon court.

The Second Estate was composed of nobles, some of whom were linked closely to the king either as part of the royal court, including positions as ministers and judicial officers, or as part of the alliance between the king and the church. Many nobles had a vested interest in the monarchy because of the king's appointments of nobles to high ranking military positions and provisions made by the king to exclude commoners from higher ranking military offices. The majority of nobles, however, particularly the robe nobility of the parlements and the poorer provincial sword nobility, were not directly allied to the king in any functional manner. In fact, there existed ancient and enduring conflicts between the central
authority of the royal government and the provincial aristocracy, which in the 18th century took the form of contention between the aristocratic parlements and the king's reforming ministers.

This meant that the parlements, in being controlled by the robe nobility, had some interest in national education that would respect a greater balance of power between the government and the provincial elite. The intellectual support for this position came from Montesquieu, who was himself a parlementaire. Montesquieu's constitutional theory of aristocratic liberalism, in making provisions for a separation of powers resembled closely the British model of government with an aristocratically controlled parliamentary system of national government. Montesquieu's theory appealed to nobles of the robe and of the sword who considered the parlements which they controlled as representing the general consent of the people. Montesquieu's theory, in effect, however, became the ideology of reactionary noblemen who wanted to secure their privileges and restore the nobility to national political life. This helps explain why the plans for national education of the parlementaires emphasized national utility and restrictions on access to education.
The commoners of the Third Estate, in particular, the wealthy urban merchants and the professional bourgeoisie who respectively maintained social and functional ties with the provincial aristocracy, were inclined to support the provincial nobility in their call for a greater balance of power, especially since the middle and upper classes of the bourgeoisie had progressively become excluded from royal offices in the course of the 18th century. But the potential for an alliance between commoners and nobility was far from certain because of other important factors.

The more progressive minded of the commoners, including lawyers, philosophes, and other writers frequently showed sympathy for the constitutional theory of enlightened despotism which was championed by Voltaire, the Encyclopaedists, and the physiocrats. Enlightened despotism was a call for power and privileges to be limited by reason and for economic reform that would enhance liberty of industry and greater fiscal equality. Some of the reforms promoted by the royal government prior to the Revolution, traced to the efforts Colbert, were based on the enlightened consensus. However, some of these efforts, including those of Louis XVI’s minister Calonne, were unpopular with the aristocratic parlements
because they threatened the vested interests of the nobility.

The commoners, on the other hand, were predisposed to support the royal government when it advocated greater fiscal equality and a lessening of privileges for the nobility. However, when the government through its intendants and fiscal officers attempted to enforce unpopular taxes upon the commoners, or appeared to be asserting despotic authority over the parlements, the members of the Third were motivated to rally around the provincial parlements in opposition to the crown. The educated commoners, therefore, tended to vacillate in their views between conceptions of government that included elements of enlightened despotism and aristocratic liberalism.

Neither enlightened despotism, nor aristocratic liberalism, allowed any room for participation in government by the lower classes who made up the majority of the population. And neither did these theories appear to leave a whole lot of room for effective participation on the part of the middle and professional classes of the bourgeoisie. But the middle classes remained in alliance with the nobility and monarchy, depending upon the circumstances, because of their own distrust of the classes below them and their aspirations toward upper
class status and the limited potential for ennoblement. This is why the educational reform tracts of the non-noble professional elite, like those of the parlementaires, emphasized utilitarian reform and moral regeneration rather than a wider enfranchisement of political participation.

The rising bourgeoisie, represented by professionals, landowners, and merchants, who were eventually to dominate socio-political discussion with the advent of the Revolution, were, prior to the Revolution, restricted in their socio-political opinions by ambiguous self-perceptions related to social mobility and by the lack of a democratic ideology, which had in fact already been developed by Rousseau. What advanced ideas the bourgeoisie did espouse prior to the Revolution were in the realm of the secularization of education and of social organization. Utility, not democracy, was the backbone of their assertive ideology. And out of utilitarian doctrines also arose the concept of a secular science of society and the seeds of anti-clericalism. A closer look at the social tensions generated within the bourgeoisie will help explain their indifference to the democratic egalitarianism of Rousseau, and a closer look at their attitudes toward the church will help explain their interest in a secular national catechism in education.
Even though petite bourgeois families sent their sons to colleges with hopes of legal careers and minor public offices as ways of enhancing wealth and status, there existed an acceptance of only limited mobility which conflicted with these drives toward improving one's status. According to Barber, the bourgeois had "necessary qualifications and attitudes for mobility," but "shared in the predominant attitude of disapproval of mobility." The "bourgeois accepted the general definition of his business activities as worthy of contempt, but he denied the immutable inferiority of his position in the class structure."\(^{67}\)

This outlook is typified in Robert Darton's bourgeois of Montpellier, who felt compelled to put his world in order.\(^{68}\) The anonymous author placed himself in the "middle range of urban society, among the doctors, lawyers, administrators, and rentiers, who formed the intelligentsia in most provincial cities."\(^{69}\) In describing a procession of dignitaries (procession générale) of his town he reveals typical bourgeois sentiments.

After meticulously describing the subtle nuances of social status as indicated by dress, wealth, privilege, public office, and corporate body of those who
participated in the procession, the bourgeois reflects upon his own status in relation to the rest of society. He eliminates the clergy from his consideration dismissing them as "not much esteemed in this city." He elevates the nobility to the status of "First Estate" (the Estate customarily used in reference to the clergy), and his fellow bourgeoisie to rank of "Second Estate." In the Third Estate, he puts artisans and common people. He defines his own class as the most useful and most important and speaks of the common people as naturally bad and inclined to cause trouble.

Most important, his views on social mobility indicate that he "seemed willing to accept a certain amount of ennoblement of the bourgeoisie. It was the embourgeoisement of the common people that really alarmed him . . ." And what were his views on education? "Education, like money," he says, "has a disruptive effect on social categories." And he positively condemned its existence in his "Third Estate."

In many ways, Darnton’s bourgeois is of the same class of men as were the educational reform writers of the late 18th century. On the list of sixty writers identified by Chisick are only a few philosophes (Condorcet, Diderot, Helvétius, Rousseau, Voltaire) and two royal ministers, Turgot and Necker. The rest of the
group are composed of unaffiliated clerics, educators, lawyers, legal functionaries, noblemen of sovereign courts, administrators, a couple army officers, and a medical professional, all from the "larger community of the Enlightenment." These men formed part of a "liberal professional elite," defined by Brockliss as those who achieved a college and university education and who "entered the ranks of professors, lawyers, judges, urban priests, canons, bishops, and physicians." Darnton's bourgeois is really part of a little larger group including these men and also urban notables, rentiers, well-to-do merchants, noble industrialists, and engineers, that are not included in Brockliss' professional elite.

Within this liberal, professional, upper bourgeois elite there existed various shades of anti-clerical sentiment, of which one view is indicated by Darnton's bourgeois who dismissed the clergy as unimportant to society. What was the source of this sentiment?

One place we cannot look for bourgeois anti-clericalism is in the failure of the Catholic church to promote a work ethic of the type which historians have in the past associated solely with Protestantism. The culture of the schools run by the regular and secular orders among the clergy of France, as we have seen, included very much the application of values associated
with the bourgeois mentality or order, meritocracy, and hard work. Ironically, we can look to bourgeois education offered in the colleges run by the clergy for the origins of anti-clericalism.

Prior to the rise of bourgeois colleges in the towns of Renaissance Europe, Huppert claims "the diocesan system for public instruction was archaic and ineffective." It relied on private masters, many of very poor quality, teaching groups of children individually at all levels of learning. One way to efficiently organize the school to handle larger numbers (remembering the bourgeois made their colleges available to everyone in town), and to economize, was to pay differential salaries to teachers in different levels of instruction, paying less to teachers of ABC's, more to humanities and rhetoric teachers. Thus, it was from this bourgeois instinct for economization and efficiency that the hierarchy of uniform, graded standards in learning, classroom management, and disciplinary practices arose. (As well as from a new conception of childhood, as Ariés pointed out.)

It then happened that the teaching orders of the clergy absorbed this system into their own school culture. In the process, an elite culture began to develop during the Reformation and Enlightenment, distinguishing the culture of the college, with its rationality, civility,
decorum, diligence, and order from the unruly, spontaneous, medieval culture of the masses. This led to a new religious self-awareness on the part of the educated urban and town bourgeoisie whereby:

    The very success of the Tridentine Reformation in reforming French Catholicism along lines desired by the social élite was in fact the cause, in turn, of a certain alienation of the élite from the clergy. The élite, particularly the bourgeoisie, could see itself as pre-eminently Christian since the Tridentine reforms corresponded so closely to its moral and cultural values.79

This new bourgeois religious self-awareness and the secular wisdom of the philosophes allowed for further distinctions from the masses, at the same time that the church and its doctrines were still the guiding light of the lower classes. More importantly, the church continued to promote beliefs in what were contemptuously called "superstitions" by the liberal elite, but which enhanced the awareness of the people of the presence of the divine in their midst.

    Ultimately, the separation between the bourgeoisie and the clergy came down to a fundamentally irreligious attitude on the part of the Enlightened liberal professionals, while for the bourgeoisie who still retained their Faith, the church became a world of two different cultures:

    Becoming more self-confident and self-assured, the bourgeoisie came in time to find the
conservatism and traditionalism of the clergy confining and anachronistic, particularly when customary clerical attitudes and practices clashed with the ambitions of an increasingly wealthy, enterprising, and ambitious bourgeoisie, and when the bourgeoisie identified abuses in the existing social order which the moralizing clergy tended on principle to defend.80

The extent of anti-clericalism and general indifference to the clergy, prior to the Revolution, is difficult to gauge exactly. The church continued to draw recruits; however, there was a "general decrease in clerical entries touching most sectors of France, with urban recruitment declining substantially more rapidly than rural recruitment."81 Three-fifths of clergymen in France came from rural parishes,82 with a large portion of these men coming from poor origins as the priesthood was the primary means of social mobility for the poor. Throughout the kingdom though the clergy was essentially middle class, drawn from the families of the liberal professional elite and the middle and lower bourgeoisie.83

It was the families of town notables that provided the elite personnel of the church who brought with them the new bourgeois attitudes toward religion. This made the Gallican clergy during the 17th and 18th centuries more elitist in origin than perhaps it has ever been. This led, as previously noted, to the cultural distinctions within the church that divided the "people"
from the professional elite. It must also be kept in mind that the mass of recruits within the church, including the parish priests and the bureaucratic functionnaires within the administration, both poor and middle class in background, must be contrasted with the much wealthier nobles who had a near monopoly on bishoprics and other high places.

It also must be recognized that recruitment, in and of itself, was not necessarily a sign of a strong commitment to the Catholic church, whether elitist or popular in cultural orientation. This is because the church was the major employer of educated men as well as a means of social mobility. Sieyès and Talleyrand, who were forced by their families to enter the priesthood, bitterly received their educational training at the well-known seminary of Saint-Sulpice in Paris. Sieyès, a commoner swallowed the bitter pill and began, after his education, to rise within the ranks of the church, but found the highest posts blocked to which he expressed much resentment. Talleyrand, because of his nobility, rose to obtain highly remunerative benefices and became a bishop on the eve of the Revolution. Yet he was notorious for living a secular lifestyle and expressing advanced views.

Clerical recruitment had a definite effect on education because teachers were drawn from the clerical
recruits. However, clerics were generally on their way to somewhere else. This led, in most cases, to a limited commitment to teaching, where teaching ten years was a long time. Regular clergy were expected to teach only a short period of time and then advance to take their turn as confessors, missionaries, or preachers. In secular colleges, where churchmen also dominated the teaching staff, the secular clerics who taught classes looked toward a career in the church and often taught school in the five to six year interim between having obtained a baccalaureate in theology and obtaining the license and the doctorate.

