

WHY FRANCE DID NOT HAVE AN AMERICAN REVOLUTION

by Pierre Beaudry

In January 2001, *EIR* published the author's report of the life of "the Benjamin Franklin of the French Revolution."¹ This was the extraordinary French patriot and scientist, Jean Sylvain Bailly (1736-1791), first president of the First National Assembly of France, and organizer of the Marquis de Lafayette's National Guard. During 1789, Bailly and Lafayette attempted to carry out a peaceful "American Revolution" in France, and establish an "American" representative and constitutional republic (though retaining a constitutional monarchy), in collaboration with Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, and then-Ambassador to France Thomas Jefferson.

Bailly, in 1789 both France's leading astronomer and her leading patriot, was a follower and historian of Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, from whose works the very idea of "the pursuit of happiness" in the American Declaration of Independence was traced (see Robert Trout, "Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness," *Fidelio*, Spring 1997). Bailly and Lafayette's revolutionary "Society of 1789" was consciously based on that Leibnizian principle.

Our previous article made public, for the first time to English-speaking readers, the crucial moments that went into establishing the sovereign authority of the National Assembly of France. The true French Revolution accomplished by Bailly and Lafayette in the crucial actions around the Tennis Court Oath of June 20, 1789—which demonstrated the sovereignty of the National Assembly—specifically imitated the American Framers of the U.S. Constitution at their convention in Philadelphia two years earlier, in 1787. The sovereign act of constitution of the nation of France was marked on that day, by the fact that the majority of the deputies present solemnly swore "not to separate, and to meet anywhere that circumstances will permit, until the constitution of the kingdom is established." It was from the sovereign decisions of the National Assembly, voted on June 17 to June 20, 1789, that a peaceful and republican French revolution was possible.

In the present historical study, the author will reveal, in light of crucial historical documents of the period, that the storming of the Bastille was a coup d'état whose date of occurrence had been chosen to coincide with the mass starvation, prepared by British policy, of the city of Paris. The storming of the Bastille of July 14 was act of an anti-"American," counter-revolutionary coup, carried out by Finance Minister Jacques Necker, Louis "Philippe Egalité" Duke of Orléans, and the British controllers of Marat, Danton, and Robespierre—Lord Shelburne and British intelligence chief Jeremy Bentham.

The purpose of a starvation-driven insurrection was to bring down the King, the government, the National Assembly, and put in power a new Jacobin King, "Philippe Egalité," with Jacques Necker as Prime Minister of a French version of a British parliamentary monarchy. The following evidence provided by the French writer and witness to the Revolution Felix Louis Montjoie,² as well as the secret dispatches written by Antonio Capello, the Ambassador to Paris of the Doge of Venice, demonstrate that the British-dominated historical accounts about the French revolution have lied systematically about the true nature of the circumstances surrounding the coup d'état of the Bastille. They reveal the most despicable

nature and the conspiratorial role of the Duke of Orléans, with his British partners, against the "American" principle of the Revolution.

A Secret In Plain Sight

Montjoie's work is the *Histoire de la Conjuration de Louis-Philippe d'Orléans, surnommé Egalité*, published in 1796. In its introduction, Montjoie states, "No conspiracy has ever been more extraordinary, or given birth to more errors, more disorders, more depredations, more assassinations, and more calamities of all sorts, than the one that I am about to write the history of. From this terrible pile of follies, of heinous crimes, of misfortunes, must emerge a great lesson which, if it is understood properly, should make the future of nations wiser and happier. No other work, therefore, from this single vantage point, merits to be read with more interest, by all sorts of readers; no other work deserves more being meditated on by whoever is called upon to institute or to govern a people.... [T]here has to be someone with enough courage to describe to the future generations, the follies, and the crimes of our current generation. Woe betide whoever was an accomplice to those follies and to those crimes; but, if the revelation of this complicity is a fault, it is the fault of history, and not of the historian, because what I might have omitted to say, someone else might have the opportunity to reveal."

Historical truths are the most difficult to accept, because they come into conflict with social beliefs that are axiomatically based on the false assumptions of public opinion controlling a population. The case of the French Revolution is a powerful example of such an historical event that has been entirely fabricated and manipulated for public opinion's consumption. The Jacobin French Revolution which was ultimately triggered by the Bastille Day coup, was not only unnecessary, but contained the seeds of Napoleonic fascism detrimental to the nation of France and the rest of the world, and should have been stopped by all means available at the time.

The error was never remedied, because the conspiracy to create a national famine that led to Bastille Day, was never permitted to be revealed, even though it was widely known to the key players involved in the events of the time. Montjoie's devastating exposé has been buried in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, and ignored by the French intelligentsia, ever since its 1796 publication.

The following will show that the storming of the Bastille was an irregular-warfare coup similar to that of the burning of the German Reichstag of February 1933, and similar to the American day of infamy of Sept. 11, 2001. The poisonous effect of those three different events, although occurring in three different places, and at three different times, is essentially the same. Their aim was to force populations to accept emergency measures under conditions of irregular warfare. In a broader strategic perspective, the Bastille coup was aimed at undoing the achievement of bringing the American Revolution to France, already accomplished by Bailly and Lafayette; and instead, at imposing on France a British-style parliamentary system, at the precise moment that the United States was celebrating the adoption of its Constitution.

The Bailly-led actions of the National Assembly, had rendered the Jacobin Terror obsolete before it occurred, just as Lyndon LaRouche's New Bretton Woods policy renders obsolete today's Jacobin terrorist operations, sponsored by modern-day "Philippe Egalités" such as British financier Teddy Goldsmith, targeting International Monetary Fund and World Bank policies of the current period.³

1. The French Paradox: Why In 1789, France Should Have Become A Republican Monarchy

During a dinner held at the home of Marshal de Beauvais, on Dec. 29, 1786, three years before the Estates General were established, Jean Sylvain Bailly forecast the coming into being of the National Assembly, and began to envisage the role that he might be called to play, in order to save the nation from being ruined.⁴ Upon hearing of the creation of an Assembly of the notables, he recalled how he was stunned by the news, and recorded this astonishing forethought:

I had forecast a great event, a change in the affairs of state, and even in the form of government. I did not forecast the revolution as it happened, and I don't believe that any man was able to forecast it; however, the deplorable state of the finances was sufficient to support my hypothesis. The need for money caused the government to be weak and dependent. The governed then had an immense advantage, such that I presumed we would be wise enough to take advantage of. This Assembly of a hundred and fifty citizens of all classes, including the most distinguished, who had become responsible for the most important affairs of the State, could not miss the opportunity of creating a great reform. That Assembly, that gathering was in the image of the nation; it was a group of citizens deliberating less on the matters of the State than on their own interests: In recent years, the best minds had turned their meditations toward political economy; and the Assembly, convened to enlighten and advise on the administration of the kingdom, naturally had to bring together all minds on this question, and bring this matter before the entire nation. Thus, when, after a long slumber, or rather after an absence, one comes to realize that our affairs had been quite dilapidated, it is difficult to forget that we have the right to bring them into order. I was, therefore, not forecasting a revolution, but a change which, without being able to determine its specific character, had to be to the advantage of the nation. When, in a century of enlightenment, one calls on reason to help, reason must ultimately become the master.

In many of his reflections on the nature of the National Assembly, Bailly repeatedly turned to the idea of *privilege*: that the privilege of an arbitrary aristocracy had to be replaced by the nobility of the soul; that is, the privilege to serve by representing the nation. Bailly attributed this qualitative change to the power of reason; but most significantly, to the Leibnizian form of the principle of reason, as was made explicit in Leibniz's discovery of the calculus. This *discovery of principle* also applied to the rebirth of the nation, as Bailly identified it, not as a revolution, but as a great change, a *regeneration of the nation*:

This Assembly, an infinitely small portion of the nation, felt nonetheless the force and the rights of the whole: It did not dissimulate the fact that it was acquiring for itself a sort of authority as a result of these rights and of this force, as can be attained by the particular wills intended to compose the general will.

Moreover, Bailly realized that the constitution of the Assembly could not be postponed indefinitely. It had to act quickly, many obstacles had to be overcome, not the least of which was the fear of being killed in the process. Bailly writes:

The Assembly was in a hurry to establish itself. We were told that the government was not happy with the firmness that the commons displayed, and the fear was that it could go beyond what the

Estates General had been accustomed to do up until that time... Backed up with a legal representation of at least the majority of the communes of the kingdom, such an Assembly had become formidable, because it was capable of executing any defensive actions, since it had the power to give orders and was virtually assured of being obeyed.

