

CHARLES GANILH'S *AN INQUIRY INTO THE VARIOUS SYSTEMS OF POLITICAL ECONOMY* AND SUBSEQUENT WRITING: ENGLISH AND FRENCH CONTEXTS

BY
WILLIE HENDERSON

Charles Ganilh (1758–1836) wrote at least three sizeable economics works and a number of published pieces on fiscal issues in France in the early part of the nineteenth century.¹ His three main works on economics are *Systèmes d'économie politique* (1809), *La théorie d'économie politique* (1815), and *Dictionnaire analytique d'économie politique* (1826).² *Systèmes d'économie politique* was translated into English by the economics writer, “D[aniel]. Boileau” and published by Henry Colburn in 1812. The full title of the translated work is given as *An Inquiry into the Various Systems of Political Economy; Their Advantages and Disadvantages and the Theory Most Favourable to the Increase in National Wealth*. The translation was noticed by T. R. Malthus and by J. R. McCulloch, both also engaged in creating new audiences for economic thinking—Malthus through his *Dictionary* and McCulloch through, for example, his *Discourse* (developed to support his teaching) and his association with the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. Peter Mesier, in New York, sold what may have been an American edition of Boileau's translation in the same year.³

This paper evaluates the translation as a foundation for the development of Ganilh's economic thinking and reviews briefly his later economics works as well as contexts for evaluating his contribution.

Director, Alworth Institute for International Studies at the University of Minnesota Duluth, and Emeritus Professor in the University of Birmingham (UK). Thanks to Luís Francisco Carvalho, Warren Samuels, and two anonymous reviewers for the *Journal* and editor Steven Medema for the encouragement to turn a note into an article.

¹Ganilh understood the fiscal conditions in Britain and was able to make a contribution to the debate on contrasts between Britain and France that took place in France after the Revolution (Ganilh 1806, Romani 2002). Any significant movement towards free-trade would involve tariff reform, as tariffs were a significant part on revenue for early nineteenth-century governments. Thought needs to be given to new sources of revenue when such changes are contemplated.

²The *Dictionary* was translated into Spanish in 1827 by Don Mariano Jose Sicilia.

³Peter A. Mesier (also a name of French origin) is known to have been working out of premises at 28 Wall Street from 1816. The business remained at that address for “more than thirty years,” www.oldandsold.com/articles14/new-york-60.shtml. Accessed September 28, 2007.

I. OVERVIEW: CONTEXTUALIZING GANILH AND HIS TRANSLATOR

According to the *New Palgrave*, Ganilh's "two works are respectively the first systematic history of thought and the first theoretically oriented dictionary of economics ever published" (Bridel 1987, p. 483). No mention is made of the translation and the volume published in 1815 is simply noted.⁴ Ganilh, who has been presented in some of the literature on him, as a "neo-mercantilist," is not given much attention in the *New Palgrave*. Bridel's judgment is that although the *Dictionnaire* exhibits a degree of sophistication in that "concepts" are "individually discussed in alphabetic order but also logically connected by means of a cross-reference system," the work is analytically impoverished (Bridel 1987, p. 483). Bridel's conclusion is that the works are only of very modest significance with respect to the development of economic ideas. Ganilh, as will be shown, did not claim otherwise.

Ganilh, in the "Plan of the Work" makes direct reference to the way in which "Opinions, arguments and controversies, have been heaped together, which by their variety and multitude embarrass and fatigue the mind. The difficulty of choosing among them disheartens the student and leaves him in doubt and uncertainty" (1812, p. 2). Ganilh is writing to help the novice understand the nature of the theoretical discussions that underpin a number of approaches to economics. His starting point is the target reader's perplexity at being faced with a range of theoretical arguments that are difficult to evaluate as science. He feels that the various "systems" of political economy "disagree in so many respects" (1812, p. 6) and that the consequences are "the discouragement of those who are desirous of studying the science, and the indifference of those whom a sense of duty should prompt to acquire the knowledge of it; hence also the little consideration which Political Economy enjoys in the world, and its total exclusion from the official routine of practical statesmen" (1812, p. 6).