These recruits, as we shall see, were often confronted with the growing anti-clerical ideology. This ideology took two forms, one deriving from an enlightened irreligiosity spread among the social elite, and another based on utilitarian attitudes of both elite and those of lesser social status who saw in the monastic orders in particular, a philosophy contradictory to the generation of wealth. Several sources of information indicate the general spread of irreligiosity prior to the Revolution, but not to a great degree. Tacket has surveyed the evidence from historians in this field and reports the following.
Although the total number of religious titles by the booksellers of Paris increased during the first half of the 18th century, the number of secular books increased in even greater proportion, and during the forty years after mid-century there was a steep drop in the percentage and number of religious titles. The provincial academies do not appear to have been openly antireligious, even though discourse here was of an "enlightened" type. There were complaints by clergymen of religious indifference spreading from Paris and other urban centers, but the extent of urban irreligiosity is still obscure to historians. Supporting the view of urban irreligiosity are results from research into the wills of the urban elite in a few cities and towns, which has indicated a sharp decline in religious references and adherence to Catholic values.

The general philosophical basis for irreligion, has been explored by Palmer, who described the intellectual distinctions between Catholics and unbelievers. He explores the confidence of the philosophes which was founded in a practical vision of a new social order for society, based upon new principles of governance. For them, law was not an obligation imposed from on high, but a "charter of liberty, under which men as individuals need observe only the rights of each other . . ." From the
viewpoint of the utilitarians, social laws were best that could be based on actual needs, desires, inclinations, and ideas. They believed that reciprocal interests could be taken into account by men such that natural inclinations for pleasure over pain would lead to social harmony. Essentially, the theoreticians tried to deduce "what ought to be" from "what is", which became in the Talleyrand Report, and still remains, the guiding spirit behind the science of education.

The theologians, on the other hand, contrasted the ideal from the actual. Although the dogma of Grace and of original sin had been tempered by the enlightened theologians, who accounted for free will and virtues of human action separate from the supernatural, they still believed that man must change his human nature. They understood that he could not do this through his natural faculties alone, he needed the knowledge of God, God’s Grace, and the sacraments that only the church could provide. This was the ultimate basis for the authority of the church. To challenge this authority as the philosophes did in the sphere of saving souls, by positing the greater validity of a secular science of morality, forced a confrontation upon the church which it did not seek.
In education, the secular reformer writers felt that because of the church's primary interest in saving souls, the clergy were little inclined to make the teaching of nationalism a priority. But the reformers did not go as far as did the philosophes who suggested that it was the constitution of society which created evils and not the individual. The reformers limited their sights to social control over individual through education for patriotism and nationalism. And this indicates their lack of will to fully apply the principles of the new science of morality. Thus political education for a new constitutional order would have to wait for the Revolution.

The Enlightenment debate between the theologians and the philosophes naturally filtered down to the new clerical recruits. Palmer notes that especially within the secular clergy students of theology were said to be very familiar with the objectives of the unbelievers and had difficulty defending the faith. Many bachelors, even those at the Sorbonne, gave orations on history and politics as opposed to theology. Enlightened bishops, in particular those such as Talleyrand, assumed there was no need for pious obligations to restrain them from using wit and intelligence. Theologians in general softened the dogma of sin and circumscribed the world of Grace. Unlike their medieval brethren, they focused attention less upon
the supernatural and more upon the natural inclinations of man. Thus, the theologians themselves aided in the separation of morals from religion in the sense that they acknowledged the existence of a human nature not known exclusively through revelation.\textsuperscript{92} This enabled many within the church to philosophically accept many of the reforms in education being advanced, especially in regard to national education. Still, most members of the clergy believed in the ultimate sanctity of god and the Catholic sacraments as the only means of individual salvation.

So what was the general nature of anti-clericalism like on the eve of the Revolution? In spite of all the new evidence accumulated since 1927 when Aulard wrote, his conclusions are still appropriate:

\begin{quote}
It would seem that on the eve of the Revolution there was in France, even in the country, a small minority of unbelievers and a large minority of indifferent people, and, though the practice of religion was general, there were too many exceptions, together with a sort of slackness or irregularity on the part of many of the faithful; in short, there was not enough faith to make an attempt to destroy it absolutely impossible, but enough deeply rooted habits to make such an attempt very difficult or impossible unless circumstances disgusted people with their priests.\textsuperscript{93}
\end{quote}

One aspect of the church did come to cause a great deal of resentment among the liberal elite and the utilitarian-minded bourgeoisie and that was the church's enormous wealth.
Both the church and the state extracted large portions of surplus wealth from the producers of society, but the relations of production in the still partially feudal society did not allow for this wealth to have much affect upon the economy in general. This is perhaps the major reason that the educational reform writers had such a limited vision of social progress and feared social mobility, and why the more optimistic among them put their faith in moral progress rather than in economic development as we do today.

Sources of wealth in eighteenth century society and the social structure

Darnton's bourgeois is typical of the rising urban bourgeoisie who were rising because of their acquisition of wealth. Wealth was the defining factor for him. Although he showed much respect for social positions, he disdained the idleness of some aristocrats and the clergy, and took little stock in honorific distinctions. He prided bourgeois talents in finance and trade for acquiring the wealth which broke down the barriers between nobility and the middle class. This process had been so successful in his view that the distinctions between the two classes scarcely existed. This breakdown of class distinctions between the bourgeoisie and the nobility was well noted by Cobban as
he exploded the Marxist myth of the Revolution as a conflict between a capitalist class and the feudal nobility. Many members of the nobility mingled freely with the bourgeoisie among whom can be considered Talleyrand. Among his close acquaintances at the time of the Revolution, mentioned in his Memoirs, are Barthes, a physician, Panchaud, a banker, and Chamfort, a journalist. Cobban mentions that some nobles even desired to sit with the Third Estate based on their involvement in commerce.

Although commerce and industry offered opportunities for a few nobles as well as the bourgeoisie to acquire wealth, by far the largest source of accumulated wealth in society came from landed rents and seigniorial dues. The latter, which was the most prominent sign of feudalism in society, took the form of a host of petty dues and claims, some in money, some in kind, some in services. The great bulk of these were extracted from the rural peasant class.

Cobban found that control of seigniorial dues did not only rest, nor very often rest with the nobility. Just as many of the high offices and even minor offices were owned as pieces of property, so to had feudal dues become a form of property, passed to the bourgeoisie under terms of the purchase of lands from the feudal nobility. In addition, many nobles hired bourgeois agents (fermiers) to collect
dues on the lands they still owned. This created even further ties between the bourgeoisie and the nobility, in this manner against the interests of the peasants.

In general, there was a movement within the nobility toward sources of wealth of the bourgeoisie (commerce and industry) and a movement within the bourgeoisie toward sources of wealth of the nobility (landed estates and seigniorial dues) in what made for an amalgamation of the two classes. This new economic elite could hardly be considered capitalist, however.

Industry, in the form of mining ventures, largely owned by the nobility, and the organization of handicraft trades (such as textiles and wallpaper production) into primitive industrial facilities, largely initiated by the wealthy merchant class, did generate concentrations of surplus wealth. But this surplus was seldom invested into further productive efforts. The nobility and the bourgeoisie devoted the bulk of this surplus to either conspicuous consumption or further investment in land. And, of course, the rising bourgeoisie continued also to invest in offices and titles.

It was, therefore, the inhibiting nature of the relations of old regime society itself, as it absorbed the economic interests of noble and bourgeois alike, that account for the relative lack of enterprise in French
industry and trade. These relations which led to a far greater investment in proprietary wealth meant that any increase in the income of the amalgamated elite "was more likely to come from a drain on production than from its increase through innovation."98

Furthermore, the great bulk of economic surplus, over and above what was retained by direct producers and those living off of feudal rents, was drained away by the state in a highly regressive tax structure. The church was a part of this tax structure, because a legal tax, the much resented tithe, was imposed by the government for the church's exclusive benefit. In addition, the church received wealth from its landed property, which Rabaut Saint-Etienne of the Committee of the Constitution estimated at one-fifth of the land in France.99 In addition, the church also possessed the offerings and alms of its flock.

Amid the funneling of surplus wealth to unproductive ventures, signs of relative prosperity existed. The number of merchants, shopkeepers, money-lenders, and master-craftsmen increased throughout the 18th century; the number of small-landholding peasants increased and many become involved in the agricultural market that grew throughout the age. This group in turn would have generated further need for professional services from men
with a specialized education. Therefore, there is reason to believe that on the eve of the Revolution, the lower classes, including the petite bourgeoisie, those who frightened the reformers with their aspirations to be educated, could retain their aspirations, however limited, and through acquiring limited surplus wealth, send at least one of their children to college.

The problem remained, however, that it was impossible to perceive that expanding education would enable the lower classes to create new sources of wealth. In fact, the lower classes themselves showed resistance to industrialization, generally as a threat to jobs. "People blamed new technology for undercutting the products of more expensive traditional methods. In Rouen, spinning-jennies were smashed and workshops producing them sacked." In this climate, the main opportunities available to improve one's position remained the acquisition of an education to achieve a lesser office in the church or public enterprises.

Similarly, if educators looked around for sources of funding for education, where would it be expected to come from? The church already monopolized the educational resources of the country, and the state was the only other entity with the power and resources to provide any viable alternatives to the church's vast educational resources.
In a country where the surplus extraction of wealth was concentrated so heavily in these entities, there was very little thought given to making the educational system localized in the case of reformers looking for ways to compete with the church's monopoly. Thus it happened that the state itself became the prize for the revolutionaries who attempted to create a national system of education. But in order to fund this system, they had to rely on the church's wealth, which only the revolutionary state was powerful enough to seize.

**Socio-cultural antecedents of national interest in moral education**

Only slowly through the course of the early modern era did an interest develop in national education, and even on the eve of the Revolution there was little indication as to the particular manner in which the state was prepared to assume control over education. However, various social structural and cultural factors that led to challenges of church controlled education anticipated the rise of the state and its control over moral education during the Revolution. These factors which have been traced in this chapter can now be summarized.

The Catholic church came to dominate public schooling in the early modern era through the impetus of the Catholic Counter-Reformation to secure Roman Catholic
orthodoxy in France. Therefore, if the state was to initiate a role in the teaching of moral education it had to have a reason to intervene in church control over the curriculum. The urban bourgeoisie of the late Renaissance gave the state a reason to intervene in educational affairs by requesting that the monarch compel the church to help fund the mostly secular municipal colleges. The state declined, perhaps for reasons that had to do with the classical curriculum of the colleges which depended heavily upon the republican literature of the ancients. However, it is more likely that the state declined this offer because of the social structure of French society which was based on strong ties between church and state.

The state served the interests of the church by granting it special privileges and recognizing Catholicism as the official religion of France. The church served the interests of the state by investing kingship with divine right and by offering a curriculum in schools that sanctioned the legitimacy of absolutism and the existing class structure of society. The class structure of society itself insured strong bonds between church and state as the nobility possessed the highest offices in both institutions.

The social structural links that existed between the urban bourgeoisie and the state were much weaker.
However, the royal government in the course of the early modern period, through the sale of venal offices, created an alliance with the upper classes of the bourgeoisie by offering them hopes for social mobility. Once ennobled, however, the bourgeoisie adopted all the characteristics of robe nobility and so the social gap between nobility and the upper classes of the commoners remained. This was especially so as the opportunities for social mobility lessened during the course of the 18th century. Thus the royal government may have bred resentments in those for whom social advance had been blocked.