Bailly's idea of the legitimacy of the National Assembly also included the idea of the legitimacy of the right of the King! From the very beginning, the members of the Assembly had come to the agreement that the "*regeneration of the nation would be made in concert with His Majesty.*" This is how Bailly expressed what we can identify as the *French paradox*:

I have to grant justice to this Assembly: in her first acts and expressions of power, she had from that moment on, acquired the wise principles which were expressed by the National Assembly in her most beautiful moments; sufficiently strong to think as the National Assembly in the times of her greatest power, sufficiently measured in her courage for not having gone beyond herself. The Assembly declared by this that she will accomplish the task of national regeneration in concert with His Majesty; she did not think that, while restoring her own rights as a nation, she would have the King lose his own. The monarch has had all of the authority for a long time; it was an usurpation that circumstances, necessity, as well as the succession of times, had brought about; and it had, so to speak, been given an aura of legitimacy. However, in a monarchy, the prince could only exercise his legislative power, even abuse of it, as the representative of the people, and this is a quality that no one could take away from him; he had the right to run for the legislature, and when the National Assembly gave the suspending veto to the King, when it declared him the hereditary representative of the nation, it was developing the ideas whose principles are represented by the decisions of today.⁵

This is a crucial turning point in French history: the creation of a paradoxical *monarchical republic* in June of 1789. This project of a *constitutional monarchy* was the only necessary and reasonable form of government that would have made it possible to move next toward a true republic, without bloodshed. Up until then, France had been governed by an *absolute monarchy*. The *constitutional monarchy* was restricting the powers of the King by a national representation under a constitution. However, this was also the most difficult page to turn in all of the history of France, because only a few people understood that this was a *crucial axiomatic change*. The discovery that Bailly made here, was that the only legitimate government was a representative government; that is, in the spirit of a government of the people, for the people, and by the people. The alternative was a British-style parliamentary monarchy, in which the nobility would keep its privilege, as the case of the House of Lords shows for England. That was the option of Necker and Orléans. The problem was so acute that any other form of government, outside of a *constitutional monarchy*, would have been a usurpation of power. This is what Bailly meant by the "national regeneration" in which representatives served the people, as opposed to ruling the people. Here, Bailly spoke of the momentous decisions [voluntary abdication of privileges of the nobility] that the National Assembly decreed on June 17, 1789, from which the privilege of the nobility *disserving* the kingdom was transformed into a noble privilege of *servicing* the nation-state:

It was voted on this day, that the National Assembly intends and decrees that all tax collections and contributions of all sorts, which have not been formerly and freely decided by the Assembly, will cease to exist in all the provinces of the kingdom, whatever their administrative form may be....

The Assembly further declares, in concert with His Majesty, that as soon as the principles of the national regeneration shall be established, it will take care of examining and consolidating the public debt....

“Finally, the Assembly, becoming active, recognizes also that it owes its first moments to the examination of the causes that have produced in the provinces of the kingdom, the famine that has afflicted them, and to the pursuit of the means of alleviating that in the most prompt and effective way possible; and consequently, it has decided to name a committee to be in charge of that important object, and that his Majesty shall be entreated to supply this committee with all of the necessary information.

The present deliberation shall be printed and sent to all of the provinces.

The decision to publish the decrees of the National Assembly, and circulate them immediately as leaflets, made the declarations not only public and binding nationwide, but also played an enlightening role for the uneducated mass of the people. This had the electrifying effect of elevating the people, as had the published ordinances of Louis XI in the 15th Century, in establishing France as the first nation-state. To this end, Bailly was attempting to solve two crucial problems at once. One was to stop, at all cost, the famine and the financial collapse, and the other was to establish the rights of the Assembly, and of the King.

It is for that reason that the Assembly included the monarch, Louis XVI, as a representative in its legislative deliberations and decisions. After long debates, the plan of the old committee for the constitution was adopted without reservation by the three orders forming the Estates General. The sovereign Assembly decreed on Sept. 22, 1789:

The French government is a monarchy. There is no higher authority outside of this law: the King reigns according to it, and it is only by virtue of this law that he can demand obedience.

No act of the legislative body can be recognized as law, unless it has been established by the representatives of the nation, freely, and legally elected, and ratified by the Monarch.⁶

By integrating the monarchy into a constitutional framework of the representation of the nation, the National Assembly was guaranteeing that the authority of the King could only be obeyed within this new law, and that his powers were no longer absolute. The actions of King had become restrained by the will of the nation.

Tackling The Debt Problem

From 1783 to 1789, the British free-trade policy was imposed upon France, and had destroyed its economy. The Treasury was empty and the agents of the Duke of Orléans were spreading the rumor that the kingdom was about to declare bankruptcy. This would not have been so surprising, when the richest prince in all of Europe, the Duke of Orléans, paid less than 40,000 pounds in taxes a year. In June 1789, Bailly saw that the issue of the public debt had become the most urgent question to resolve. He wrote: “Even though this public debt

did not interest the people directly, the question of the bankruptcy was about to create a general reversal of fortunes which would have shaken the entire kingdom, so it was necessary to rapidly dissipate any fear in this respect, and secure public credit.”

The act of consolidating the debt was not just a solemn act of justice for the general welfare of all, but was a question of honor and of legitimacy that the National Assembly could not leave to anyone else. This was a crucial test of strength for the newly formed Assembly. Bailly was preparing the Assembly to declare an orderly reorganization of the public debt; that is, the equivalent of a Chapter 11 debt reorganization, cancelling the illegitimate debt, while maintaining the crucial national institutions open and functioning. The difficulty, however, was that the Assembly had to give itself the legitimate authority which, up until then, had only resided in the King. Furthermore, this act of sovereignty could not be construed to be a usurpation of the King's prerogative. Quite to the contrary, the nation had to come of age, and had to take hold of its inalienable rights legitimately.

Bailly himself noted that the use of such words as “the Assembly intends,” or “decrees,” and so forth, reflected the authority of a “sovereign language” by which the National Assembly began to declare the will of the nation. “She *intends* by her constitution, and she *decrees* by her sovereignty,” he commented.

Meanwhile, Jacques Necker, at the Ministry of Finance, in an unholy alliance with the Duke of Orléans, was ready to cause the greatest possible chaos and confusion: 1) by creating a famine and declaring the bankruptcy of France; 2) by eliminating the National Assembly; 3) by militarizing Paris, and crowning the Jacobin King Philippe Egalité (Duke of Orléans); and 4) by getting himself named Prime Minister, under a British parliamentary system that he was openly advocating. It was for that purpose that the Jacobin cult was created and the Bastille coup d'état organized.

2. Why The King Was Needed For The Regeneration Of The Nation

In order to understand this period of French history, and recognize its significance for today's world, it is essential to emphasize that the French Revolution was not necessary, and that all French school children should have been taught that Louis XVI was in agreement with the principles of the American Revolution, was constantly seeking ways to show his love for the French people, and that, more than once, his tragic timidity would prevail over his desire to demonstrate his affection and to assert the truth of the American Revolution. Louis XVI was a kindly, but weak king.

Bailly says of him:

Despotism never entered into the character of the King; he only desired the happiness of his people, the which was the only means of seducing him; and if ever he was pushed into some act of authority, it was either because he was convinced that some good would come of it, or some ill was to be avoided, and that was done within the perspective of soothing the pain of the nation, for the prosperity of the empire, and for the happiness of all. I remain convinced that he has always considered his authority, and the need to maintain it, merely as a caution and as the basis for tranquility and for internal peace. Since we are talking about the causes of the regeneration, let us say that the first cause is found in the character of Louis XVI, himself. This King could not have displayed more goodness than he did, but, if he had been advised by better ministers, there would not have been a revolution.

Bailly wanted Louis XVI to follow in the footsteps of his great predecessors Louis XI and Henry IV. On the extraordinary occasion of becoming mayor of Paris, Bailly welcomed the King, and gave him the keys of the city with these words: "I bring to Your Majesty the keys of your good city of Paris. They are the same keys which were presented to Henry IV; he had recovered his people, now the people have recovered their King." Bailly constantly looked for ways to win the King over to the Leibnizian idea of the common good.

When, on the momentous day of June 17, 1789, the motion of Abbot Sieyès was presented for the recognition of the National Assembly, 96% of the representatives of the nation were present; 491 voted in favor of the creation of the National Assembly and 90 opposed. It was further established:

Since only the representatives whose powers have been verified could concur with the national will, and since all of the verified representatives must be present in this Assembly, it is also necessary to conclude that it is incumbent upon them, and it is only incumbent upon it, to present and interpret the general will of the nation.

Bailly noted that this assertion, according to which the will of the nation pertains only to the National Assembly, is not a reckless statement, but was founded on reason. (The reader should be reminded that, to the contrary, Napoleon made a parody of this sovereign event when he usurped the power of that National Assembly, and crowned himself Emperor of France, in 1804.) Moreover, the same article asserts:

There cannot exist any veto, or negative power, between the throne and the Assembly.

The Assembly declares therefore that the common work of national restoration can and must begin without delay with the deputies present, and that they must pursue it without interruption, and without obstacle.