Such arguments, as developed in the "Plan" are very similar to those later employed by Jane Marcet, Malthus (in the introduction and text of his *Principles* as well as in the preface to his *Definitions*), McCulloch in his *Discourse*, and later by Harriet Martineau, to justify their works on economics and economics education (Malthus 1820; 1827, p. vii; Henderson 1995, pp. 52, 53, 71). McCulloch, interested in the general utility of developing an understanding of economics, talks with astonishment of the fact "that the study of Political Economy is not even yet considered as forming the principal part in a comprehensive system of education" (McCulloch 1824, pp. 4–5). Like them, Ganilh is writing an evaluative text for a popular, though in his case, also an influential audience. Ganilh is clear that in undertaking the task of reviewing and ordering theories, "[t]he merit of originality will rarely be mine" (1812, p. 13) "and it is only because the utility of political economy seemed evident to me, both in a moral and political point of view, that I have investigated whatever I thought worthy to be considered as pertaining to the science, and calculated to simplify its study, to accelerate its improvement, and to insure its success" (1812, p. 14).

⁴I came across the translation by accident in an antiquarian bookshop near the British Museum in London.

Two out of the three authorial objectives are educational in force. His aims are the removal of “difficulties which I encountered when inclination led me to a science to which my previous studies and ordinary occupations had kept me a stranger” (1812, p. 13). Again, very like the motivations that Marcet (whose *Conversations on Political Economy* were influenced by her reading of J-B Say) and Martineau articulate for the development of their work. Ganilh is searching for a plan that “commands attention without fatiguing the mind; allows every separate portion to be examined without losing sight of the whole; and forms a picture which a person of the least discernment may readily contemplate in its full extent without being bewildered by the multitude of details” (1812, pp. 13–14). The intention of “forming a picture” and the construction of the target reader as “a person of least discernment” reinforces themes in common with Martineau, who delighted in her self-assessed capacity to paint, in words, economic pictures (Henderson 1995, pp. 69, 71). A review of the translation in America clearly identifies the target readers: “The legislator, and those who aspire at becoming legislators”; “the merchant who seeks to understand ... the vast importance of his profession”; “the student of political economy.” The reviewer holds that Ganilh’s book is “better suited for popular instruction, than the ‘Wealth of Nations’” (*American Review of History and Politics (ARHP)* 1812, October, p. 307).

Rather than engaging in fictionalized forms of economic life, Ganilh is undertaking an ordered review of systems of thought. Ganilh is not out-of step with the discussion in Britain where, for example, McCulloch also felt the need to review other systems when writing his *Discourse*. Ganilh is constructing, in his view, a simplified and evaluated text built around his own experiences as a novice reader. His aim is to foster a climate of opinion in support, in common with writers such as Jean-Baptiste Say, of a scientific approach to economic life. *Théorie* develops his interest in “science”—a notion of the subject maintained throughout Ganilh’s thinking, in common with Say and others at the time (Staum 1998, p. 95), but there seen as the confrontation of speculative philosophy with observation and experience. Ganilh’s *Dictionnaire*, published in 1826, maintains his commitment to “l’accès” and the “diffusion” of established knowledge in the belief that other writings (“catéchismes”; “épitomes,” “éléments”; “sommaires”) “sont trop savans pour ceux qui ne savent rien et pas assez pour ceux qui savent quelque chose” (are too knowledgeable for those who know nothing and not knowledgeable enough for those who already know something) (Ganilh 1826, pp. xxvij, xxij).⁵ The fact of a translation by the author of a popularizing work on political economy makes such a re-contextualization potentially available.

Ganilh’s intellectual concerns originate in a French debate. As a politician, Ganilh had a reputation for powerful oratory and for robust opposition to Napoleon’s legislation when he felt such opposition was justified (as for example, according to Holmberg, to drafts of the Code Civil) (Holmberg 2002). Ganilh maintained his support for the key ideas of the Revolution under different political circumstances and among those ideas was an act of 1791 which “made illegal all forms of restrictive trade corporations” (Jennings 2007). His writing strives for a set of principles that

⁵The translations here from French have been undertaken by the author and have been rendered into acceptable English rather than as literal translation.

would inform his political judgments. To establish such precise thought, he explores, and attempts to resolve, paradoxes (1812, pp. 7–8). He is interested that governments should at least understand the best economic advice, and hence, implicitly, that statecraft should be guided by something in addition to the French tradition of financial and administrative pre-occupations, to which Ganilh had already contributed. Ganilh hopes for a scientific political economy capable of being included in “the official routine of practical statesmen.”