The ennobling process, in another respect, created even more problems for the royal government. In the ennobling process prior to 18th century many members of the bourgeoisie purchased offices in the provincial parlements and so became allied with the provincial aristocracy that often challenged royal authority. Thus it happened that provincial members of the robe nobility, bourgeois in origin, came to support the rights of nobles against the reform initiatives of the monarch. As the parlementaires asserted their authority in conflict with the royal government, they also came to have less of a vested interest in church control over education which was supported by the king. And they had a new ideology with
which to counter the church’s control over education: nationalism and utilitarianism.

One example of this tension between parlements and king is exemplified in the controversy over Jansenism, a religious sect within Catholicism that developed affinities with the more austere doctrines of Protestantism. In 1713, Jansenist principles were condemned by a papal bull. When the royal government attempted to enforce the bull, the king and his ministers and most of the bishops, as well as the Jesuits, came into conflict with the Jansenists and their sympathizers. This latter group included members of the Parlement of Paris and most provincial parlements who supported Gallican liberties; it also naturally included Jansenists who could be counted among professors at the University of Paris, and among teachers within the Oratorians and Doctrinaires.102

This confrontation of the king and his loyal nobility against the parlementary nobility and members of the professional bourgeoisie would be played out again in events leading up to the Revolution. Target, for example, was both a Jansenist and a lawyer at the Parlement of Paris, who sharply attacked the constitution of the Jesuits early in his career in defense of a client.
Following the expulsion of the Jesuits, royal authority and local parlements who often quarreled feverishly in the 1760s over constitutional and fiscal questions, cooperated to help fill the void left by the loss of over 1,000 Jesuit teachers in over 100 colleges. Behind this cooperation, which included the participation of bishops, royal officials, and local notables and town councilors, was the drive for national education as evinced in the plans of the reform writers of the time. But as we have seen these plans called for a type of national education that in some cases conflicted with church controlled education.

Emanating from the plans of the reformers was the call for national education in the form of civic studies and a secular catechism which implied the separation of ethics from religion. Civic education for the masses was promoted by both clergy and laymen. This alliance among churchmen and secular officials in the interest of secular affairs can be attributed in part to the cultural influences which the bourgeoisie and the Enlightenment had upon the church and its schools. Also, many of the reformers, including the philosophes, felt that religion was necessary for the masses, and so they advocated a type of civic and religious catechism for the schools.
Although the clergy felt confident in their ability to teach national education and did not view it as incompatible with teaching Christian doctrines, many laymen who wrote about educational reform displayed a distrust in the ability of clerics to teach national education. Religious teachers and teachings might be fine at the elementary level of mass education, but in the colleges, where a deeper understanding of nationalism as a form of secular wisdom was to be taught, there was less trust in the ability of the clergy to fulfill this task. Both the parlementaires, such as La Chalotais and Rolland, and the philosophes, such as Diderot and Voltaire espoused this view. It became "the major feature of the challenge to religious domination over education," expressed as a desire for the state to "control educational activities of the clergy and restrict them to the sphere in which religion would legitimate social stability to the exclusion of that in which it would harm intellectual development."¹⁰³

The problem with the existing state government and education was that, although it had a track record of initiating reforms in education, these reforms did not touch upon moral education which was left solely to the discretion of the clergy. This is attributable to the traditional alliance between church and state in France
that reflected the social and political structure of the old regime. This does not mean, however, that the state did not support bourgeois interests in education from time to time.

To the degree that meritocracy is a bourgeois value, frequently used to justify social mobility based on talent rather than status, the royal government did promote some bourgeois reforms in this direction. In the early 17th century, when the government intervened to reform the University of Paris, it declared all teachers possess a maitrise ès art degree, and later it forbade venality so that professorships could not be sold. In the second half of the 18th century, the government in guiding the reorganization of the Jesuit colleges, instituted a competitive exam, the agrégation, for eligibility for advanced study and teaching positions at the College of Louis-le-Grand. In spite of objections from the faculty, the state persisted so that the agrégation "represented a step in nationalization both by its royal enactment and in aiming at a standard for the whole country."¹⁰⁴ In fact, the entire effort to make provisions for filling the ex-Jesuit colleges with new teachers included an attempt to provided a uniform national standard for doing so. But this effort was never realized to any significant extent, and it failed to provide for the type of national
education advocated by the reformers, because state, local, and church officials in charge seldom intervened to initiate curriculum reform.

Nevertheless, the stage was set for national education to be instituted by some secular force in society, a force which ultimately would have to be political in nature so as to wrestle control of moral education away from the clerics. This is not to say that clerics were against national education, many of them wholeheartedly endorsed it and had even become influenced by different aspects of the movement toward secularization. But their interest was still in maintaining control over the teaching of national education, which from the perspective of the non-clerical reformers, would lead to insufficient civic education.

The state had so far resisted encroaching upon the clerical monopoly, and would have remained hesitant to do so had it not happened that the state itself was overtaken by political forces representing social classes hitherto restricted from state policy making. The members of the revolutionary Committee of the Constitution, who were responsible for L'Instruction publique, indicate clearly the nature of the new social classes that finally challenged the church's control over moral education, initiated after they had taken control of state policy
making. This new national political group was composed of talented and capable non-noble legal professionals such as Barnave, Rabaut Saint-Etienne, Le Chapelier, Pétion, and Buzot, who formed an alliance with the more liberal and radical magistrates of the parlements, including Target, Tronchet, Duport, and Beaumetz. As part of this alliance were two churchmen, Talleyrand and Sieyès, one an aristocrat and the other a commoner who had risen in the ranks of church administration. What held this group together to challenge church control over education was their common belief in the secular assertive ideology of the reform movement in education which had social roots in both urban bourgeois culture and the liberal robe nobility of the parlements.

In consequence of their assertive educational ideology this revolutionary group came together fully expecting to initiate some type of national education with elements of meritocracy, utilitarianism, and universal elementary education for the masses that would enhance social control over them by making them wiser and better functioning citizens. What they did not expect was that they would also introduce revolutionary elements of democratic education into their assertive ideology, which would cause them to revise the reform movement for national social utility.
Social control was still an implicit part of the National Assembly's design for education; however, it took the form of moral regeneration and was masked by the rhetoric of liberalism with a classical bent. This classical liberalism, defined in large part by the classical education and enlightened ideas of an 18th century socio-cultural elite, was more than mere rhetoric however. Provisions for civil and fiscal equality for the masses in the constitution of 1791 attest to this.

In education, this meant that social control was subordinated to the radical notions of democracy and secular moral progress. Examples of these notions, as advocated in *L'Instruction publique*, include the democratic nature of the secular catechism, democratic disciplinary practices (the apprenticeship in democracy), the secular science of society, and scientific learning methods (really quasi-scientific involving communication skills and positive reinforcement).

The specific nature of the secular and democratic values in *L'Instruction publique*, indicating the most important discontinuities in education, can best be explained by revolutionary events and the influence of the secular ideology of the Enlightenment. That these secular and democratic notions entailed some important
contradictions provide fodder for moral lessons in history and civic education as we shall now see.
CHAPTER V

REVOLUTIONARY EVENTS AND DEMOCRACY IN EDUCATION

There are no longer corporate bodies in the State; there is only the private interest of each individual and the general interest.

Le Chapelier

The origins of revolutionary events and the coalition of the liberal nobles and the bourgeoisie

The politicization of members of the nobility and the bourgeoisie, who made up the revolutionary group of the National Assembly, began with the call in August 1788 to convocate the Estates-General. This action, prompted by pressure upon the government, was spawned by a fiscal crisis that precipitated a political conflict.

By 1787 half of the annual revenue of the state went to service the national debt, a debt generated in large part by French participation in the American war for independence. Calonne, the finance minister of the king expressed the dilemma in February as follows:

To continue to borrow would be to aggravate the evil and to precipitate the ruin of the state.

To impose new taxes would be to overwhelm the people whom the king wishes to relieve.

To borrow on future revenue, we have had too much of that already....
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To economize is no doubt necessary... but economy alone, however stringent it be, would be inadequate and can be considered only as a secondary means.¹

Matters this grave called for more than the absolute will of the king with advice from his ministers, and so an elite representative body from the nation was summoned. This "Assembly of Notables" included high clerics, princes of blood, provincial lords and governors, sovereign court magistrates and administrative officials of which the vast majority were nobles.²

Calonne's plan called for a land tax to be administered by provincial representative assemblies. The notables, mostly landowners, questioned the tax proposal, but agreed to constructing the assemblies and accepted the view that greater fiscal equality was necessary for the country. The notables disbanded without achieving full agreement with the government, but the latter sought to initiate its reform plan through the local parlements anyway. The parlements accepted the provision to establish provincial assemblies, many of which already existed, but they remonstrated against the tax. They also called for the Estates-General, a far more representative body than the notables.

The reaction of the parlements against the government's proposed tax generated public sympathy for the parlementaires. Great crowds supported the
magistrates against what was perceived as the absolutism of a government attempting to force its will upon the nation. That the fiscal reforms proposed by the government were necessary, in light of the debt, and that they included liberal reforms such as free trade in grain, did not become the key issue. Power did. Lawyers and liberal magistrates openly expressed sympathy for the British constitution as elaborated upon by their mentor, Montesquieu. His theory of the separation of powers provided, in their minds, a legitimate authority with which to counter the king and his ministers. Rabaut de Saint-Etienne was among the professional bourgeoisie who supported this constitutional challenge, in what was really a conservative conflict of noble privilege versus monarchical reform.

When the government revised its plan and yet continued to meet with parlementary resistance, the monarchy attempted to circumvent the parlements by reforming the judicial system and upgrading lower courts. Using this tactic the king’s ministers hoped to acquire an alliance with the lesser professionals for their move against the parlements. Royal authority was also exerted by exiling the parlements of Paris and Bordeaux. But the lower courts resisted registering the new laws and there were popular demonstrations against the king’s provincial
administrators. Riots erupted in Grenoble as the military governor of Dauphiné attempted to arrest some members of the parlement. Other disturbances throughout the country, and finally, complete bankruptcy, forced the government in August 1788 to finally call for the Estates-General. In relenting to public pressure the crown, however, had hopes that the Estates-General would divide the popular opposition. This happened, of course, but not with the intended consequences either the king or the parlementaires had hoped for.

The Estates-General, a national representative body last assembled in 1614, was composed of the First Estate, made up of the clergy, the Second Estate, comprising the nobility, and the Third Estate, the commoners, including as we have seen, everyone from the highest bourgeois to the common day laborer. When it came time to vote on specific measures, the nobility and the clergy could easily block initiatives of the Third which were not to their liking, because voting was by order.

Lefebvre estimated the approximate number of non-noble clergy to be 100,000, the nobility 400,000, and the commoners 2.3 million. Recent estimates, however, indicate a general population of approximately 25 to 26 million.) The initial announcement to convoke the Estates-General generated popular enthusiasm. And as
Lefebvre noted, there was no reason in the summer of 1788 to anticipate the professional bourgeoisie would eventually intervene in this conflict between royal power and the aristocracy.⁴

As part of the government’s recent display of cooperation by calling for the Estates-General, the Parlement of Paris was restored. However, when the magistrates of the parlement demanded that old forms of 1614 be retained, a rift developed in the alliance of commoners and noble parlementaires. Members of the Third realized their impotence under the old arrangements of the Estates and had already begun to initiate changes in the traditional forms. The provincial assemblies that had been established in 1787 had doubled representation of the Third and initiated voting by head instead of by order. Barnave, who arose at this time as a non-noble leader of the Third, helped establish this model in Dauphiné. And this set a precedent that members of the Third in other provinces of the country also began to call for.