The denomination of National Assembly is the only one that is appropriate for the Assembly in the present state of affairs, either because the members that compose it are the only representatives who are legitimately and publicly recognized and verified; because they have been sent by approximately the totality of the nation; or finally, because the representation being one and indivisible, none of the deputies, whatever order or class they may belong to, has a right to exercise his functions outside of this Assembly.⁷

Thus, the Estates General were dissolved, under the overpowering principle of this *unity of national representation*, which legitimized and confirmed all other principles pertaining to the sovereignty of the nation-state. Any other form of government would have been a usurpation of power.

3. The Duke Of Orléans And The Grand Orient Freemasons

In 1773, Louis-Philippe-Joseph D'Orléans was initiated into the Freemasons, and was introduced to the highest mysteries of the Masonic order. He pledged his honor, fully convinced that he would be able to use this resourceful society for the goal that his ambition and vengeance were leading him to attain. The Freemasons knew that he was entirely devoted to them, and in each other's embrace, they became the most important instrument of manipulation of public opinion to set up the Bastille coup. It was under such a bloody

conjunction that the Jacobin club was created, and became hegemonic throughout the period of the Terror.

On that day, the Duke of Orléans—known as "Philippe Egalité" Duke of Chartres, Duke of Nemours, first Grand Duke of Montpensier et d'Etampes, Duke of Valois, Count of Beaujolais, of Vermandois, and of Soissons—also became the Founding Grand-Master of the Grand Orient Freemasonic Order of France. He was a blood prince born of the cadet branch of the Orléans family, a descendant of Philippe of Orléans (1640-1701), brother of Louis XIV, and he had a claim to the throne of France if Louis XVI were to die, and his direct heir, the Dauphin, were forced into exile. Orléans' objective was to become the *Jacobin King*, and for that purpose, he devised a diabolical scheme to create a general famine, provoke an insurrection against the National Assembly, and have the King assassinated.

Montjoie reports that the Freemasons came from England into France under Jacques II, during the reign of Louis XIV, and began to recruit in the military. After a while, all French institutions, including the Church, had been infiltrated. Montjoie relates that when the Masons wanted to escape the surveillance of the police, their leadership was given to the Count of Clermont, Abbot of Saint Germain des Prés, who recruited the nobility into its ranks. "When the Count of Clermont died, Louis-Philippe-Joseph replaced him."⁸

It is interesting to note how much "equality" was really involved in the nefarious activities of this blood prince. The lodge of Toulouse (1779) was very strict on the question of equality. It established that "no one can be affiliated with or accepted in our lodge unless he is twenty-five years of age, is a noble, or a military of the sovereign court." The lodge of Savoie proclaimed: "Equality does not mean anything. It is only a word." According to Gerard Gayot, a current Masonic "expert" from the University of Lille, the Grand Orient of France defined the following limitations of democracy for their Order, during the French Revolution: "No one will be accepted who is a man of abject or vile profession, rarely will an artisan be accepted, even if he is a master, most of all in the places where corporations and communities have not been established.... Never shall we accept workers identified as companions in the arts and crafts." Freemasonry was accessible only for those who were of high birth, high merits, or high revenues.⁹ So much for the noble idea of *equality*.

When Orléans was introduced to the highest order and was initiated to receive the degree of Kadosch Knight, he was submitted to the following ritual, as Montjoie reports:

First he was brought to an obscure room in the back of which there was the representation of a dimly lit grotto where bones were displayed and a mannequin was standing, all dressed up with the ornaments of royalty. Next to it stood a double ladder.

When Louis-Philippe-Joseph was introduced by five brothers, he was told to lie on the ground, as if he were dead. In that position, he was told to recite all of the grades that he had received, and to repeat all of the oaths that he had made. He was then given a detailed description of the grade he was about to receive, and he was told to swear never to reveal anything of this to any Knight of Malta. After this ceremony, he was told to get up and to climb to the last step of the ladder, and then let himself fall off. He obeyed, and everyone clamored that he had risen to the *Ne Plus Ultra* of freemasonry.

Immediately after his fall, he was given a dagger, and he was ordered to give a blow to the crowned mannequin, which is what

he did. A liquid in the color of blood squirted out on him and dripped onto the floor. He was further told to cut off the head of the figure, and to hold it up with his right hand, and hold the dagger soiled with blood, in his left hand, which he did. Then it was revealed to him that the bones he saw in the grotto, were those of Jacques de Molai, Grand Master of the Templar Order, and that the man whose blood he had spilled, and whose head he was holding in his right hand, was Philippe le Bel, King of France. He was furthermore instructed that the sign for the grade to which he was being promoted consisted in putting his hand on his heart, then extend it horizontally, and then let it fall on his knee, indicating that the heart of the *Kadosch Knight*, was ready for revenge. Then he was shown the secret handshake of the *Kadosch Knight*, which is done by shaking hands in a stabbing gesture.

Montjoie remarks that this was the Duke of Orléans' initiation to cruelty; and that his slaying of the mannequin meant the assassination of Louis XVI.

4. The Famine Conspiracy

The Duke of Orléans developed a plan based on three simple underlying assumptions: 1) If you cannot trust the leaders to feed you, you cannot trust them to govern you; 2) Hunger will convince the people to arm themselves against the King and his ministers; and; 3) The people will embrace whoever usurps power and gives them the food. Simple, diabolical, deadly!

On July 13, 1788, France had experienced the most devastating hailstorm in its history. Its most fertile lands were devastated, and the Duke of Orléans took full advantage of this natural calamity to acquire the remaining grain that was stored in France, and ship it to England! The Marquis of Ducrest, Orléans's chancellor, was sent to England to oversee the operation. Orléans had no legal difficulty in accomplishing this diabolical deed, since the Finance Minister, de Brienne, had signed a free-trade agreement with England that allowed an unlimited amount of grain to be exported into that country. The Duke of Orléans' ability to control this crucial food resource, and to take advantage of the British free-trade policy, was at the center of his overall plan to usurp the throne of France.

Orléans devised the following scenario to bring down the kingdom of France, as Montjoie reports:

He imagined he could take over the entire nation of France; by gaining hegemonic control over the food of the entire nation, by producing a general famine; by organizing so well his intrigues for that purpose, that he would be able to persuade the people that the government was solely responsible for such a terrible calamity. He found also in that scheme of starvation, the evil opportunity to push the inhabitants of the cities and the countryside into despair, and then to lead them from despair to insurrection. Furthermore, if he could gain total power after the destabilization brought about by the famine, he would be assured to maintain himself in this usurpation, by means of reestablishing abundance.

Orléans thought his plan was foolproof. First, take over the monopoly of grains and wheat throughout the French countryside. For that purpose, he hired an unscrupulous exchange agent by the name of Pinet, who was in charge of receiving and authorizing all funds to buy up grain. Pinet had organized, in July and August of 1788, a national network of buyers who would pay what the producers offered. A formidable sum was provided initially by the vast resources of Orléans; then Pinet devised a loan scheme in which

he invited thousands of lenders to lend money at 30, 40, even 75% interest. Orléans was willing to risk an initial loss, confident that once the famine hit with full force, in a few months, he would make a fortune by reselling at the highest price.

Most investors asked no questions about what the money was for; those who committed the indiscretion of asking, were not permitted to participate. The scheme was immensely successful, and Orléans managed to buy the majority of the grains that were not affected by the devastating hailstorm. Meanwhile, his British agent, the Marquis of Ducrest, brother of the Marquise of Sillery, was in England organizing the fleet of the British East India Company to ship the French grains offshore to the Channel Islands of Guernsey and Jersey. It was too risky to store the French wheat in England, because such an attempt would have raised suspicions. British reporters began to write articles in French newspapers about how the English people, wary of the possible French famine, decided to stock up on their own reserves for the coming Winter.

Ducrest was allowed to bring back into France only the amounts of wheat that Orléans told him to. This whole affair was conducted with great secrecy; Finance Minister de Brienne was blamed, and was told to leave the country in August 1788, by which time the price of bread had skyrocketed everywhere. Of course, the King and the government were accused of being responsible for this disaster, and found themselves incapable of explaining the truth of the matter. Troops were put on alert everywhere, and brought into Paris to protect the marketplaces. Montjoie, who was an eyewitness to these troubles, wrote:

These alarming precautions were taken merely to prevent the pillage of grains while the emissaries of Orléans were encouraging the population to loot. The same men were circulating, in the most perfidious fashion, the lie that the Court, for reasons that we shall soon reveal, had exported to England all of the wheat of France, and that it was the Court that caused the famine that was beginning to be felt. Everybody was putting the dogs on the wrong scent and was blaming the Court for the crime that had been committed by Orléans. Never was such an abominable maneuver ever imagined; and never was it conducted with more ability.