This search for a set of economic principles as a guide to action and to form a basis for political economy was shared with figures such as J-B Say, Germain Garnier and F. L. A. Ferrier, though not necessarily with the same results (Steiner 1995, p. 209; Romani 2002, p. 359). In 1817, the highly experienced Comte d’Hauterive published a work that brings together the issue of the science of political economy and the “règles administratives” of the French administrative tradition (d’Hauterive, 1817). The wider socio-political and intellectual context of the work is that of the reception of Smith’s ideas in France after the Revolution and the working out of a system of economic thought that faces up, in some manner, to the aspirations of the Revolution and to “les principes de la science de l’administration” (Steiner 1995, p. 211). The key elements in this debate have been summarized as answering, in addition, the theoretical question: “Quels principes pour l’économie politique: Quesnay ou Smith?” (Béraud, Gislain, and Steiner 2004, p. 4).

Ferrier had attacked Smith in 1805 and had drawn attention to discordant theoretical voices as well as to the imprudence of a country giving “son argent en échange des produits des autres pays” (its money in exchange for the products of other countries) (Steiner 1995, pp. 209, 211; Maunier 1911, p. 486). Garnier (1796) had earlier reconsidered physiocratic thinking. Ganilh, in engaging in this wider conversation, draws upon an extensive and impressive range of sources from a number of countries and time periods, as well as upon recent economic literature in French. His French sources include: Richard Cantillon, Garnier, Canard, Etienne Condillac, François Véron de Forbonnais, Plumard de Dangeul, Baron de Montesquieu, Voltaire, J-B Say, François Quesnay, D’Avenant, and others.⁶ His Scottish sources include works by Sir James Steuart (in Ganilh’s view the best proponent of mercantilism), David Hume, Adam Smith, Adam Fergusson, and the Earl of Lauderdale, as well as the main English mercantilist writers. The intellectually active French context was still relevant for Marx when he undertook, later, his exploration of value in his *Theories of Surplus Value*. When Ganilh wrote *Systèmes*, the issue as to which system or systems were to form the basis for social analysis was an open one, as it was to some more limited extent in Britain.

Daniel Boileau, the translator of this work and a “naturalized Englishman,” is not himself considered, as far as I can establish, in the history of economic thought (Boileau, 1811, p vi).⁷ Even in the history of economics education, Boileau is largely invisible, with more attention being given to the pioneering women economics educators of the early years of the nineteenth century. In 1811, Boileau published a work entitled *An Introduction to the Study of Political Economy; or, Elementary*

⁶Although many of his sources appear in the list of Primary Sources consulted by Whatmore (2000) in the compilation of his work on *Republicanism and the French Revolution*, Ganilh’s book is not listed.

⁷He has a French name but seems to have come from Germany.

view of the manner in which the wealth of nations is produced, increased, distributed and consumed.⁸ Boileau made no claim to originality. His aim in his own book was to provide a “useful introduction to the standard treatise of *Adam Smith*” (Boileau 1811, p. ix). It is interesting to note that in preparing for this task he drew upon, “Professor Jacob’s text book for German universities” (Jacob, Ludwig H. von *Grundsätze der National Oeconomie* 1805 Halle) as well as upon “the *Edinburgh Review*,” and a range of other sources. Boileau felt that the “sense” of the term Political Economy needed to be restricted in the German manner to “national economy” and hence to investigations of “the means of providing a plentiful national income” (Boileau 1811, p. ix). This view is re-enforced in the plan of the work in which the following definition appears: “Political economy is the knowledge of the means by which nations are best enabled to provide a plentiful income for themselves” (1811, p. 2).