In October, when a second assembly of notables was called to decide procedures for the Estates-General, the nobility further reiterated its demand for traditional forms, but they did, however, commit to complete fiscal equality. Under pressure from royal authority, the notables eventually accepted doubling representation of
the Third, but did not concede on voting by head. It is obvious that the nobles' fear of losing time-honored political rights based on their social status was more important than economic privileges, which are, after all, a function of political power.

In response to the doubling of the Third, some provincial parlements drew up remonstrances and in some places violence broke out between the nobles and bourgeois professionals. This revolt of the nobles caused the Third Estate to radicalize. Rabaut de Saint-Etienne, had prior to this aristocratic reaction, favored an English system of government with two chambers, of which one included the two privileged orders as a barrier against democracy. Democracy he viewed as anarchistic. But in December of 1788, he espoused a government of a single chamber, composed much like the Estates-General, with doubling of the Third and with voting by head.5

Rabaut's reaction was indicative of growing sentiment among the Third which also came to be shared by a few members of the Enlightened aristocracy. A group known as the Committee of Thirty, founded by Adrien Duport, a magistrate of the Parlement of Paris, brought together nobles such as Talleyrand, La Fayette, Condorcet, and some non-nobles, of whom the most noteworthy was the ecclesiastic, abbé Sieyès. Their purpose appears to have
been to promote liberal viewpoints in contradistinction to the recalcitrant positions of the conservative parlementaires, with the intent to acquire influence in the elections for the Estates-General. Although little is known about this group they apparently inspired pamphlets, models of petitions of grievances, supported candidates, and dispatched agents to provinces.6 Talleyrand, who as a cleric had created somewhat of a stir in attending the funeral of Voltaire, most likely supported Voltaire’s views of Enlightened despotism, in reaction to the obstinacy of the aristocracy to support reform.

The ideas of Sieyès, on the other hand, were more radical, and he expressed the most advanced views of the Third Estate more sharply and vociferously than any of the other propagandists at this time. Particularly important was his famous pamphlet, What is the Third Estate? In this writing he anticipated the eventual rise of the Third Estate separate from the other two orders, and its usurpation of the role of national government. Most important in his rhetoric is the emphasis upon the "nation" as an abstract entity, that became a key concept in the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen, the constitution, and national education in the Talleyrand Report. Sieyès asks:

Who, then, would dare to say that the third estate has not within itself all that is
necessary to constitute a complete nation? If the privileged order were abolished, the nation would be not something less but something more. Thus, what is the third estate? Everything; but an everything shackled and oppressed. What would it be without the privileged order? Everything; but an everything free and flourishing. . .

In such a state of affairs, what must the third estate do if it wishes to gain possession of its political rights in a manner beneficial to the nation? There are two ways of attaining this objective. In following the first, the third estate must assemble apart; it will not meet with the nobility and the clergy at all; it will not remain with them, either by order or by head. I pray that they will keep in mind the enormous difference between the assembly of the third estate and that of the other two orders. The first represents 25,000,000 men, and deliberates concerning the interests of the nation. The two others, were they to unite, have the powers of only about 200,000 individuals, and think only of their privileges. The third estate alone, they say, cannot constitute the Estates General. Well! So much the better! it will form a National Assembly . . .
Estates-General, because *cahiers de doléances*, or lists of "grievances and wishes" for the king, were written up in the electoral assemblies. Thus, the views of the propagandists might show up directly in a formal manner to be presented to the king.

The *cahiers* were intended to serve as each constituency's instructions to their elected representatives. They have been described variously as "a gigantic survey of public opinion," or as "the widest, most detailed and truest test of opinion ever made in ancien régime France." However, because of the large number of people who had to be represented, the degree to which the *cahiers* are a test of Third Estate opinion is less certain than for the other two estates. Often, members in the assemblies of the Third turned to the professional elite to express their views, such as in the case of numerous *cahiers* of the Rouen area, which were derived from the model drawn up by Thouret. "Although local demands were able to make themselves heard, the influence of the lawyers and the local bourgeoisie, who very often did the actual writing, did determine the tone of the *cahier.""}

When the issue of education was addressed, as it was in many *cahiers* (but not in the majority of them), the appeal of Sieyès to the notion of nationalism became the
most characteristic element of these. And of course, this element echoes the writings of the educational reform movement begun at mid-century. The frequent call for an education which is "nationale," "patriotique", "du citoyen," is seldom qualified, however. National education is generally described as "a study of national institutions," of the "national administration," of the "constitution," and in a few cases is proposed to include a "catechism of social morality." \(^{11}\)

It is noteworthy that, although there is no significant "divergence of views between the clergy, nobility, and bourgeoisie," \(^{12}\) "there is less articulate demand for a national educational system on the part of the Third Estate." \(^{13}\) Bernard suggests that among other factors, this may be due to the fact that the more educated in the electoral assemblies had the most influence and were part of a tradition of opinion skeptical of popular education. \(^{14}\) (This tradition was explored in the previous chapter.) The clergy addressed the issue of national education the most frequently, but expressed fears of national control. In contrast, the Third Estate called more frequently than the others for "étatisme in education." \(^{15}\)

Even with calls for national education and state intervention in education, the majority of cahiers demand
that teaching be entrusted to the congregations and religious orders already in existence.\textsuperscript{16} There was thus no call for the separation of church and state in education. As stated in one cahier the principal goal of a national system of education is to give students "a robust constitution, patriotic sentiments, and the necessary knowledge to be a Christian and a Frenchman."\textsuperscript{17}

Differences did arise, however, in regard to who should control the schools. The cahiers of the clergy often complain of lay encroachment in administrative affairs of the secondary schools, and call for either total control by the clergy or equal numbers of ecclesiastics and civil officers in college administrations. The second and third orders show less fear of laicization in college administrations or "les droits de surveillance," recommending more control be given to the provincial estates or even to the Estates-General.\textsuperscript{18} Finally, the clergy called for a larger contribution to education from their own order, particularly from the wealthy ecclesiastics. A few cahiers of the Third, from rural areas, go even further to suggest educational funding be contributed from the assets of the sale of the property of "unuseful" chapters, abbeys, and monastic orders.\textsuperscript{19}
The cahiers, in general, were the voice of the people to be taken by the representatives of the Estates-General to Versailles. They were to provide the "imperative mandates" from which to construct some type of constitutional reform of the country, which would ultimately lead to resolving the fiscal crisis among other economic and political problems. They were plans for reform, not revolution. That revolution resulted quickly following the opening of the Estates-General, was in large part due to the ideological and social make-up of the non-noble elected representatives, and the fact that among those elected were well known publicists, such as Rabaut de Saint-Etienne, Target, Duport, Thouret, and Siéyes, whose names were identified with liberal or even radical views about government.

It was not long before these men met in the Committee of the Constitution in the "National Assembly" of Siéyes. Together, these men made up part of what came to be known as the patriotic party or national party, which was not, however, a party in any contemporary sense of the term. In fact, these men feared factional political groupings, intending rather to achieve unity in the "nation" of Siéyes, as we shall see.
The social status of the revolutionaries of 1789

The Estates-General opened on 5 May 1789. Tension was created when the clergy and the nobility demanded meeting separately and voting separately, while the commoners demanded meeting in one assembly and voting by head. In the face of resistance on the part of the king who sided with the upper estates, the Third arrogated to itself the title of National Assembly on 17 June. Within the next week a few liberal nobles and large numbers of parish priests within the clergy joined the Third, and by 27 June, the king was more or less forced to require the resisting clerics and nobles to take their places in the National Assembly.

Social analyses of the approximately 1,300 members who sat at one time or another in the National Assembly indicate that it was basically a traditional representation of the middle and upper classes of ancien régime society. There were 261 nobles of the sword, 73 of the robe, 116 lesser nobles, 108 members of the bourgeoisie in the process of being ennobled through venal charges or other means, 214 upper class bourgeoisie, 517 middle class bourgeoisie, 15 lower class or petite bourgeoisie, and 9 rural small landowners (paysannerie).20

The vocational breakdown of the members of the National Assembly presents a picture less traditional in
regard to the political powers of the old regime. Most noteworthy is the fact that among the nobility, only 22 members were elected from the sovereign courts that represented a proud, articulate, self-confident oligarchy of the old regime. Among these few were Duport and Beaumetz, who held more liberal views than most of their magisterial colleagues. For the most part, the nobility consisted of middling and minor aristocrats, who, however, in their cahiers often expressed the same views on reform as did the Third. This helps explain why the liberal nobility, those such as Duport and Lameth, played important roles in the National Assembly, where 33 of the 54 presidents of the Assembly belonged to the nobility.

Elected to the First Estate were a minority of bishops, a few of whom like Talleyrand, could be considered liberal nobles. The majority of the First was composed of parish priests and ecclesiastical functionaries. Sieyès, who was among the latter, was elected by the Third. No doubt his radical views made him unacceptable to most members of the clergy.

The Third was dominated by some well-known, successful lawyers, including Thouret, Target, Tronchet, Barnave, Le Chapelier, Rabaut de Saint-Etienne, and lesser known lawyers, such as Pétion and Buzot. Also elected to the Third were those from the up and coming bourgeoisie,
including wholesalers, shopkeepers, financiers, and industrialists, none of whom however, were chosen to participate on the Committee of the Constitution.

The National Assembly, in general, included more men from the legal profession, 39 percent, than any other group, with commercial professions accounting for 10 percent of the members. Most of these men of law were of the non-noble liberal professional elite. They advocated ideas and policies associated with classical educational liberalism. Educated in the classics, in the church-controlled secondary schools of France, many pursued education with hopes of attaining social mobility. Now, they had finally arrived at the gates of power. And they dominated the activities of the Assembly even out of proportion to their relative high numbers, just like they had succeeded in school, relying on their talents and not their birthrights to carry the day. This is confirmed in an analysis of 648 "active" members of the National Assembly. These members are defined as those who voted at least once or twice in the Assembly and who do not appear on the "obscure" list from the Moniteur.

This list is made up of 648 deputies, among whom 315 or 49 percent were employed in public charges, 58 holding non-venal offices and 257 possessing venal charges, of which 218 were in the various courts of justice. Lawyers
made up 151, or 23 percent of the deputies. All together, 466 deputies, or approximately $2/3$ represented the legal profession. Those engaged in economic activities, including commerce, industry, or shopkeeping account for 14 percent of the active; land-owning farmers, rich and poor, make up 6 percent; doctors, military men and teachers each make up less than half a percent of the total; with only 3 members of the clergy and one pasteur in the group. The lack of active participation by the clergy, the majority of which were parish priests who showed much sympathy for the cause of the Third Estate early in the Revolution, is a significant factor reflective of the secularizing tendencies of the Revolution as it moved toward democracy.

Within the group of 648 "generally active" members of the National Assembly, have been identified 193 deputies who took a more active role by participating on various committees, and within this group can be identified 62 of the most active committee members. This group of 62 deputies includes 18 men possessing venal charges, 9 non-venal officers, 21 lawyers (6 of whom were avocats au parlements), 4 men of commerce and industry, 3 doctors, no farmers and 7 unidentified others. Once again, office holders and lawyers lead the group.
If we narrow down this group of 62 to those 14 members of the Committee of the Constitution, at the heart of the National Assembly, we find the following: 3 lawyers, Target, Tronchet, and Duport (a noble) with high positions in the parlementary courts and Beaumetz, an aristocratic parlementaire without a lawyer’s background; 6 lawyers (avocats), Thouret, Barnave, Le Chapelier, Rabaut de Saint-Etienne, Pétion, and Buzot; 2 members of the clergy, Talleyrand and Sieyès, 1 colonel in the army, Lameth; and one writer with an administrative post, Démeunier.