Some time prior to 1789, the Duke of Orléans had been recruited to British intelligence by Lord Shelburne, Lord Stanhope, and Doctor Price, who created with him the Society of the Revolution. This was the Jeremy Bentham-run British intelligence wing of the Jacobin society that helped organize the French Revolution, and whose purpose was to establish similar revolutionary groups in England, Ireland, and Scotland. The political wing of this Orléans network was represented in government by opposition party leader Charles James Fox, the opponent of William Pitt the Younger. Orléans' plans were totally in accordance with the Court of St. James strategy to destroy France. Orléans' most important asset from the higher ranks of the British oligarchy was John Frederick Sackville, Duke of Dorset, Ambassador Extraordinaire of King George III to France, in 1789.

The following incident reveals how the famine created by Orléans was orchestrated with the witting complicity of the King of England himself.

In May 1789, the news had been circulating all over Europe that England had secured an extraordinarily large reserve of grains. Faced with the severe shortages in France, Louis XVI personally wrote to a minister at the Court of St. James, asking the British government to sell him a very modest supply of 20,000 sacks of wheat. The minister replied that he could not take that decision upon

himself, but that he would plead with Messrs. Pulteney, Walson, Wilberforce, and Major Scott, telling them that this good-neighborly gesture would go a long way to improve relations between the two countries. Immediately, William Pitt the Younger sounded the alarm in Parliament and, after some debates, requested that the export request be forwarded to the King's Privy Council. The Privy Council decided to establish a parliamentary commission to study the proposal, and ultimately the request was denied.

Montjoie wrote: "Not only was this help rejected, but the refusal was so harsh that a strict rule was further passed against any contraband, or any fraud that might elude this edict. Thus, the British, stuffed with our grains, mercilessly refused this poor Louis XVI a slight portion of the sustenance that they had stolen from his own people; this rejection simply added to an already ravaging famine, and it was from that situation that the insurrection of July 14 emerged, and the heinous crimes of October 5 and 6."¹⁰ It was only in October 1789, that the Duke of Orléans decided to selectively repatriate some of the grain from England.

5. The Necker-Orléans Bastille Coup

Further historical evidence that the storming of the Bastille was a coup d'état has been provided by Antonio Capello, Ambassador of Venice to Paris, in July 1789. His recently published dispatches indicate that the Venetians were well informed of the British-Jacobin operation in France, and that Capello was briefed regularly by the Duke of Dorset, Ambassador of England to Paris. Capello reported to the Doge that, indeed, it was the Swiss-British agent Jacques Necker, Minister of Finance, who had planned the insurgency of 100,000 foreign troops against Paris, as a strategy of tension in preparation for the storming of the Bastille. In turn, this Bastille coup d'état became the smokescreen aimed at overshadowing the historic Tennis Court Oath of June 20, 1789, which had established the authority of the National Assembly founded by Bailly and Lafayette, in agreement with the principles of Benjamin Franklin's American Revolution.

The intelligence reports from Capello show clearly that he was aware that the uprising was not spontaneous, and that there existed a carefully laid plan behind the storming of the Bastille. On July 20, 1789, Capello sent the following revealing Dispatch No. 189:

Never was there a revolt against a sovereign which had been better conducted, never was so little blood shed, and never had a revolt been terminated so rapidly....

The reason for the rally of these troops surrounding Paris, and at Versailles, was no longer a mystery: The aim was to give military support to the exile of Necker, force the dissolution of the Estates General, and declare national bankruptcy....

Without any resistance, a great quantity of guns and ammunition were taken, as well as a great quantity of flour which had been stored there [the Invalides Hospital] for the soldiers. From there, they [the Parisians] went to the Arsenal, where they took everything they could find; thus, armed with rifles, cannons, and gunpowder, under the direction of the French Guards, the order to storm the Bastille was given, because one is not master of Paris unless he is master of that castle. Mr. Delaunay, governor of the Bastille, had already received the order to defend himself with his soldiers and to fire on the people: He had already been assured of

receiving, within twenty-four hours, a reinforcement of 10,000 men through underground passages that extended up to five miles....

The fatal plan of the ministry, the which had failed momentarily, was conceived like this. In the night of Monday, between the 13 and the 14 of this month [July], the plan was to bring troops into Paris, by fire and sword through Montmartre hill, with the intention of creating a terrible massacre, such that the citizens would have been prepared to defend themselves with cannons and rifles, since the entire city would have been given arms: Barricades had been erected to stop cavalry charges, and even the women had assembled in the houses a huge quantity of rocks and heavy boards to throw down at the soldiers. In one district, a motion was introduced, which was fortunately rejected, and which proposed that the blood princes and the ambassadors form, as it were, an initial front line in order to stop the enemy troops; you will find enclosed a copy of that motion. However, the fear which prevailed at Versailles was that a hundred thousand armed Parisians were expected to attack the King's Palace. The storming of the Bastille thwarted the plan. So many defensive means had been deployed, so quickly, the defection of a non-negligible part of the troops which were sent to the city, all of this made it clear that the ministry's plan was impossible to execute, and that there were not enough troops to send against twenty million unified subjects.

In view of these disasters, the National Assembly sent, on that same Monday, a deputation to the King to explain the horrible situation in the capital, imploring him to withdraw the troops.¹¹

If one pays attention to the *intention* here, the truth is easily unravelled. Just by lifting slightly the veil of Capello's dispatches, it becomes evident that fear was the manipulating element on both sides of the irregular warfare operation: On the one hand, Necker and Dorset created a panic in Versailles where the King expected the assault of 100,000 enraged Parisians; on the other hand, the Duke of Orléans created a panic in the half-starved Paris population with the invasion of 100,000 foreign troops, presumably under the King's order; and then, the unexpected diversion: the Bastille. After he had become Mayor of Paris in 1790, Bailly reportedly said to the King that the famine of that year had been orchestrated by the Duke of Orléans: "I did not hide the fact from him that the famine had been more or less fabricated...."¹²

Orléans' Assassination Attempt Against The King

In his account of the Orléans conspiracy, Montjoie reports that during the first few days after the storming of the Bastille, everything had been readied for the Duke of Orléans to take power, and that even Necker had been literally bought by him:

This idea, that Necker was the only one who could regenerate France, was thrown to the public by the party of Orléans, with such zeal, and with such success, that it became the dominating idea. The third estate, the clergy, and the nobility, all of the bodies, and what is scarcely conceivable, even the Parliament itself, which had grave causes of discontent with this man, all feverishly desired to see Necker reinstated as the head of the finances. Necker, who did not ignore the fact that this general favor was primarily owed to Orléans, saw himself pushed by gratitude into the faction of that prince who looked upon him as his creature, and concurred that in all opportunities, he could count on his devotion.¹³

So, what went wrong? Why did the Duke of Orléans not come to Paris, the day after the storming of the Bastille, and claim his crown as planned? The day had been fixed, the moment had been chosen, the multitude of the people were in the streets, clamoring for him. On July 12, the two busts of Necker and Orléans were paraded in the streets of Paris, with chants of “Long live Necker, long live the Duke of Orléans!” yet Orléans was nowhere to be seen. The Count of Virieu reported that, on July 17, he was told by a Parisian that “the National Assembly was in danger, and that if there was an attempt on any of the deputies' lives, the majority of the population was ready to proclaim the Duke of Orléans, either as protector of the nation, or as lieutenant-general of the kingdom.”¹⁴

Paris was in a state of convulsion. yet the leader of the mob was not there. Even the Duke of Aumont, a peer of the realm, who appeared to be ignorant of the Orléans conspiracy, proposed to lead the people himself, but without succeeding. The population applauded him, but the electors of Paris, paid by Orléans, refused to grant him the signed authorization to become the commander in chief of the Paris armed forces. Still, Orléans did not show up. Where was he?

The answer is simple. Orléans had gone to Versailles on the morning of the 15th, to ask the King for a safe passage to England! Orléans said to the King: “Sir, I come to implore Your Majesty to let me make a trip to England, in the eventuality that the situation becomes more troublesome than it is already.” The King simply shrugged his shoulders.

Montjoie estimates that the Duke of Orléans was too much of a coward to show himself in Paris after the storming of the Bastille. However, this is not true. The fact is, that Orléans was plotting to have the King assassinated. Orléans went to see the King to create an alibi for himself. The killing of the King was absolutely necessary, because there was no possible way that Orléans could even become lieutenant-general of the kingdom, as long as the King was alive. Louis XVI had to be put out of the way.