Like Ganilh, Boileau’s own text is aimed at “those to whom rank or fortune hold out the noble prospect of being one day called to legislate for their fellow subjects” and for his audience he “condensed the elements of a science on which so great a share of human happiness depends” (1811, p. v). This is a conventional target. The *Edinburgh Review* of July 1804 states that the “study of political economy” has “peculiar claims upon those who are born to a high interest in state affairs” (p. 343). Earlier he had published *An Essay on the Study of Statistics; containing a syllabus for lecturers* (Boileau 1807), suggesting that he had an interest in the production of educational, as well as translated, texts. He clearly had some entrepreneurial skills in arranging for the translation of Ganilh to be published in England and sold in New York. He had previous experience of publishing across national boundaries (see below). Boileau had just produced his own elementary text but he needed to continue to publish to supplement his income. It was difficult to find work as a tutor because of the “strong presumption that an imperfect acquaintance with the language of my adopted country renders me inadequate to the task of delivering either public or private lectures” (Boileau 1811, p. vi). In the American review of his translation of Ganilh published in October 1812, the reviewer notes that the “English version of this work is executed in rather a slovenly manner, in consequence of too great haste” perhaps, it could be suggested, a haste motivated by financial considerations, but also notes that “The translator shows himself, however, fully competent to the task” (*ARHP* October, 1812, p. 353).⁹ The British *Monthly Magazine* was yet more positive: “Our extracts demonstrate the ability of Mr. Boileau, in the arduous duty of transferring from one language to another, the verbal precision which belongs to this branch of knowledge” (*Monthly Magazine* 1812, p. 612).

⁸According to the British Biographical Index, Boileau was “a native of Berlin” who, after University studies at Halle, had resided in Paris until 1792 when he went to England where he became “naturalized.” He earned his living translating and developing French and German grammars of one sort or another. His textbook on Smith was noticed and pronounced to be “by Sir F. D’Ivernois and several other learned men to be of great importance in the study of this useful science.” See entries for Daniel Boileau in the Index. D’Ivernois was an exiled Swiss “printer, lawyer, economist and historian of Geneva” and an outspoken critic of Napoleon (Holmberg, 2004). He had, it seems, taken part in the Geneva rebellion of 1782 (Whatmore 2000, p. 11).

⁹The plans for the publication of a translation of Ganilh’s work are noted in the American magazine, *The Portfolio*, also of 1812 (*Portfolio* 1812, p. 393).

The “Advertisement” Boileau produced for the English edition makes his own interests clear. After a critical and political comment on Napoleon’s economic policy, Boileau states of Ganilh, “The impartiality and the soundness of the views which he displays in his work give it a particular claim to the attention of the English nation; and it is with the view to render its circulation more general, that I have attempted a translation.” Boileau’s indirect reference to Napoleon as a “ruler bent upon destroying commerce” reinforces the notion of Ganilh as an intellectual supporter of unrestricted commerce. More than that, it suggests that Ganilh’s book is an economic text with a secondary political purpose. In Britain, supported by the translator’s nudging, it could be taken up by those reviewers opposed to the consequences of the French Revolution or by those Whigs not opposed to the Revolution but who were not happy with Napoleon’s continental trade policy. Boileau may have been prompted into translating Ganilh by François D’Ivernois who held Ganilh in high esteem for his “true principles of civil administration” (*Monthly Review* 1809, p. 514; *Monthly Review* 1812, p. 421). D’Ivernois was very hostile to Napoleon and, despite his radical background, was “latterly an apologist for Britain” (Whatmore 2000, p. 136).

The anti-Napoleon context is allowed by the reviews both in the *Monthly Magazine* and in the *Monthly Review*. The *Monthly Magazine* is constrained:

We have been agreeably disappointed by the perusal of this work. We did not expect to receive much benefit from a Frenchman on political subjects, during the present vassalage of the press in France. Mr. Ganilh has, however, discussed all the topics of economical and financial science with freedom and ability; and has detected many errors and prejudices of English authors (1812, p. 612).