What is significant about this group is not that men of law make up over 70 percent of its members, which would be in keeping for a group designated to prepare the highest legal document of the realm, but that non-noble lawyers rather than aristocratic magistrates make up the largest proportion of the legal professionals. This is indicative of social changes in the Revolution which, as the Revolution progressed, allowed for previously excluded social groups to acquire power, taking the place of the once often haughty parlementaires and oligarchic aristocratic officials of the crown. The bourgeois push from below, always an important factor in the expansion of schools in the previous two centuries, had led to the emergence of its children in national politics.
It was these new men who were among the deputies elected to the Estates-General with the purpose of proposing to the king some form of democratic representation, including limitations on royal power, and some measure of civil and fiscal equality. At the outset of the Revolution it was not clear, however, that these measures would be effectuated in any truly revolutionary manner. Several things had to happen first: the Estates-General itself had to become more democratic, and once the National Assembly was established its members had to have reasons to subordinate the king and the church to the nation; and finally, events had to lead them to pursue these aims, because the instructions in the cahiers did not go this far.

The revolutionary push toward democracy and secularization

The democratization of the Estates General began when the leaders of the Third, led by Sieyès, demanded that the orders meet as one assembly and vote by head. On 13 June, a large group of parish priests broke rank with the First to join the Third. Among those from the nobility to leave their fellow aristocrats were Lameth and Duport. Talleyrand, whose career would be marked by decisions of cunning that led him to successes within numerous ideologically conflicting governments, joined one day
prior to the king's order for the rumps of the privileged estates to join the new assembly. The king's order on 27 June 1789, made the assembled group, soon to be known as the National Constituent Assembly, more democratic in that voting was in common and by head.

In July, the Assembly began to debate constitutional and fiscal issues and formed the Committee of the Constitution. The Assembly was moved to establish a truly revolutionary government with no little amount of help from the people, when on 14 July, various groups created civil disturbances in Paris. The urban masses, motivated for many different reasons, including high prices for grain, fear of an aristocratic reaction (the king had staged troops outside Paris), economic misfortune, and for many, genuine political consciousness, took to arms. In the process a symbol of ancien régime tyranny, the Bastille, was attacked, the governor of the Bastille hacked to death, and the chief magistrate of Paris murdered.

Paris was not the only location of disturbances. In other municipalities as well there were food riots, many who refused to pay custom dues and municipal taxes, royal intendants who were forced to withdraw from their positions, and members of the king's army who defected to the popular cause. Sometimes disorder was accomplished
against the efforts of the local urban notables, who attempted to maintain order. But other urban leaders turned popular actions to their advantage against the old oligarchies of the towns and cities. The leaders of the patriotic party in the Assembly soon realized they too could benefit from the popular uprisings.

In the wake of the civil disturbances, the king was quick to publicly embrace the Assembly and withdraw his troops from around Paris. Popular violence continued, however. On 22 July, the intendant of Paris and his father-in-law were hanged by angry, hungry crowds. The heads of the victims were paraded through the city on pikes. This was naturally shocking to the legalistic minded Assembly. But some within it, realizing their need to maintain an alliance with the people, or who could view the more heinous crimes as resulting from social despair, probably agreed with Barnave’s regretted remark as he asked: "What is so pure about the blood shed?"

The urban masses were not alone in their attacks upon the old regime; the peasants in the countryside also became contemptuous in what has become known as the "Great Fear." Whether this was fear of an aristocratic plot, or the unleashing of pent up resentments, or a rebellion of slaves against masters, is difficult to gauge. In the process chateaux were looted and burned, abbeys
devastated, and there were some deaths. Peasants refused to pay dues to landowners and to pay the tithe that benefitted the church.

It was in the wake of these civil disturbances of July that the National Assembly met on August 4 and destroyed the privileges of the old regime, and hoped in doing so, to provide leadership for the discontented masses and thus restore order. Le Chapelier, who was chair the night of the 4th, oversaw the renunciation by the Assembly members of many privileges and institutions from which most of them benefitted to some degree or another. Wiped away were the sale of offices, the seigniorial courts, and tax exemptions. The tithe was abolished as were feudal dues, whose owners were nevertheless to be compensated so as to uphold the sanctity of private property.

The destructions of the night of the 4th were revolutionary in part because much of the destruction was not anticipated in the cahiers. Many gave specific instructions not to support the destruction of privilege, and there was support to pay parish priests more, not destroy their income all together.

With the old regime destroyed, the Assembly had to set out the principles upon which the new regime would be established. These were based on what Peter Gay has
called the "science of freedom," developed by the philosophers. In turn the principles of freedom were expressed by the revolutionaries in the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen presented on 26 August 1789. Three aspects of the Declaration were critical for revolutionary education: its secular ideology that included democratic elements which were utilitarian, meritocratic, and libertarian in nature; its emphasis upon the sovereignty of the nation; and the liberty it granted to cults, which included the rejection of the requests of the Catholic clergy of the Assembly to declare Catholicism the state religion.

The democratic and libertarian elements of the Declaration which declare "men are born and remain free and equal in rights" (Art. 1), and which assure "the preservation of the natural and imprescriptible rights of man," including "liberty, property, security, and resistance to oppression," would make any social catechism derived from the Declaration radical compared with the catechisms of the old regime. Equally radical is the claim that "the source of all sovereignty is essentially in the nation," (Art. 3) not with the monarch. Furthermore, the monarch and all citizens are at the mercy of the law as "the expression of the general will." (Art. 6)
Social opportunities that could be derived from an education were enhanced by the Declaration in the claim that, "All citizens . . . are eligible to all public dignities, places, and employments, according to their capacities, and without other distinction than that of their virtues and their talents." (Art. 6) "Social distinctions can be based only upon public utility." (Art. 1) The new inequalities will not be based on social status, nor privilege, but rather upon democratic inequalities of talent and social usefulness. There is naturally no reference to individual salvation in all of this, only individual rights to compete and to serve purposes of national utility.

With the Declaration, salvation becomes a public and civic affair, because democracies demand virtue as the philosophes had proclaimed. The degree to which salvation remains a private affair is up to individual choice, for "No one ought to be disturbed on account of his opinions, even religious, provided their manifestation does not derange the public order established by law." (Art. 10) This article is important because it pertains to the freedom of religious cults. Very little else is mentioned about religion in the Declaration; but, it seems certain the new government will not be one of atheists. Religion, in the form of deism, is acknowledged in a very limited
but obvious manner in a statement introducing the enunciation of rights in the Declaration: "In consequence, the National Assembly recognizes and declares, in the presence and under the auspices of the Supreme Being, the following rights of man and citizen."

It is noteworthy that nowhere in the Declaration is there reference to the ancients. This is a clear indication that the moderns felt they had surpassed the wisdom of the ancients studied in their youth. The wisdom of the pagans is still to be included in the education of citizens, as attested to in *L'Instruction publique*, but new territory will now be charted based on the 18th century concept of a secular science of society, which in its political form is a science of freedom. The National Assembly's debt to the ancients is expressed in several ways in *L'Instruction publique*, but as with the philosophes, ancient wisdom was used as a stepping stone on its journey toward secularization. What Peter Gay said of the philosophes could be said of the revolutionaries: they "pitted classical thought against their Christian heritage that they might discard the burdens of religion, and then escaped their beloved ancients by appealing to the science of nature and of man; this pursuit of modernity was the essential purpose of their education."27
The science of society, the "social art" as referred to in *L'Instruction publique*, goes beyond the science of politics, and for very good reasons. There are conflicting values in the *Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen* which make the science of freedom rather difficult to achieve in practice.

**Limitations and contradictions in the new science of freedom**

The *Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen* expressed in the form of a social catechism would promote the inculcation of high secular ideals indeed! But the new catechism, as we know it today in different forms, has also resulted in the nausea of repetitions of democratic ideals which writers as various as Sartre and B. F. Skinner have explored in our own age. This conflict between the ideals and the "nausea" of the Assembly's catechetical proclamations can be traced to fundamental contradictions in the Declaration, that when worked out in practice, have led to compromises and interpretations of the Declaration serving specific political and social interests. The Declaration, in spite of its worthy ideals, also served the socio-political interests of the liberal professional elite who perceived, or wanted to perceive, that their interests coincided with those of the general will.
At the same time that the Rousseauian concept of general will was made the basis for law and national sovereignty in the Declaration, the leaders of the Revolution knew very well that there were important social distinctions that stood between them and the masses who made up the greater part of this general will. Most important among these distinctions was their education.

For instance, the men of the Committee of the Constitution had all obtained sound educations and showed much talent. Talleyrand and Sieyès received sound secondary educations at the College of Harcourt and obtained university degrees in theology. Target began studies of law prior to the usual entrance age and was a member of the Académie Française. Thouret studied law at the University of Caen, Duport in Paris, Barnave at Grenoble. Rabaut studied humanities at Geneva. It is likely that Pétion attended college in Chartres, and Buzot in Evreux and then went on to obtain training in law. Démeunier acquired a sound education and had translated Cicero and many English works into French. Lameth was made a sous-lieutenant at age 16, and Beaumetz at the same age, was substitute supernumerary to the procureur générale. These men were not only by virtue of their own talents prepared to establish a system of education based on merit, but they assumed that men of their own
educational backgrounds and merits should represent the will of the people.

This was of course the mandate which they had acquired from the philosophes who had put so much stock in education as necessary for political leadership and democratic participation. Rousseau, who spoke to the relationship between education and the general will, had concluded that in order for the masses to acquire the virtues necessary to express their wills directly in a democracy, a totally new form of education was required. According to Rousseau, the only way that direct democracy can work, is if all citizens are Emiles. And he himself acknowledged that this was virtually impossible in his own day. On the other hand, he remained a strong critic of representative democracy, recognizing that it would be susceptible to the influence of special interests in conflict with the general will.

From what Rousseau provides in Emile and the Social Contract in the way of educational methods, his radical vision was not that adopted by the Assembly in L’Instruction publique. They adopted his ends for education but not his methods. The ends of education established by Rousseau are expressed well by Peter Gay: "Emile has no false politeness, no egotism, no guile; he is healthy, clear-thinking, cultivated without regard to
fashion, sturdy, self-reliant, public-spirited, and capable of giving and accepting affection. To achieve this goal, the Talleyrand Report relies heavily upon a science of education that is literate rather than natural in nature. And the hierarchical ordering of subjects in the age-graded curriculum of the Talleyrand Report is closer to that of the ancien régime schools than to Rousseau's ideal of a curriculum based on natural development.

The revolutionaries believed that radical changes in educational methodology were not called for given the new secular ideology they had politicized in the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen. In this regard they put much faith in "national education" to achieve Rousseau's goals. Rabaut de Saint-Etienne, who wrote a plan for education in December 1792, distinguished public instruction which "enlightens and trains the mind" from national education which "must mold the heart." And it was to national education that he put faith in educating the masses through social catechisms, public games, national festivals, and fraternal competitions.

This cultural bombardment based upon the ideals of the Declaration and the Revolution were posited by Rabaut as:

an infallible means to incessantly communicate, immediately, to all the French at the same time,
uniform and common impressions, of which the effect will be to render them, all together, worthy of the Revolution; of liberty, this right of justice which often changes to injustice; of equality, this fraternal bond which changes so easily into tyranny . . . 31

Now the revolutionaries realized the limitations of the Catholic catechism to effectively establish Christian virtues in the hearts of Catholic parishioners. The call in *L'Instruction publique* for moral regeneration implied the failure of socialization processes in Catholic controlled education. The optimism of the revolutionaries in their own catechisms and rituals was founded on the belief that the secular ideals of the Enlightenment were expected to guarantee the spread of virtue and communitarian unity in ways that the Catholic catechism and Catholic rituals did not. This is because the doctrines of the Catholic church were based on superstition, original sin, and otherworldliness. Therefore, in this context, effective revolutionary education was not so much a matter of method as of content. Rousseau's radical methods could thus be denied.