Then, on July 17, when the King's carriage reached Paris, at Place Louis XV, and was prepared to turn in the direction of rue Royale, a loud fanfare welcomed him by playing the popular song, chosen by Bailly himself, and entitled: “Where Could We Be Better Than Within Our Family?” Montjoie reports the following dramatic sequence that occurred at that moment:

An assassin posted by Orléans beyond the river, mounted on some construction material which had been put there for the erection of the Louis XVI Bridge, and armed with a rifle of extraordinary caliber, took a shot at the King's coach. From that distance, and in the midst of all of the noise of the crowd and of the musicians, no one heard the shot. The bullet came from behind the King's coach, passed above two armed bourgeois who were standing on the left side, and hit a woman located behind them, who had raised herself in order to better see the King. This woman, between 30 and 35 years of age, and of a large stature, was named Anne Felicite Jacquelin Duprateau. She came to the ceremony with two of her friends, one of whom was an ecclesiastic. The unfortunate woman fell into the arms of these two men. As she fell, she put her hand to her breast, and uttered in a muffled voice: *I have been hit*. She expired four minutes later.¹⁵

According to Montjoie, the cadaver of this unfortunate woman was later examined by two doctors affiliated with the Chatelet tribunal, Dr. Sallin of the University of Paris, and Dr. Rufin, a local surgeon, who carried out the autopsy. The angle of penetration of the bullet

and its large size confirmed the assumption that the assassin had used a rifle of special caliber, and that the shot came from slightly above the crowd, and from the other side of the river. An immediate investigation was undertaken, but as soon as it became known that Orléans was behind the coup, the whole affair was silenced.

Had the King been killed, and the Dauphin, the Count of Artois, and Queen Marie Antoinette been forced into exile, as was planned, the Duke of Orléans would have had a legitimate claim to force a change in the reigning dynasty, since Philippe, Duke of Anjou and King of Spain, had renounced the French crown by treaty. No one could have stopped him from becoming the *Jacobin King*. It was only later that the National Assembly passed an edict maintaining the dynasty of Henry IV and Louis XVI by declaring: “The throne is indivisible, and the crown is hereditary from male to male....”¹⁶

The Venetian Capello further identifies the full special operations capabilities of the Duke. In his Dispatch No. 203, dated Oct. 19, 1789, Capello writes to the Doge:

We have discovered, during the investigation surrounding the last troubles that I mentioned to you, a conspiracy organized by the Duke of Orléans, which shows that his promotion of the cause of the people was made only with the purpose of furthering his own evil designs. I will give you a more exhaustive report about the conspiracy of this perfidious prince as soon as I am able to do it with full knowledge of the situation. For the time being, it seems to me that when he became cognizant of a plan projected by the Queen, and according to which the King was to leave Versailles to be transferred to Metz, before he is forced to live in Paris, this first blood prince prepared an assassination of the King and his royal family during the trip, and later, in the middle of a revolt being prepared to blow up in Paris, he would get himself nominated lieutenant general of the kingdom. The sacking of a large part of the capital was to become the reward for the conspirators. The Duke of Orléans spent considerable amounts of money hiring soldiers in secret, and creating a party. We have discovered an arsenal of munitions of dual ball cartridges, and we have discovered that an arms manufacturer had already been contracted to produce, just by himself, fourteen thousand rifles. The commanding officer, Marquis de Lafayette, was to become the first victim. An infinite number of houses, which had been condemned to be burned, were already identified and, among them, in violation of the rights of people never seen among the most barbarian peoples, were located the houses of the three Ambassadors of Sardinia, Sweden,¹⁷ and of Malta. The depositions of many people who were arrested have clarified everything, and have revealed the names of the chief perpetrator and of his accomplices. All necessary precautions have been taken: The national militia and the regular troops were activated without interruption and no one was permitted to leave Paris until the day before yesterday. However, since it would have been dangerous, in the middle of such turbulent events, to inflict upon the Duke of Orléans the punishment that he deserved, notwithstanding the fact that, being a member of the National Assembly, his person was considered inviolable and sacred, the decision was made to send him away. To cover this up, a special commission was devised as a pretext, and the King sent him on a mission to the King of Britain.¹⁸

Capello also confirmed that the Palais-Royal of the Duke of Orléans had been, during this entire early period of the Revolution, “the true center of ferment. The Duke of Orléans, who is the proprietor, has now gained great popularity by supporting the cause of the people, but his intentions are suspect...”¹⁹ All of the above is extensively corroborated by Montjoie who asked: “Was it acceptable that the palace of the first blood prince [Orléans] be transformed into nothing else but a series of taverns, of places of debauchery, of game arcades, and become the rendezvous for all of the vagabonds, the rascals, and prostitutes of the capital?”

6. How Bailly And Lafayette Became The Leaders Of Paris

Bailly had been asked to write the speech that the King was to deliver on the morning of July 17. However, the King did not use the speech written by Bailly, which had probably called for him to announce officially that he was the hereditary representative of the nation, and that he was one with the National Assembly. Bailly had been urging the King to fully embrace the new constitutional monarchy, and renounce the idea of absolutism. Although the King would not do it, he did for the first time give public recognition to the National Assembly, by name, and responded, although a bit late, to Bailly's call for removing the troops from Paris and Versailles. The King said:

So, it is I who am but one with the nation, it is I who am counting on you. In this circumstance, help me guarantee the safety of the State. I expect it from the National Assembly; the zeal of the representatives of my people, assembled for the common safety, is to me a sure guarantee; and, counting on the love and fidelity of my subjects, I have given orders for the troops to leave Paris and Versailles.²⁰

As the German poet Friedrich Schiller might have said at this point: "The King was too 'little,' and too late." The *punctum saliens*, the dramatic turning point, had passed. Had the King been a stronger and wiser leader, he could have stopped the bloodshed of the previous day, and could have identified himself *constitutionally* with the National Assembly. He chose not to do so. That is how the crisis could have been turned into an opportunity. By maintaining his *absoluteness* against the nation, the King was sending the wrong message, and was confirming that he intended to remain within his *old fatal axioms*. The King had this one last chance to solve the *French paradox* of a republican monarchy. In other words, the retreat of the royal troops and the arming of Lafayette's militia, on Monday the 13th; the Bastille secured without Delaunay, on Tuesday the 14th; and the King declaring himself the first representative of the National Assembly, on Friday the 17th: These three crucial actions, recommended by Bailly, could still have turned the Bastille coup d'état into what Schiller described as "a great moment in history."

On the 17th, a deputation, including Bailly and Lafayette, left the National Assembly in Versailles to go to Paris, where the population was awaiting the news of the latest developments. They were received triumphantly at City Hall. With the news that the King had endorsed the National Assembly, Lafayette spoke before the entire body of the electors and the people assembled, and stated: "The King had been deceived, but it is no longer the case; he knows of our calamities, and he knows them so that they will never happen again." Bailly and Lafayette were acclaimed as heroes. Someone cried out that Lafayette should become the Commanding Officer of the Paris Militia. When Lafayette accepted, another voice called for Bailly to become Provost of the Merchants, and then, a third voice added: "No, not Provost of the Merchants, rather Mayor of Paris!" The crowd took up the cry, and Bailly, weeping with emotion, said that he was not able to fulfill this honor. Bailly was nevertheless voted Mayor by acclamation.

At the news of this nomination, John Bondfield, merchant and United States commercial agent at Bordeaux, wrote to Benjamin Franklin: "Your friend Mons. Balli [sic] is chief magistrate of Paris; the Marquis de Lafayette General and Commander in Chief.... I am

satisfied that you will be elated at the liberal sentiments that appear to reign. You will see in our archbishop's report that they are not innocent of the proceedings of America which they quote as models...."²¹

Immediately after this nomination, Bailly was uncertain as to whether he had been legally chosen. He stated: "My course was to keep calm and reserved. The office was new; there were no established forms. It was not for me to regulate them or establish them. My role was to wait." Bailly wisely went to the National Assembly to get his nomination ratified. His announcement was enthusiastically confirmed and voted on immediately. Still uncertain, Bailly went to the King to ask for his approval. Similarly, deputy Clermont-Tonnerre, on the same day, asked the King, in the name of the National Assembly, that both Bailly and Lafayette be confirmed in their nominations. The King approved them both.

Bailly further exemplified the democratic process by demanding that the Electoral Assembly of the City of Paris invite the representatives of the districts to assemble and deliberate on his nomination and that of Lafayette. On July 21, Bailly's election was ratified by 55 of 60 districts of Paris. Strengthened by this powerful mandate, Bailly then knew that he could force through the required reforms in this time of crisis. The *Journal of the Estates General* wrote: "Observe how man is the product of circumstance. Known for a history of astronomy, M. Bailly, destined to end his days in a peaceful armchair at the Academy, finds himself today thrown into the storms of a revolution...."²²

As Mayor, and with the mandate of the districts, Bailly considered that he now had a legal basis of authority, and set out to reform the city's administration, creating public works and special infrastructure projects. On behalf of the City Council, Bailly submitted to the National Assembly a project for the construction of canals connecting Paris to the Marne River, all the way to the Atlantic near Dieppe. The canal linking Marne to Paris was to promote internal navigation and to create much-needed employment for the Paris population. Numerous projects within the city were started, such as building bridges, expanding streets, and building sewer systems, thus providing jobs for a lot of Parisians. Over 17,000 men who had been attracted into Paris as vagabonds were sent back to the provinces in land clearing projects in the Champagne and Medoc regions. As for the Marne-Paris canal, it was finally begun in 1799, and was completed within three years.