The *Monthly Review* is more strident: “had the voices of people like Ganilh been heard ‘in the cabinet’ then ‘Bonaparte’ would have been made aware of ‘the folly of wasting, in unprofitable warfare, that part of his population which was most likely to become useful in the capacity of productive labourers’” (1812, p. 419). This sentiment is pushed with respect to the translated text. The review notes that Ganilh “finds means to introduce a tone of animation to which Political Economy has seldom been deemed favourable” and, for evidence, provides this quote from Ganilh:

In vain do nations exert, fatigue and exhaust themselves in military, diplomatic, and commercial combinations, to obtain by cunning or force, a larger or smaller share of general wealth. Their efforts are abortive; the distribution of wealth follows the ratio of labour, manufactures and commerce; and as these obey neither force nor cunning, and only yield to equivalents, blind ambition will, necessarily, at last be obliged to submit to their peaceable rule (1812, p. 49).

The year 1811 was one of economic crisis and France’s policy was highly unpopular throughout Europe. Similar reasoning would apply to the market in the United States, hit much more severely than Great Britain, by the outcomes of mercantilist restrictions on trade. Boileau earned his income, later, largely as a writer by publishing grammatical works on French and German. Boileau had lived in Paris for some time and he continued his contacts with France (he may well have known Ganilh) during the Napoleonic Wars and was ready to publish an edited version of a literary work by Madame Cottin in Paris in 1810 and again in 1814 (Boileau 1810).

Having considered possible contexts, it is time to explore a number of aspects of *Systèmes* as it is presented to the reader in English. If it is the “first systematic history of thought” what makes it systematic and what supports a decision to classify the work in this way? What makes it, in Boileau’s judgment, “impartial”? It could be classified by arguments illustrated above, as an extended and systematic review article with essentially educational aims. The question is not one of exploring late eighteenth and early nineteenth century literature to see if it is in fact the first history of thought text but rather what is it in its construction that suggests that it is “systematic” in its approach. To answer this question it is necessary to say something not simply about content but the structure and method of analysis and presentation.

Other questions will be considered. Is the work merely derivative or is there something original in it? A final and related question is directed at the notion—found in various places including in the editor’s footnote to Marx’s quotation from the book that is published in *Grundrisse*—that Ganilh is a “neo-mercantilist.”¹⁰ This judgment is articulated in *Theories of Surplus Value* (1863). It is a judgment which, even if unimportant in its self, has tended to be applied to other aspects of Ganilh’s work and hence needs some exploration. Given the French intellectual climate at the time of its writing is this judgment supported by what is written in this text? Once this has been undertaken, the analysis will be extended to include *Théorie* and the *Dictionnaire* and will examine briefly the evolution of Ganilh’s thought.

II. WHAT MAKES THE TEXT SYSTEMATIC?

“Systematic” normally means ordered according to a clear set of principles or textual strategies. One aspect has already been considered. Ganilh is motivated by the desire to achieve a plan that is based upon the “analytical method” and so achieve his aims of coherence and simplification. The content of the work is the “various systems” and the aim is to review the systems through the headings “sources of wealth,” “labour,” “capitals,” “the circulation of commodities,” “revenue” and “consumption.” In some respects the systematic element, carried by the topics identified, could be considered as providing a prototype from which the *Dictionnaire* evolved. Ganilh maintains that political economy is motivated by “l’esprit de système” and so he would have wished system to be evident in his approach to writing (Ganilh 1826, p. j).

The various theories are those of mercantilists, of the Physiocrats (discredited during the course of the Revolution but resurfacing when Ganilh was writing) (Steiner 1995, p. 211), of Adam Smith, of Lauderdale and of his French contemporaries. The list of *dramatis personae* is extensive and more modern writers are also included. Ganilh presents textual evidence of having read widely in the earlier literature. It is this comprehensive nature of the review of “systems” of thought that makes it possible for Bridel to classify it as “the first systematic history

¹⁰Ganilh is quoted three times in the manuscript. The translations made of Marx’s notes on Ganilh for the English publication of Marx’s unpublished draft can be matched with Boileau’s though Nicolaus’s translation is into modern English. This means that the sense is the same but not necessarily the words chosen. Compare, for example, the Marx’s quotation from Ganilh in the version supplied by Nicolaus on page 259 with Boileau’s translation (pp. 255–56). There are variations, also, within the other two quotes.