Not only Rousseau's educational methods were denied, but his concept of direct democracy was denied as well. Article 6 of the Declaration states that "all citizens have the right to take part personally or by their representatives" in the formation of the law as an
expression of the general will. The sovereignty of this
general will is expressed in the form of the nation. This
was the nation as Sieyès and the Assembly conceived it,
not the nation of the people. Although "nation" and
"people" coincide in constitutional texts as the
"collective conscience," there exists an important
theoretical and historical distinction between the two.
"Nation" is an abstract entity, that of a spiritual
entity; "people" is more concrete as the object and
support of political power. Therefore, to speak of the
nation as being sovereign and not of the people as being
sovereign, is to leave room for interpreters of a
spiritual unity. And this, according to the constitution
of 1791, is to be done by the peoples' representatives who
must possess a certain amount of wealth, and by
implication education, in order to participate directly in
legislation.

The people themselves, however, demanded to be
listened to, no matter how inarticulately and violently,
and in spite of having elected representatives to the
Estates-General. The events of July 1789 showed this to
be the case. The people clamored to be heard again in
October 1789. By this time, the Assembly and the popular
press had become impatient with the king's general
indifference to the decrees of 11 August (the
renunciations of 4 August codified) and to the *Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen*. Louis XVI said he agreed with only some of the August decrees and began to express reservations about the Declaration. Once again, the combination of higher prices for grain, fear of an aristocratic plot, and political conscience led to another Parisian civil disturbance.

This time the people of Paris carried their anger to Versailles where they directly threatened the king and considerably worried the deputies of the Assembly. The crowd demanded that the king and the Assembly move to Paris and they accompanied them the next day for the move. Once again, the people had forced the king’s hand in their representatives’ interests, as Louis XVI gave his assent to the August decrees following this incident. But the people also appeared uncontrollable and more willing to listen to the radical journalists than to wait for their legislators to make decisions. Many among the nobility began to emigrate and some thoughtful revolutionaries looked to other than political means for controlling the people.

One enlightened response to the civil disorders of July and October took the form of a group known as the Society of '89, which first took shape after the disorders of the October days. Formally, the club which was
really an academy in nature, was opened in May 1790 and by June over 100 deputies of the Assembly were members, including Sièyes and Talleyrand. Among the leading members were Condorcet, Lafayette, and Bailly. Also included were numerous men from the banking and finance community. Their aim was the development of a "social art" and the application of its principles to the constitution. There is thus good reason to believe that the members of the Committee of the Constitution, through Talleyrand and Sièyes particularly, derived the notion of the "social art" in *L'Instruction publique* from this organization.

Similar to its usage in the Talleyrand Report, the social art of the Society of '89 was intended to be a secular science of society. The purpose of the social art was to establish the integrating principles of the economic sciences and especially their common link with the general science of civilization. It was intended to be a blend of social statistics and psychology serving the needs of political-economy. This idea had some practical roots. Social statistics were increasing in importance with the need to tax the nation more completely, and were being applied to humanitarian needs through life assurance enterprises that were based on the calculus of probabilities and mortality rates. It was believed that
these concepts could offer a "general epistemological model for a mathematical science of conduct potentially applicable to all aspects of human existence." Ultimately, the social art was intended to serve the interests of the nation by creating a rational social order and to serve the interests of the financial community by creating a rational pattern of social and economic investment. It was an elitist's and a capitalist's scientific approach to government.

The social art was not very well developed conceptually in the short life of the Society of '89, which lasted only until the spring of '91, and lost many of its members prior to this time. This explains why it is suggested in L'Instruction publique that little is known about the social art, but that it offers potential in the future. The social art was a nebulous hope, but it offered a more scientific means of establishing revolutionary polity and the science of freedom than did the communication skills of enlightened educational methods or the development of a social catechism. It also reflected a desire to control behavior without explicit socialization processes, offering freedom in appearance only, much as the behaviorists desired in this century.

What caused the dissolution of the Society of '89 were political conflicts which divided its members. As
the monarchists within the Assembly began to be associated with the club, the liberals left it because of its being tagged as anti-popular. The symbolism of this rift is significant, in that no matter how much the revolutionaries strove for Rousseau’s concept of a communitarian society, whether based on the general will or upon an elitist conception of human science, politics kept getting in the way. If only men were education as in Plato’s Republic, then unity was possible according to Rousseau. The problem was that the implementation of democracy could not be contained efficiently by the revolutionary guardians of Plato’s republic. Democracy was too contagious.

The processes of democratization and secularization proceeded to unfold within the Assembly even before the king consented to the Declaration. Two measures passed in September of ‘89 were particularly devastating to royal authority. The first was the rejection of a two chamber system of government which would have allowed for a sort of aristocratic chamber of peers on the British model. Target and Rabaut led the movement challenging this proposal. The single house legislature that was then adopted assured that the king would be confronted with legislators dominated by the liberals and commoners.
Next, the king was limited to only a suspensive veto over legislation, instead of an absolute veto. The suspensive veto meant that his veto could not become effective for the period of two legislatures. The triumvirate of Lameth, Barnave, and Duport led this attempt to restrict the king’s power, while Pétion and Sieyès argued that any type of veto was absurd. The suspensive veto irritated the monarchists of the Assembly who felt a strong monarchy offered the assurance of freedom. By the time the scheme for the separation of powers was completed, the Assembly had created a government with a very weak executive.

The members of the Committee of the Constitution, once the monarchists had been purged from it, continued to support constitutional measures and maintain views insuring a monarchy where kingship was conserved only in name, not in fact. Thouret called for the king not to be regarded as a hereditary monarch, but as the premier public functionary, and he set out the circumstances by which he could be deposed. Barnave demanded the decrees of 11 August be made into law without necessitating the king’s endorsement. Rabaut argued for the motion inhibiting the king from dissolving the legislature.

Sentiment was clearly in the direction of giving the legislative branch greater powers over that of the
executive in the constitutional separation of powers, a separation which, in reality, can never be completely established. Sentiment for a strong legislature was based on the notion of the legislature as the true representative of the general will. Also important was the obvious fact that the king had displayed reluctance to join the Revolution all along.

It was during this time of democratic constitutional formation that the Committee of the Constitution received numerous educational proposals from the public that included 60 published plans and numerous handwritten contributions. It was in the recommendations from some of these, particularly those from enlightened-minded professors, that the concept of an apprenticeship in democracy was formulated. Palmer describes these proposals as recommending that "Schools should be small models of free and democratic government; students should live under rules that they have themselves made or consented to and serve on committees for the maintenance of discipline."36

This idea, which was adopted in L'Instruction publique, allowed for the democratic government of the National Assembly to be reflected in the schools, much like authoritarian disciplinary practices in ancien régime schools reflected old regime political organization. Now,
true to its base, the model government for schools in the Talleyrand Report was to be one that replicated a representative democracy, not direct democracy. The issue of representative government, however, contained contradictions in practice, that are not discussed in *L’Instruction publique.*

The issue of just how representative, representative democracy should be is one that plagued the revolutionaries. This is because the concepts of direct democracy and the general will are what motivated the politically conscious sans-culottes and their allies who took part in the popular uprisings. The issue of shared power in a representative democracy is put in perspective by considering the Paris municipal revolution that paralleled the national revolution.

The attempt to create a revolutionary government for Paris was initially concentrated in the electoral assembly that had elected representatives to the Estates-General. Among the democratic leaders of the Paris electoral assembly was Nicolas Bonneville, who in his youth "had been expelled from a local college for reading portions of Rousseau’s *Emile* aloud to other students."\(^{37}\) When Sieyès asserted on 17 June, in the declaration constituting the National Assembly, that it alone had the right to interpret the general will of the nation, Bonneville
responded by asserting that the Assembly, although having a certain amount of freedom to create laws, had a responsibility to carry out the wishes of their constituents.\textsuperscript{38} In the \textit{Tribun du peuple} he wrote that real political power should be with the ordinary citizens, "otherwise you will have substituted a despotism of the many in place of a despotism of one minister."\textsuperscript{39} This was classic Rousseauian mistrust of representative democracy and a sentiment that few of Bonneville's fellow electors shared. Nevertheless, Bonneville along with others, such as the priest Claude Fauchet and Condorcet, came to dominate Paris municipal politics after the fall of the Bastille.

A constitution for the Parisian Communal Assembly was written up by Bonneville and Fauchet such that the rights of the 60 district assemblies in Paris were preserved. However, direct democracy was abandoned, particularly in the feature that no district could recall their representatives if they disapproved of their representative's activities. On the other hand the powers of the mayor were severely restricted. In this manner the Paris Communal Assembly became a small model of the National Assembly, which had excluded the Paris electors from having direct participation in its affairs.
After a struggle with Bailly, the mayor, the Communal Assembly regained its authority and Condorcet became its first president. The leaders of the Paris Assembly became known as Fauchetins, because Claude Fauchet was elected president four times. The greatest challenge to the Communal Assembly came from the districts in Paris, who felt the Fauchetins had taken control of the city without their approval. The Cordelier district, which included members such as Danton and the journalist Prudhomme, challenged the Communal Assembly's authority in the name of direct democracy. Prudhomme, who felt direct democracy was logistically impossible at the national level, viewed it as practical and necessary at the municipal level. He suggested that the Communal Assembly existed only to carry out the wishes of their constituents and hence representatives should be liable to recall by their electors.  

This problem reflected that at the national level as to who should speak for the "nation." In what manner should democracy devolve in allowing each individual's voice to be represented in the general will? It was obvious that there were definite practical limitations to direct democracy based on numbers of voices that could potentially be heard.
Bonneville's solution to this problem at the municipal level was to elicit anonymous views from the people that could be written down and placed in a box. Then a select group, forming a cercle social, was to edit and publish these writings. In actually establishing this procedure, each suggestion or complaint was edited and deciphered by those who published the journal Cercle Social. In this manner a small elite group articulated the people's views in accordance with the standards of the Enlightenment.\footnote{\textsuperscript{41}} In using this practice, it is really education that intervenes in the process of direct democracy, the logic being that "enlightenment" is the general qualifier of public representation.

However, the general optimism with which the revolutionaries discussed "enlightenment" and education indicates that at some future point in time general mass enlightenment may be achieved, such that interpreters like those of the Social Cercle may not be needed. This is implied in the assertion by Rabaut de Saint-Etienne that a well founded theory of education is based on the following truths:

- that it is enlightened thought that has created the revolution and broken the chains of slaves;
- that man is capable of an indefinite perfection;
- that his perfection depends upon the knowledge he acquires; that the more men are enlightened, especially generally enlightened, the more governments will be improved; that the more men are enlightened, the more they will understand
the value of liberty and know how to conserve it; that, the more enlightenment will be at the
door of everyone, the more equality will be
maintained among men. Therefore, you must
spread enlightenment to the people, true
enlightenment and the most appropriate
educational methods to extend it to them for all
time.42

This same view can be found in *L'Instruction publique*, but
the constitution of which *L'Instruction publique* is a part
limited suffrage, not based upon "enlightenment", but upon
property qualifications that consisted of the payment of a
certain amount of taxes.

The *Social Cercle* went on record as opposing these
property limitations to suffrage, but continued to filter
the voice of the people according to their own enlightened
opinion.