Bailly immediately got the Electoral Assembly to authorize the demolition of the Bastille fortress. On the one hand, this gave people work and wages, and on the other, it diverted the rage of the population away from pillaging the city and directed their destructive impulse toward breaking the stones of the hated fortress, as opposed to breaking the law. The work began in earnest on July 16, two days after the fortress had been taken.

Meanwhile, Lafayette had organized the Communal Assembly to authorize a 20-cent daily wage for the National Guards. The problem of provisioning the National Guards in a city that could barely feed itself was a very difficult one. A military committee was appointed to supervise the administration and provisioning of the guards under the high command of General Lafayette. The National Guard was acting as the executive arm of the police department, which had the responsibility for maintaining law and order under the authority of Bailly. This is how Bailly and Lafayette kept close contact with each other through relaying police orders to the guards.

The following letter of Bailly to Lafayette, dated Sept. 3, 1790, is exemplary of their spirit of collaboration for the security of the capital:

I believe, my dear friend, that it is desirable, as I told you yesterday, to show an imposing force, so that order will be reestablished.... I hope that, if there is any disturbance today, you will find it opportune to come and see me in order that we may make dispositions in concord. It is not only for form's sake that I ask you this; you know I depend upon you...."

On July 25, 1789, Bailly created a Communal Assembly with the sole purpose of drafting the municipal constitution. Bailly further increased the policing of the city for which he encountered the greatest criticism. He intervened against the local Orléans mafia, which had increased prostitution, gambling, and pornography. Bailly strictly enforced the law and cracked down on the debauchery that went on in Paris. In such moral matters, he would not delegate his powers either, as he was so often asked to do.

Bailly was severely criticized by the Jacobins for centralizing his power. During the two years that he was Mayor, Bailly fought the leftist tendencies that the Jacobins were spreading. Bailly required that the very real responsibilities and duties of a Mayor be matched with equivalent powers to execute, which did not in any way entail a repudiation of the principle of representative government.

7. How Bailly And Lafayette Saved Paris From The Famine

The food crisis was the most critical problem of Bailly's administration. For over a year, since the hailstorm of July 13, 1788, the Orléans conspiracy had taken its toll on the city, and Bailly's first and immediate objective was to secure wheat and bread delivery for the population. Although he had to deal with an empty Treasury, an armed populace which was restless and largely unemployed, a poorly provided militia, and a paralyzed legal system that was aggravating an already overcrowded prison system, Bailly knew that Orléans had manipulated the grain markets, and that he was fighting him by all means put at his disposal, to feed Paris. He spent the entirety of the 1789-90 period striving to increase administrative efficiency to solve the famine problem. The specter of renewed violence caused by the lack of food was like a Damocles sword hanging over his head during the entire Summer and Fall of 1789. Brucker describes the situation as follows:

Bailly and his harassed assistant fully realized that the end of unrest and the reestablishment of law and order depended to a great extent upon their efforts to ward off famine in Paris. For months the city had lived on reduced rations, as a result of the poor wheat harvest of the year before. Provisions for 800,000 inhabitants had been obtained largely from foreign sources through Bailly's exhortations of Necker and the royal government. The crisis in July disrupted the machinery which had been established to feed the city, and almost immediately, Paris was faced with a severe food shortage.

Two days after the storming of the Bastille, the Electoral Assembly established a committee of subsistence which was given full control over buying and distributing grain. The next day, Bailly met with the group and scarcely left the committee for the next three months. The work that Bailly and his assistants performed during this crucial

period was one of the brightest spots in his administration. Working day and night, the small group of men were faced with a constant crisis, and for two months there was never more than one day's grain supply on hand. Every possible source of supply had to be investigated; Bailly's correspondence with Necker teemed with suggestions for locating a few more bags of wheat to ward off hunger and Jacobin disorder for another day.²³

The record shows how it was Bailly's courage and tenacity, in his efforts to save Paris from the famine, that prevented another insurrection. As Mayor of the Commune of Paris, Bailly had suddenly become responsible for the general safety of the population. Deputies and City Council members were sent in every city across France to purchase whatever grain could be found. Bailly even had to negotiate for foreign purchases, and made sure that the grain sources would be open, that the convoys would be protected. He would authorize members of the provision committee to negotiate with merchants from Hamburg, Sicily, Naples, Sardinia, even Africa. He would encourage bakers to go out of town, and make their own purchases.

However, by mid-August 1789, the food shortage had reached its peak, and the failure of one day's delivery could have become the spark for an insurrection. As Bailly reported: "The anxiety about the supplies was always used as a means of scaring the population into serving another purpose."

On Aug. 19, Bailly reported that the convoys of grain were servicing both Paris and the city of Versailles, in proportion to their respective population sizes. Every day, he required for Paris alone, 1,600 sacks of wheat, just for bread. On that day, Bailly received the request to increase the portion for Versailles, since it only had three days' reserve left. Bailly sent a message back saying that Paris never had a reserve of more than a day for the last two months, and on this day, Paris had no reserve at all left for the next day.

Here is the entire account that Bailly gave of the next day, Aug. 20, 1789:

Today was a second day of anxiety in a row that I had to endure in securing provisions for Paris. M. Virion, commanding officer of Bazoche, posted in Saint-Germains-en-Laye for the safety of the convoys, came to tell me that a dragoon detachment from Versailles, which was in charge of escorting the grain to that city, had forwarded a great number of grain carts that were absolutely essential for the next day in Paris. He added that after going to Versailles to correct that mistake, he was told that they would willingly let the grain go, except that when the carts got to town, they were immediately emptied, and there is no way to recoup them without exposing ourselves to the revolt of the people. I did not hesitate for one moment; this was the equivalent of telling us to expect famine for the next day. I did not want to write to Necker, because my letter would have been too strong; so, I sent two members of the provisions committee, M. Dussault and M. de Leutre, to meet with Necker in Versailles, and explain to him our situation, and to insist that the carts must be sent immediately, and to further let him know that if the grain is not in the Halle [in Paris], this very night, I would assemble the battalions in the morning to let them know of this state of affairs, and that there was every reason to believe that 30,000 armed men would go and get them. At the same time, I cautiously gave orders to M. Virion to direct toward Paris the other provisions that were destined for Versailles that night, and to arrange for their replacement with those that would follow. He had an infinity of business and intelligence to attend to; he actually succeeded in sending me 16 carts that arrived at 8 o'clock in the morning; but on top of that, the

carts that were diverted toward Versailles were immediately returned, and M. Necker was not surprised and was not upset with my determination, perfectly normal in such a dangerous situation. I succeeded in getting recognition for the services of M. Virion by getting him promoted lieutenant in the national cavalry.

I give this extensive dramatic account by Bailly of the situation, to show that it was for this reason that he had been nominated Mayor of Paris, and Lafayette had been made commandant of the Paris militia. They were the only two leaders who could be counted on to guarantee the food supplies to the capital. Any other leader would have failed, and another Orléans plan for an uprising would have succeeded.

Lafayette's role in saving Paris was just as indispensable. On Sunday, Aug. 23, Lafayette proposed that the Assembly decide to equip and arm the volunteers of the National Guards. This was not a small thing, since the cost was about 50 pounds per man, and there were 24,000 men, for a total of 1,200,000 pounds. Bailly wrote:

But, one must consider that the establishment of the citizens' National Guard was essential; the safety of Paris, the protection of the National Assembly, and of the King, the constitution, and freedom depended on it, the historical development proved the point. There was not one moment to hesitate. This armament could not have succeeded without the immediate authorization of the assembly; otherwise it would have taken a long time: it was helping the citizens who had to pay for the uniforms. Today, we would probably not make this expenditure without consulting the different sections of the Commune; but, then we had to do the good, and do it without delay; that is the case where administrators have to think and decide on their feet.

8. The Mysterious Death Of Pinet And The Exile Of Orléans

Because the famine was not going as well as he had hoped, Orléans became fearful that his financial wizard, Pinet, had entered into some secretive arrangements with Necker, against him, and he wanted to look at his books, especially his "red book" (see below). The point to be understood is that Bailly's efforts in countering the famine conspiracy succeeded in creating factionalization among the co-conspirators. Approximately at the time that Bailly and Lafayette had consolidated their positions as the two leaders of Paris, and were in a position to guarantee the deliveries of grain into the capital, a Paris newspaper, the *Monitor*, made a stunning announcement:

Pinet, an exchange agent in Paris, and the general receiver of a secret society, called the *Monopolist*, whose existence had for a long time represented a public calamity in France, was found dead under mysterious circumstances near Saint-Germains-en-Laye. This society has been in existence for a great number of years, according to treaties agreed upon during the service of several ministers; and it had the nefarious privilege of buying up the grain of France, of transporting them to the islands of Jersey and of Guernsey, and it was able to export them out of there, providing exorbitant fares. It was understood that such a perfidious abuse could not survive the revolution. For a long time Mr. Necker attempted to destroy it, but his efforts were without success, until now. It ended with the death and the bankruptcy of Pinet, general receiver of the society, who had amassed a considerable fortune by speculating on the sale of grains, and who had, it was revealed, relationships with MM. De Breteuil, Barentin, de Villedeuil, and Albert, a member of the last ministry, accused then of having favored maneuvers which were putting the revolution in jeopardy.