While the Cercle Social was supposed to reflect
the thoughts of all the people, it actually
became the principal organ of the Fauchetins.
They used the organization to spread their
democratic ideas, to praise the work of the
Communal Assembly, and to attack conservative
policies in the municipal government and even in
the National Assembly.43

The members of the Social Cercle justified their own
political regime in practical terms claiming that without
their representative democracy, the mayor (Bailly) would
easily thwart any semblance of direct democracy. The
contradictions in the views of the Social Cercle directly
resulted from the concept of enlightened democracy.
Enlightenment meant unity of thought through the
application of reason and the creation of national education. Democracy produced disagreement that turned even the enlightened into political factions.

The concept of enlightened democracy was not the only feature of revolutionary ideology to contain fundamental contradictions that applied to the issue of democracy and education. A government based on constitutionalism and monarchy produced equally important contradictions, but with relevance to the secularization of education.

The principles of secular morality and the contradictions of constitutional monarchy

The secularization of formal education followed on the heels of democratization and nationalism in politics. It was the nationalization process that established the principle of secular authority over the schools. Palmer states that the nationalization of education in France can be traced to three events: "the sequestration of college endowments, the disruption of the teaching clergy, and the presentation of the Talleyrand plan to the National Constituent Assembly . . ."44 Let us now consider the sequestration of college endowments and the sources of disruption of the teaching clergy.

In November 1789, Thouret presented the motion to sell ecclesiastical property based on the earlier suggestion by Talleyrand. The nationalization of church
property involved the sale of church lands as a way to bring in revenue to the financially strapped state; it also indicated the state was to make provisions for the upkeep of the clergy. "That it was to be the first step in the secularization of the state and the commencement of a still unfinished war between Church and the Revolution hardly anyone guessed."45 Parish priests as well as the revolutionary laity viewed the nationalization of church property as a way to reform the church and provide necessary assets for the state to direct this reform, as well as to ease the debt.

The Assembly continually exhorted the teaching clergy to continue their efforts. In February 1790, when monastic vows were suppressed at the urging of Target, monasteries and convents were dissolved on the basis of utilitarian principles. These principles exempted those dedicated to education and charitable work. The real blow to the teaching clergy took place with the abolition of privilege, although the effects of this were not immediately felt. With the abolition of privilege having been declared on 4 August and then codified, teaching was, in principle, no longer to be monopolized by the church and its teaching clergy. This is explicitly declared in L’Instruction publique.
Problems began to develop for all educators, when with the nationalization of church property, land and buildings constituting college endowments were eventually sold.\textsuperscript{46} This had the effect of making the schools become more dependent upon national and local sources of funding, neither of which was satisfactorily provided during the Revolution.

The most disturbing problems, however, were created among educators, with the establishment of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy on 12 July 1790. This measure had a disrupting affect upon teaching orders as well as the entire Catholic clergy.

The Civil Constitution of the Clergy was intended as a comprehensive reform of the church, a way to return it to "the discipline of the early church" and "bring it into harmony with the principles of the Revolution."\textsuperscript{47} And this was acceptable to most priests. But it was also a clear policy of fusing church and state in spite of the freedom of religion which had been acknowledged in principle. Ironically, part of the reason the Assembly took this step was to reduce sectarian conflicts that were arising around the country resulting from Catholic fears that the Revolution was becoming something of a Protestant plot.
Although there were only fifteen known Protestants in the entire Assembly, radicals such as Rabaut and Barnave were Protestants who had acquired much influence, and Rabaut, in particular, had led the movement to declare the liberty of cults which was included in the Declaration. Furthermore, Rabaut led the fight against Dom Gerle’s motion, on 12 April, to declare Catholicism the established religion of the country. In this light, the Civil Constitution could be viewed as placating a still powerful institution in France.

Provisions under the Civil Constitution of the Clergy included the arrangement of salary scales generous to the priests but less so to the bishops when compared with old regime remunerations. Residency requirements were established, and as planned for in L’Instruction publique, the state would also provide religious training for Catholic priests and maintain a reformed Catholic religion in the schools. The problem was that in extending the principles of democracy to all spheres of life, all clerics were to be elected by citizens, which would also mean by atheists and Protestants.

When the Assembly decided to push through this legislation without consulting either the bishops or the Pope, discord erupted. In October and November as departmental bishops were elected some communities
rejected them while others rejected clerics who denounced the Civil Constitution. To ensure compliance with the Civil Constitution, the Assembly, on 27 November 1790, imposed an oath to the Civil Constitution, dismissing at once those clerics, including teachers, who did not take it. This measure, resulted in turmoil throughout the country between juring and nonjuring priests and their sympathizers. It disrupted education as:

Local governments and Jacobin clubs conducted purges of their colleges as of other bodies. Under such pressures some teachers took the oath, some refused it, some took it with reservations, some took it and recanted, and some abandoned their clerical orders, proclaimed themselves good patriots, became laymen, and in some cases married.48

The Civil Constitution, aside from causing disruptions in teaching and conflicts among the clergymen, also fanned the flames of counter-revolutionary efforts. As such it is considered a major blunder of the National Assembly. In the oath itself, the Assembly attempted to synthesize religion and state in a manner that hid fundamental conflicts of principle between secularization and Catholicism.

Now Rousseau had given the Assembly a model from which to synthesize religion and state. What after all was the idea of a social religion but a combination of secular wisdom and a certain amount of religiosity? This
is partially what Rousseau proposed when he evaluated the potential of Christianity to be a social religion:

There remains, then, the religion of man or Christianity, not that of today, but that of the Gospel, which is quite different. By this holy, sublime, and pure religion, men, children of the same God, all recognize one another as brethren, and the social bond which unites them is not dissolved even at death.

But this religion, having no particular relation with the body politic, leaves to the laws only the force that they derive from themselves, without adding to them any other; and thereby one of the great bonds of the particular society remains ineffective. What is more, far from attaching the hearts of citizens to the State, it detaches them from it and from all earthly things. I know of nothing more contrary to the social spirit.49

The value of Christianity in this view is the same as that expressed in L'Instruction publique where the term Roman Catholic faith seldom makes an appearance, but where the term "elements of religion" is emphasized. Frequent mention is made of purifying these elements, ridding them of their superstitious content and relying closely upon the essential truths of the Gospels, particularly when theological schools are discussed in L'Instruction publique.

Like Rousseau, the Committee of the Constitution realized the weaknesses of the Christian religion to guarantee fidelity to the state. They believed as Rousseau when the latter said:

There is, however, a purely civil profession of faith, the articles of which it is
the duty of the sovereign to determine, not exactly as dogmas of religion, but as sentiments of sociability, without which it is impossible to be a good citizen or a faithful subject.50

This is the philosophical basis for the secular science of society (the social art) in L'Instruction publique. The essence of it is to become the basis for a secular catechism. Once again, Rousseau’s influence can be noted in L'Instruction publique when we consider his words in the Social Contract:

The dogmas of civil religion, ought to be simple, few in number, stated with precision, and without explanations or commentaries. The existence of the Deity, powerful, wise, beneficent, prescient, and bountiful, the life to come, the happiness of the just, the punishment of the wicked, the sanctity of the social contract and of the laws; these are the positive dogmas. As for the negative dogmas, I limit them to one only, that is, intolerance; it belongs to the creeds which we have excluded.51

Given the emphasis of the Assembly on reforming the church along this line of reasoning, it was generally expected that the priests who had supported them would not reject such a view. In fact, there were many who could make the bridge from civil professions of faith to Christian professions of faith. The priest Claude Fauchet spoke for these by continually repeating the message that "the French Revolution is based on principles derived from the gospels; anyone calling himself a good Christian ought to become a patriot."52
The patriotic unity espoused by Fauchet was expressed in high symbolic fashion at an event which took place prior to the discord generated by the requirement of the constitutional oath. This was the occasion of the first anniversary of the Revolution which the patriots chose to celebrate on 14 July 1790, one year after the fall of the Bastille. It was an event celebrated in areas all over France, in which the focus was on Paris. In Paris, at the Champ de Mars, Parisian and provincial members of the revolutionary National Guard were called together to reconfirm their oath to the constitution.

Students and teachers abandoned their studies for a day to attend this celebration along with 350 to 400 thousand others. Organized by Target, it was declared the Festival of the Federation and it embraced the ritual elements of "national education" which we have seen in Rabaut's definition of the concept (not to mention provisions in *L'Instruction publique* for such festivals). At the Champ de Mars, as in other municipalities throughout the country, an altar was erected to the fatherland. In Paris, the king and the president of the National Assembly sat side by side on the same level: kingship and democracy united. Two services were performed: a religious mass by Talleyrand at the altar of Christ, a civic service at the altar of the patrie. There
were many from the lower clergy who attended, although the upper clergy were conspicuous by their absence.

It is significant that the altar, replete with neoclassical motifs and inscriptions to equality, virtue, law, and the patrie, was set up in the open air and not within the confines of a church or official building. This was an open celebration of national unity. Rousseau's God was that of everyone and it was incarnated in no single person but rather in the people of the fatherland itself. Aulard, in reference to the event stated: "The Catholic church was no longer the sole occupant of the realm of faith in the soul of the French people and, though perhaps it escaped their notice, its position of privilege and prestige was henceforth diminished."

The essential problem, however, that followed in the days after this halcyon event, was not just one of the loss to the Catholic church of its previous status in France. The real problem of the Constitutional Oath for many clerics was one of principle and faith, of the inability to unite in their hearts two opposing principles: innocence and original sin. The concept of original innocence created the most fundamental difference in the civil faith as compared with the Christian faith. It also gave new hopes to the powers of education.
The myth of original sin, which the philosophes thought they had exploded, made much of man’s incapacity to change fundamentally through his own efforts: education could not do the work of grace. Conversely, the philosophes’ doctrine of man’s original innocence, though it did not necessarily imply, persuasively testified to the efficacy of education in man’s renewal.54

This difference of principles within the field of philosophy and religion was mirrored by a parallel conflict on the plain of politics and social justice.

Another essential conflict between Christian education and democratic education is to be found in the struggle between divine grace and secular justice. This struggle, which was highlighted in Michelet’s history of the Revolution, was admirably recaptured by Albert Camus who explained the essential contradiction of the constitutional monarchy as follows:

The king, in one of his aspects, is the divine emissary in charge of human affairs and therefore of the administration of justice. Like God Himself, he is the last recourse of the victims of misery and injustice. In principle, the people can appeal to the king for help against their oppressors . . . It is true in France, at least, that, when the monarchy did know, it often tried to defend the lower classes against the oppressions of the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie. But was this, essentially, justice? From the absolute point of view, which was the point of view of the writers of the period, it was not. Even though it is possible to appeal to the king, it is impossible to appeal against him in so far as he is the embodiment of a principle. He dispenses his protection and his assistance if and when he wants to. One of the attributes of grace is that it is discretionary. Monarchy in its theocratic form is a type of government which
wants to put grace before justice by always letting it have the last word. Rousseau in his Savoyard curate's declaration, on the other hand, is only original insofar as he submits God to justice and in this way inaugurates, with the rather naive solemnity of the period, contemporary history.  

The principles and the spiritual basis of Rousseau's concept of justice are to be found in *The Social Contract*, which Camus recognizes is also a catechism, "of which it has the tone and the dogmatic language." But the new catechism is in direct conflict with both monarchy and Christianity:

Until Rousseau’s time, God created kings, who, in turn, created peoples. After *The Social Contract*, peoples create themselves before creating kings. As for God, there is nothing more to be said, for the time being. Here we have, in the political field, the equivalent of Newton's revolution. Power, therefore, is no longer arbitrary, but derives its existence from general consent. . . . with *The Social Contract*, we are assisting at the birth of a new mystique—the will of the people being substituted for God Himself.