It is reported that Berthier and Foulon were members of the association.²⁴

This extraordinary report confirms all of the suspicions that Bailly and Lafayette had about Orléans. The editor of Bailly's *Mémoires* further reports that Pinet's bankruptcy had involved the considerable sum of 53,000,000 pounds, and that, "his death, which was preceded by the disappearance of most of his associates, destroyed the baneful society of Monopolists, whose existence had lasted for over 60 years. Fifteen hundred families, who had lent money to Pinet, without any knowledge of his operations, were reduced to misery."

Some people said it was murder, some said it was suicide. The *Monitor* acknowledges that Pinet was working for the Duke of Orléans and that, at the beginning of the Estates, the court had summoned both Orléans and Pinet to appear for questioning in Marly, and to discuss the causes of the famine. However, Pinet's death put an end to that inquiry. The editors further reported that before his death, Pinet mentioned that a "red book" had been stolen from him, which included all of the names of the people involved in the perfidious operation. The "red book" was reportedly never found.

Finally, following the assassination attempt on the Queen, on Oct. 5-6, the King forced Orléans to go into exile in England. Bailly's editors have indicated that during this assassination attempt on the Queen, cries of "Long live King Orléans!" had been heard during the bloody scenes in Versailles, and that the Marquis de Lafayette had heard again at the Commune, a speech in favor of Orléans becoming lieutenant-general of the kingdom. The editors note: "It seem that one could follow the traces of a conspiracy which was being prepared with a different aim than that of establishing liberty. The court accused Orléans of having formed a plot against the throne."

It was Lafayette who, ultimately, was authorized by the King to tell Orléans that he had to go into exile in England. Lafayette went to meet the Duke of Orléans at Mme. de Coigny's residence, and read him the "riot act," coldly and imperatively:

Prince, France and the King both need peace, and your presence here seems to represent an obstacle. It is said that your name is being used to mislead the multitude and incite disorder. You have relations in England, you can serve the country there, and you must immediately eliminate the pretext used by these disruptors of the public peace.²⁵

Orléans had no choice but to go. After a political tug of war inside of the National Assembly, which was won by the Orléans faction, the decision was taken to hide the true reason for his exile, and he was given a "personal mission," from Louis XVI, to visit the Court of St. James. The affair was covered up, and the National Assembly officially declared that the Duke of Orléans had nothing to do with the events of Oct. 5-6, 1789.

During the following years, Orléans' Jacobin faction became so powerful, that it succeeded in subverting and taking over the National Assembly, and imposing the Robespierre Terror. It was only internal factionalization between Orléans and Robespierre that finally broke up the usurpation plan, and ended with the beheading of Orléans on Nov. 7, 1793. The family interests of the Orléans, however, regained power after the demise of Napoleon, when the son of Philippe Egalité, Louis-Philippe (1830-48) restored the Orléans branch of the Bourbons on the throne of France.

9. The Society Of 1789: A Leibnizian Academy

As these events were proceeding, only five days before Benjamin Franklin died in the United States, Bailly and Lafayette created, in Paris, on April 12, 1790, the Society of 1789. This society was born of a faction fight within the Society of the Friends of the Constitution (Jacobins), over the treason of the Duke of Orléans, and over the constitutional monarchy, and the need to establish, in France, a science of “political and social economy,” in the spirit of Leibniz. The Society of 1789 was founded explicitly as a Leibnizian Academy. Jean Sylvain Bailly, Marquis de Lafayette, Abbott Sieyes, the Count of Mirabeau (the elder), Gaspard Monge, Antoine Lavoisier, Evariste Gallois, Benjamin Franklin, Jacques Pierre Brissot, Dupont de Nemours (father and sons), Marquis de Condorcet, and the Duke of LaRocheffoucauld-Liancourt, were a few of the most famous members. The group rejected the Jacobin idea of “people's power” and was attempting to have the King break away from the Court, and the Monarchist Club, and rally behind a constitutional monarchy.

The founding principle of this Society of 1789 was the same principle that informed the U.S. Bill of Rights, and its aim was to establish the pursuit of happiness through *societies of economic science*, based on a form of “social economy” very similar to what Lyndon LaRouche has developed today, internationally, from the work of Leibniz.

Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz wrote in his paper “Society and Economy” (Hanover, 1671): “With the help of these Academies (or Societies), which are institutions of research and development, with their own manufactures and commercial houses directly attached to them, the monopolies will be eliminated, because the Academies will always guarantee a just and low price for the goods, and very often, such goods would become even cheaper because new manufactures will be built where none exist at that time.” (Such Leibnizian academies are still in existence today in Russia, as demonstrated by the joint seminar sponsored by the Schiller Institute and the Academy of Sciences of Russia, held in Moscow on Nov. 27-28, 20001.)

It is in a similar spirit that the following statement of principle of the Society of 1789 should be understood:

There exists, for individuals, an art of assuring and maintaining their happiness: Up until now it has been developed in moral philosophy, and elevated by the ancients to some sort of perfection.

There must also exist, for nations, an art of extending and maintaining their felicity: This is what we have called the *social art*.

This science, toward which all of the others strive, does not seem to have been examined in its totality. The art of cultivating, the art of commerce, the art of government, even the art of reasoning, are merely portions of that science; they have all developed themselves, each on its own, separately; but, no doubt, these isolated members will succeed in their complete development only when they are brought together, and form a well-organized body.

Reuniting so many inconsistent and separate parts, searching into the economic sciences their mutual relationships, and most of all, the common relationship that they can have with the general science of civilization, such is the object of the social art.

It is not one, nor many human beings, neither a single nation, it is the concert of peoples which can assure that this art will undergo

efficient progress; but this progress will accelerate as soon as the minds shall follow everywhere an orderly task that is constant and uniform.

This common method must therefore be created. But, before it can be established, perfected and generally accepted, it were natural that its foundations be laid by an association, which, by communicating the principles and the spirit which animates it to other similar societies, could, like them, assemble among similar systems the different results of all enlightened men, wherever they may be, and take care of the good of humanity.

This is the plan upon which this Society of 1789 has been founded....

And, I might add: “in the spirit of the U.S. Constitution.”

Among their far-reaching objectives was to bring together, through their foreign correspondents, “the principal political events which were of interest for both hemispheres, the treatises, their respective forces, and the presumed views of powers; the current situations, both internal and external, of the different nations, especially their advancement in the social art; the usefulness and the dangers of their particular institutions will be presented, considering the interests of governments, especially in their relationships with the interests of the governed, and the relations of the Cabinets and their influence on the happiness or unhappiness of the people.”²⁶

The short-lived *Journal of the Society of 1789* also intended to give particular attention to “descriptions and designs of machines,” as well as international promotion for remarkable discoveries.

On June 17, 1790, the Society of 1789 had a great dinner celebration, with 190 guests, which made a lot of noise all over Paris in honor of the birth of the National Assembly. At the end of the dinner, the members began to sing a well-known song, “Les Dettes,” praising the Federation, and made several toasts to the Revolution, to the Nation, to the King, to French patriotic women. And Abbot Sieyes proposed a special toast to “the best of all constitutions, that of the United States of America.”²⁷

10. Conclusion

Bastille Day not only represents a deplorable symbol of hypocrisy and infamy in itself, but also, the fact that such a subversive coup d'état is still acclaimed today, by the French government, shows the Romantic attachment that the French authorities, and the great majority of the French people, have had, for over 200 years, to the Orléanist aristocrats, and the British Crown control over them. The lack of resolve to change such a situation only contributes to aggravate the affairs of state in today's France. This is not merely a party question, or a practical question, but a question of moral principle, and a question of historical justice; for unless the treasonous act of the Bastille is recognized as such, and repudiated once and for all, the honor of France shall never be restored.

This British-Orléans scheme of starving the French population, as a means of usurping power, must be reported and understood as one of the most horrible calamities in the history of mankind. If the French do not make that urgent corrective change in their history books, then, following their favorite Cartesian methodology, it were as if they would propose to the American people that they celebrate Sept. 11, 2001, as their new national holiday!

FOOTNOTES

1. Pierre Beaudry, "Jean Sylvain Bailly: The French Revolution's Benjamin Franklin," *EIR*, Jan. 26, 2001.

2. C.F.L. Montjoie, *Histoire de la Conjuraton de Louis-Philippe-Joseph D'Orléans, surnommé Egalité* (Paris, 1796), Vol. I, pp. ij- iij.