The problem posed for the Assembly members in making the transition to justice from grace was their inability, either intellectually or politically, to fully confront the once most powerful ideas of the realm: Christianity and kingship. The educational reform writers had indicated, as had Rousseau, that a conflict of interest existed between true nationalism and Christianity and national education as controlled by the clergy. But the majority of the cahiers had given no indication of a
desire to replace the teaching clergy nor the monarchy. What they expressed seemed to be the centuries old bourgeois desire to civilize the teachings and practices of church dominated education alone.

The Feast of the Federation, with its calm neoclassical motifs, military regimentation amid pleasant spontaneous expressions of national sentiment, was the ideal enlightened bourgeois ceremony. Its origins can be traced to an enlightened group of Christian men who had progressively withdrawn from the communal carnivals of Medieval Christian origin, who had prompted the civilizing of youth in regimented Christian colleges, who withdrew from the confraternities of late Medieval origin to join secular enlightened academies, all which ended with their separation from the larger social fraternity of the church. This group now had established a Christian democracy that could mediate between themselves, the elite, and the people, in a manner most acceptable to their bourgeois instincts. For them the intellectual and heartfelt disputes between innocence and grace were perhaps irrelevant. Besides, there were even clerics, such as abbé Gregoire and father Fauchet, who had worked out these inconveniences of revolutionary faith. Both could be Christians and constitutionalists; both were independent of the philosophes and the Catholic fold.
They saw a unity in Christian democratic monarchy which Rousseau did not see. For Rousseau, Jesus created two different allegiances for men. For the constitutional priests, Jesus, and his representative on earth, the king, provided the symbolism of the unity between heaven and earth. This was a unity that would eventually be shattered by regicide, however, in 1793.

In 1790, the members of the Assembly could not even imagine such thoughts. Pétion and Buzot might be republicans at heart and the entire Committee of the Constitution may have participated in substantially reducing the powers of the king to that of first citizen, but their was no impetus yet to act on the conflicting values of the constitutional monarchy. Part of this was because kingship offered an irreplaceable charisma as the traditional sacred center of society, as a fixed reference point for the nation. On the practical political side, there were those such as Barnave and Duport, who viewed the king as also representing the guarantee of property and the security of persons.58

On the other hand, with their classical educational backgrounds the revolutionaries wanted to believe that fluency in communication was everything, that reference to the "general will" and to "virtue" in their speeches could create an alternative sacred center. For the Assembly
"charisma became most concretely located in words, in the ability to "speak for the nation." But could oaths really compete with kingship?

In the end, it was the king himself who perpetuated the schism within the Christian democratic monarchy, doing just as much damage to national unity as did the constitutional oath. This happened when on 10-11 June 1791 he attempted to flee the country, leaving behind a proclamation renouncing the Revolution. When he was captured along the escape route and brought back to Paris, republicans came out into the open; they now had reason to depose the king who had been reluctant all along.

Pétion, Buzot, and Robespierre were among only seven deputies in the Assembly, however, to call for a trial of the king. They supported his deposition and an election of a regent by the people. Most deputies feared such drastic measures. Regencies were notorious in French history for their perils and if the Assembly began to move in the direction of republican sentiment, it could mean redrafting the constitution which was nearly complete.

The Assembly's way out of the dilemma was to:

pretend, against all evidence, that the king had been kidnapped . . . Those who objected to such patent fictions were heavily voted down. The king was suspended from his functions: for the rest of its life the Constituent Assembly controlled the executive as well as made laws. But there was never any doubt that the vast majority of deputies were determined to retain
the monarchy at the cost of however many fudges and fictions were required.\textsuperscript{60}

Public sentiment, however, was strongly in favor of a trial and some even called for a republic.

A crowd of 4,000, organized by the Social Cercle attended the Assembly meeting on 15 July to protest the absolution of the king's guilt. On 17 July, a petition calling for the king to be reinstated only if confirmed by popular election, was taken to the altar at the Champ de Mars. Here, three days earlier festivities had been held for the second anniversary of the Revolution. But now a menacing proposition confronted the National Assembly from this symbolic quarter of liberty. The people were calling again for direct representation.

By late afternoon, the petition contained 6,000 signatures. However, the lynching of two men found under the altar and whose motives are unclear to historians (Vovelle has called them provo\textsuperscript{c}ateurs; Doyle, "unfortunates;" Cobban, merely "two men"), gave cause for Bailly (an old political rival of the leading members of the Social Cercle) to declare martial law and call on Lafayette and the National Guard to intervene. In the midst of a mostly unarmed crowd the guards fired on it, this after some shots were heard among the crowd and after the guards had been pelted by stones. Fifty people were killed in what was considered a massacre, and the clubs
and journals associated with the petition were closed by the government.

Albert Camus notes that murder is one of the defining points of Revolution, that amid the striving for unity, not just principles are destroyed, but men as well. Therefore, perhaps the most sublime ethical question to ask of civic education is to request that it consider whether "innocence, once it becomes involved in action, can keep from committing murder." Can the revolution of principles of our age, "without laying claim to an innocence that is impossible . . . discover the principle of reasonable culpability?" On what basis do we justify the death penalty in a civil society? Rousseau drew the line at intolerance for which he was willing to summon the executioner. He maintained an intolerance of intolerance. But he does not seem to have addressed the hypothetical situation of a democracy where the general will of the people has indicated an acceptance of intolerance.

This is of course what happened to some degree, though it can be argued not as a result of direct democracy and the true accounting of the general will, during the terror of the Revolution. It was not only the constitutional monarchy that tried to stifle dissidence with brute force, but the democratic republic as well.
Among the victims of the revolutionary striving for unity and finality following the reign of the Constituent Assembly were some of its most noteworthy members, including Thouret, Barnave, Le Chapelier, Rabaut de Saint-Etienne, Buzot, and Pétion. Target, Démeunier, and Tronchet remained quiet and so escaped the tragic fate of the others. Sometimes, as in the case of Target, who was involved in the administration of a revolutionary commune during the Terror, assistance was given to enable the accused to escape the executioner. Perhaps Target had discovered some sense of reasonable culpability in the science of freedom.

Virtue and national education in 1791

Virtue came to be defined by the state for formal educational institutions in 1791 as a result of the politicization of social, cultural, and intellectual challenges to traditional education of the old regime. These challenges developed during the course of the early modern era of French history and gained momentum in the latter half of the 18th century. The revolutionaries, in the midst of unexpected revolutionary events, then gave their own specific form to the values associated with the previous challenges to old regime education.
During most of the early modern era of French history the state intervened infrequently in educational affairs and never to exert its influence upon moral education in the schools. This is because church dominated education provided moral lessons in the curriculum that transmitted both Christian and monarchical values supportive of the royal state government. These values also rationalized the social structure of society which at the top echelons of both church and state offices were monopolized by the nobility. The state, therefore, had no reason to want to change or control moral education conducted by the church.

The church also monopolized the resources of education, particularly the teaching corps, and there was no other group capable of offering resources to compete with the educational resources offered by the church. Municipal officials just prior to the Reformation era attempted to force the church to offer its resources to fund their own schools, but the tide of religious fervor backed by the king dashed such hopes.

The state eventually acquired an interest in moral education, in 1789, but only after several changes took place that led to the challenge of church control over moral education. First there was the cultural challenge of the burgeoning urban bourgeois mentalité. It helped civilize the church by moving to rid it of superstitions
in education. However, this effort eventually presented a challenge to the popular rituals and doctrines of salvation that appealed to the masses of the church and which the church could thus never abandon completely. This resulted in the continuing efforts by the revolutionary bourgeoisie, once it acquired the powers of state, to reform the church further. Also of cultural importance is the fact that the urban bourgeoisie supported civic, secular humanism, as it appeared in the classical curriculum. Ancient republican ideas of virtue would eventually reappear during the Revolution as part of the new assertive ideology of the revolutionaries.

The intellectual challenges to the old regime took the form of a new ideology that not only borrowed from the secular humanism of the ancients but included the modern ideas of the philosophes. The provincial aristocracy, particularly the nobles of the robe in the parlements, showed interest in the new enlightened doctrines. Of particular importance were the political views of Montesquieu which gave them a means of defending their own privileges in the guise of challenging royal despotism.

In the second half of the 18th century, these enlightened provincial nobles, along with an even larger group among the liberal professionals of the bourgeoisie, challenged church authority in moral education with the
doctrine of national utility, and they challenged the doctrines of absolutism with the constitutional theories of Montesquieu and Locke.

The state government responded to the reform movement in education by cooperating with the parlements to maintain the schools evacuated by the Jesuits. It also initiated reforms in education that included setting uniform, meritocratic standards and providing opportunities in fields of study not previously established in the colleges, but the government took no action in regard to moral education. Therefore, it was not until the new social group of liberal aristocrats and the professional bourgeoisie took over the political institutions of state government that any change in moral education took place. This means that ultimately, the state acquired an active involvement in moral education only after socio-political changes took place in state government.

With the rise of the new political class during the elections to the Estates-General, the issue of national education, based on national utility, dominated discussions about education but did not imply a direct challenge to church control over education. This was in keeping with the views of many of the educational reform writers. But the events which brought about the
transformation of the Estates-General into the National Assembly had a radicalizing effect upon the new political group.

First came the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen which added a whole new dimension to the old assertive ideology that was based on national utility. Then the power and status of kingship was considerably reduced. Together, nationalism, utilitarianism, and democracy were conceived as part of a new secular morality as derived from a secular science of society, or the science of freedom. This revolutionary assertive ideology presented a challenge to both Christianity and the monarchy in ways that were far more radical than the reform movement writers anticipated. This is what L'Instruction publique tells us. It indicates that the state came to define virtue because its very essence as a revolutionary state was now invested in a new political group with an ideology that culturally, socially, and intellectually contradicted the moral lessons of the old regime.

With the Talleyrand Report, the Committee of the Constitution, had finally vindicated the bourgeoisie of the Renaissance who had struggled to enlist the church to their cause. They did this by achieving political power in a time when skepticism was throwing doubt on the role
of the church in national education. But they could not rid themselves of the church for various reasons, and so they made it subordinate to the state, including the subordination of the teaching clergy to the new values of the revolutionary state.

The specific values behind the socialization processes of revolutionary education were based on limited conceptions of representative democracy and on the new secular morality, which also reflected the social and economic class interests of the liberal professional elite. The educational ideology of this new political class of men may be described as classical educational liberalism. Although it consisted of acting according to human made law which could be changed on behalf of the public interest, the public interest itself was to be defined through democratic institutions intended implicitly for the professional liberal elite.

This new elite deserved this status for three basic reasons. First, for 250 years they had been disciplining themselves in a rigorous hierarchical and meritocratic school system. Second, their status as a ruling class was merited by an economic situation which required that only a few children possessed of talent should rise above the vocation of their birth. Third, the secular morality they
espoused and believed in gave new hope to conquering the sins of mankind.

The truly revolutionary democratic notions in the socialization processes of the school culture of the professional liberal elite are basically two: a constitutional secular catechism to include the Declaration, and the application of democratic practices to the establishment of disciplinary policies in schools. The former the revolutionaries derived from the need to conserve the revolutionary measures they had instituted. The latter they derived from an application of the basic principles of democracy to which they were not inclined to make an exception, as we have been.

The problem was that in defining democracy according to the Declaration, the revolutionary elite was not able to contain it, not with conceptions of a new secular science of society, nor with ritual catechisms invested with the power of the new revolutionary words. In keeping both Christianity and monarchy as part of the new constitutional order of the country, the revolutionaries attempted to achieve an impossible unity of principles, the consequences of which their bourgeois sensibilities for rational order caused them to overlook.
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