3. On Goldsmith, see "Teddy Goldsmith: The 'Jeremy Bentham' Behind New Terrorism," *EIR*, Aug. 24, 2001.

4. *Mémoires de Bailly*, MM. Berville et Barrière (eds.) (Paris: Baudouin Frères, Imprimeurs-Libraires, 1821). All quotations from Bailly, except as otherwise noted, are from this source.

5. Bailly, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 20. Bailly himself had an interesting comment to make on the paradox of a *republican monarchy*. On May 28, 1789, he enters the following remark in his *Mémoires*: "Today, we have begun to discuss the first foundations of the constitution, and the basis that will establish the monarchical government. When an objection came up about the fact that the word *monarchy* was understood differently, and could signify different things, M. de Wimpffen, who had written about this, proposed the word *royal democracy*. It was very remarkable that the association of those two words was considered bizarre; but, since we did not know then where the whole thing was going to take us, it seemed to me that we could say that the result of the constitution was a royal democracy or a democratic monarchy." Vol. II, p. 314.

6. Bailly, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 6.

7. Bailly, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 160.

8. Montjoie, op. cit. Vol. I, p. 52.

9. *La franc-Maçonnerie a-t-elle inventée la Révolution Française? Entretien avec Gérard Gayot. Re. La franc-Maçonnerie française. Textes et pratiques (XVIII et XIX siècles)*, Gallimard, Coll. "Archives," 1980. Two important documents on the role of the Freemasons and the French Revolution were written by Abbé Augustin Barruel, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire du jacobinisme*, à Hambourg, Chez P. Fauché, 1798, and Abbé Jacques François Lefranc, *Le voile levé pour les curieux ou les secrets de la Révolution révélés à l'aide de la franc-Maçonnerie*, 1791.

For the record, it is important to note that during the years preceding the coup d'état of the Bastille, Bailly had joined the Freemasonic lodge of the Nine Sisters (les Neuf Soeurs), which had been created with the collaboration of Benjamin Franklin, and had become known as the champion of "philosophy," the secret enemy of the Grand Orient Lodge of the Duke of Orléans. Founded in 1779, the lodge of the Nine Sisters included an impressive number of individuals such as Bailly, Michel de Cubières, Nicholas Fallet, Joseph-Jérôme de Lalande, Abbé Cordier de Saint-Firmin, Pierre-Nicolas Le Changeux, Jean François Cailhava, Charles-Georges-Thomas Garnier, Chauvet, Evariste-Désiré Desforges de Parny, Court de Gébelin, Benjamin Franklin, Voltaire, Condorcet, Roucher, and Guillotin. Later associates of Bailly were Desmoulin, Chenier, Pétion, and Sieyes. Most of their meetings were held at Notre Dame d'Auteuil, as Franklin called Mme. Helvetius' home. From Edwin Burrows Smith, *Jean Sylvain Bailly, Astronomer, Mystic, Revolutionary*, The American Philosophical Society, News Series, Vol. 44, Part 4, 1954, p. 467.

10. Montjoie, op. cit. Vol. III, p. 27. The crimes of Oct. 5-6 relate to the assassination attempt against Queen Marie Antoinette by the Duke of Orléans; an action which would cause the King to force Orléans to be exiled to England.

11. *Venise et la Révolution Française, Les 470 dépêches des Ambassadeurs de Venise au Doge, 1786-1795*, Edition Etablie par

Alessandro Fontana, Francesco Furlan et George Saro, (Paris: Editions Robert Lafont, 1997), p.305. Although Capello lied by insinuation about the "secret council" of Bailly at the National Assembly, and about Lafayette and his Paris Militia involvement in the storming of the Bastille, and made the stupid Romantic judgment that the storming of the Bastille was "a noble revolt," he nonetheless revealed the truth about the well-conducted plan and the role of the ministry.

12. Seriyes and André, *Anectodes inédites*, 40, quoted by Smith, op. cit. p.514.

13. Montjoie, op. cit., Vol. III, p.27.

14. Montjoie, op. cit., Vol. II, p.69.

15. Montjoie, op. cit. Vol. II, p.83-84.

16. Montjoie, op. cit., Vol. II, p.136.

17. Necker's daughter, Madame de Staeël, was married to the Ambassador of Sweden, and lived in one of those houses. The Staeël family was going to be well compensated for providing such a cover, showing that the Necker family had been a victim in the operation.

18. *Venise*, op. cit., p.344. Furthermore, Capello confirmed that Count Mirabeau was the Duke of Orléans' most important asset, at the National Assembly. That explains how Mirabeau was able to "foresee" a number of events which were about to occur. The top collaborators and co-conspirators of the Duke of Orléans were Count of Mirabeau, Duke and Duchess of Aiguillon, Duke of Biron, Duke of Crillon, Baron Montesquieu, Barnave, Laclos, Dubois de Crauce, Valence, Général Dumourier, the Lameth brothers, Marquise of Sillery, and Baronne de Staeël, the daughter of Necker.

19. *Venise*, op. cit., p.301. Clearly, Capello understood what the plan of the ministry was, and what the real nature of the Duke of Orléans' actions was, and he had a fairly accurate conception of the French Revolution, which he divided up into five different factions: 1) "the republicans who want a republic, one and indivisible"; 2) the "federalists, who want a Swiss type of federation"; 3) "the royalists, who want a parliamentary monarchy, like in Great Britain"; 4) "the aristocrats, who want the old regime back"; and 5) the "Marat faction, which wants the sovereignty of the people, without ever enunciating clearly how it should be exercised." Obviously, Capello had no view on the "American faction" of Bailly and Lafayette, whom he might have put into the "federalist" or the "royalist" faction. On Nov. 19, 1893, Capello reported on the executions of both the Duke of Orléans and of Bailly, who were guillotined only four days apart.

20. Bailly, op. cit. Vol. II. p.5.

21. *Collected Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, American Philosophical Society.

22. Gene A. Brucker, *Jean-Sylvain Bailly, Revolutionary Mayor Of Paris* (Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1950), p.16, quoting the *Journal des Etats Généraux*, I, no. 8.

23. Brucker, op. cit. pp.41-42.

24. Bailly, op. cit. Vol. II, pp.311-312.

25. Bailly, op. cit. Vol. III, p.162.

26. Augustin Challamel, *Les Clubs contre-révolutionnaires* (Paris: Maison Quantin, 1895), p.392-94. Challamel reports that the Society of 1789 was involved in establishing the General Federation of all of the National Guards of the Kingdom (including the Navy), which celebrated their national federation on July 14, 1790. It is interesting to note that instead of

celebrating the Bastille, on July 14, 1790, the Society of 1789 chose to celebrate, on the esplanade of the Champ de Mars, a federation of 60,000 National Guards, representing 83 departments of France. At this unique event, Lafayette pronounced the swearing to the Constitution, which was then repeated by the King. On that day, Louis XVI became "Supreme Commander of the National Guards of France," and Lafayette became "Major-General of the Federation," both of them under the authority of the Constitution.

In creating this national event as a military holiday, Bailly and Lafayette were pulling the rug out from under both the Jacobins and the Monarchists. Indeed, the Jacobins were quite upset with seeing their July 14 being taken over by the American faction, and charged that the Society of 1789 was a group of "Modern Machiavellians." The Monarchists were also unsuccessful in getting Marquis de Villette to call, on that day, for Louis XVI to become Emperor of France. According to Augustin Challamel, the Federation of July 14, 1790, "created, regardless of the oaths, a permanent antagonism between the constitutionals [Bailly, Lafayette, et al.] and the revolutionaries [Orléans, Robespierre, et al.], who were clinging to their principles" (p.420).

Challamel reported that the Club of the Federates had been created as a royalist anti-Orléanist military grouping which was attempting to establish a federation of states, "that is to say, a system which intended to turn the 83 departments of France into small equal states, supporting each other, in times of need, from one end of the country to the other, following the model of the United States of America." The Federation of July 14 was dissolved three years later by the Jacobin-controlled Convention (p.384).

27. The words of "Les Dettes" ("The Debts") were as follows:

The traitors to the nation fear the Federation:

That's their distress; but also for over a year, Liberty pursues its plan:

That's our consolation.

The time has come where forever their projects shall all be vanquished

That's their distress: And man this time shall establish Man in his rights:

That's our consolation.

It often happens that three return when two go to the woods,

Says the frivolous press; three orders were assembled, a wise abbot has made them one:

That's our consolation.

Some regret their ranks, Crosses, titles, and decorations:

That's their distress; The time of brilliant stage is ended, Let talent and virtue reign:

That's our consolation.

Less attention beyond all doubt shall be given to cordons and

Grand Crosses

That's their distress; but of laurels, or oak leaf prices, Upon merit shall glory reap;

That's our consolation.

We have seen some who sadly have merely uttered the sacred oath:

That's our own distress; we shall make it with a loud voice, from our mouth and from our heart:

That's our consolation.