of thought.” Ganilh provides direct excerpts from Quesnay and this is noted by Steiner as exceptional at the time (Steiner 1995, p. 219). Steiner also suggests that Ganilh’s interpretations of details are not always accurate.¹¹

The analysis is organized into “Books,” and each book is devoted to the exhaustive treatment of key element of one aspect such as the concept of labor and of capital, trade (“the circulation of the produce of labor by means of commerce”) and so on. Each book tends to have an introductory and concluding section and one aim is to find points of agreement (“All systems of political economy agree in making the national income consist in the produce of annual labour” (1812, p. 431)) and disagreement (“The French economists think”; “Adam Smith on the contrary teaches”; “Finally some authors condemn” (1812, pp. 442–43)). A sense of system then informs both the macro-structure of the text (the contents of Books and chapters and the overviews and final conclusions for each book) and micro-elements such as the sequence of head sentences just illustrated. It is not surprising that Frank William Taussig, writing in 1896, who saw Ganilh as a follower of Smith, thought that Ganilh’s text was “neat and lively, and shows the skill of the French in exposition” (1896, p. 157). Taussig overlooks the fact that Ganilh saw others as making a contribution and that the science had not yet, according to Ganilh, consolidated. Towards the end of the work, and in a spirit of hyperbole Ganilh writes:

The various systems of political economy, thus analysed, approximated, and discussed, form a focus of knowledge which sheds a most brilliant light on the science, brightens the path into the labyrinth of public and private wealth, and affords a glimpse of the end towards which it ought to be directed. The science has not yet, it is true, attained that degree of certainty and evidence which precludes all doubts and controversy among the learned, yet it is sufficiently advanced to prescribe rules of conduct that no country can neglect without rendering herself tributary to the nations by which they are observed (1812, p. 460).

III. WHAT MAKES IT “IMPARTIAL”?

The impartiality is partly guaranteed by the method of textual organization. Ganilh is concerned with evaluation. The necessity for impartiality, and for a systematic approach as well, arises because Ganilh is engaging in a scientific project, shared by others at the time, of articulating established and secure principles of what Steiner calls “la science de l’économie politique” (1995, p. 209). Ganilh’s primary concern is to be scientific. Shaping an abstract and covert political message, essentially that peace will restore commerce and hence prosperity, is a secondary and subordinate concern. Given what he sees as the range of propositions coming from different sources, Ganilh attempts to sort out points in common and points of difference. His method is “analytical” (1812, p. 13). Once a topic is identified, key elements of that topic are derived from a variety of authors and listed. Thus in the introductory section on trade, there are short quotes from Sir William d’Avenant, Hume, François

¹¹This essay will not attempt to evaluate the veracity of Ganilh’s understanding of Smith and Quesnay and the others cited.

Quesnay, Antonio Genovesi, and Smith, providing quotes on how similar subjects allow for direct comparison and such provision is one of his methods of approximation. The supreme importance of commerce is established by all of the quotes. What is in doubt, according to Ganilh, is “the principle, nature, progress, method, different modes, and numerous effects of this productive and beneficial circulation” (1812, p. 251). Ganilh’s text is therefore largely tied to, and inspired by his comprehensive sources. His method is to find points of similarity and difference. To the extent that it is based upon a core of agreed principles, it appears politically neutral.

Ganilh criticizes, for example, both Lauderdale and Adam Smith. In discussing Lauderdale’s idea of value and the notion of a distinction between private and public wealth, Ganilh says, “it will be seen that it was my duty to neglect no means to prevent the noble Earl’s opinion gaining any credit” (p. 436). His aim is to set forth points of agreement and disagreement and to try and make an evaluation of the differences. He evaluates Lauderdale as more critical of details in Smith than engaged in constructing a new system, a judgment that recalls statements made in the review of Lauderdale’s book—as indeed do his criticisms of Lauderdale’s distinction between public wealth and private riches—published in the *Edinburgh Review* of July, 1804, and known to Boileau.¹² In making evaluations he reaches conclusions based on his assessment of the propositions that he deems relevant. Smith’s views on the primacy of the division of labor are contrasted with Lauderdale’s argument in favor of the benefits derived from “the circumstance of supplanting and performing labour by capital” (1812, p. 131). Among other things, on historical grounds Lauderdale disputes Smith’s notion that workers in the course of specialization made independent contributions to the development of machines. Ganilh repeats his concern for truth and for science:

I thought it my duty not to omit any of the numerous considerations which Lord Lauderdale has supposed calculated to discredit the division of labour, that main pillar of the doctrine of Adam Smith; because it is of essential importance not to leave any doubts on this part of the science, and because it is equally dangerous to abandon oneself to a blind credulity, or to shut one’s eyes to certain and positive truths (1812, p. 135).

Ganilh has to make an evaluation of the distinctions and this he does by treating machines as “more diligent, more active, and less expensive labourers,” in the spirit of Lauderdale, and noting that the “division of labour” is the “undertaker that directs them”—a helpful synthesis (1812, p. 137). He does not reflect upon possible social conflicts (in the short-run) of such a view.

It is also the case that Ganilh is not over-awed by Smith however much he admires him consistently as the creator by “un seul jet” (all at once) of political economy (Ganilh 1826, p. j). By elevating commerce, Ganilh also elevates the returns to commerce and reinstates its productive status. Nor is he over-awed by J-B Say for that matter. Say is criticized for his views, set out in *Economie Politique*, on the

¹²Lauderdale was sympathetic to the French Revolution and this may have been a reason for Ganilh’s interest.

comparative productivity of slave labour (1812, pp. 148–49).¹³ Ganilh's notion of human motivation are more in line with Adam Smith's view of both slavery and motivation as set out in *Lectures on Jurisprudence(A)* and in *The Wealth of Nations* and in line with Smith's view of "ambition" and self-regard as set out the *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. Ganilh sees the free laborer operating under the attractions of "pleasure, vanity and ambition," a set of influences suggestive of the *Theory of Moral Sentiments* (p. 148). He also suggests that Say's own position is undermined by Say's observation that the slave master only incurs expense enough "barely" to keep the slave alive. Ganilh's evaluation of Say's proposition is interesting for it shows that Ganilh's income-expenditure approach (see below) is deeply-held:

It is impossible that the free labourer should expend more and produce less than the slave. Greater expences suppose a larger produce; for at no time and in no country, can anything be obtained for nothing. Every expence supposes an equivalent produced to meet that expence. If the free labourer expends more than the slave, the produce of his labour must be more considerable than that of the labour of the slave (p. 149).

Although Ganilh appears radical, he modifies his conclusions with respect to the existing state of the "colonial system" (1812, p. 150). Human nature is general but its particular expression is moulded by historical circumstance and institutional arrangements. There is a sense of the persistence of what ought to be, to borrow a double-phrase from both Hume and Smith, outmoded "customs and manners." On this basis, he does not advocate the abolition of slavery, which seems curious in a convinced Republican. He also makes a point about generalizations from "theory" and "experience":

set the slave free, and it is more than probable that when he is no longer impelled by fear, he will be little excited to labour by the sentiment of private interest; the repose which he wished for, will be to him the supreme good, and the need of labouring for his subsistence will perhaps not easily interrupt the enjoyment of this repose. It is therefore impossible to one the maxims and principles which suit the other, or to derive from two particular instances a general rule applicable to all cases. (1812, pp. 151–52).

Slavery was not finally abolished in France's colonies until 1840, Ganilh later constructs Smith as being of two minds with respect to the advantages and disadvantages of colonies (1822, p. 282).

While Ganilh praises Smith, he also criticizes where he feels that it is appropriate. To this extent his stand in the early work predicts the stand that Ganilh will later take in the *Théorie* where his concern is to subject philosophical speculation to empirical investigation. On the contrast between productive and unproductive labor, he is scathing: "Adam Smith, who triumphantly refuted the paradox of the exclusive productiveness of agricultural labour, completely revived it

¹³Ganilh makes an analysis of institutional behaviors and while is not inclined towards the idea of slavery, introduces an ambiguity: "although it appears demonstrated, that the labour of the free man is more advantageous than that of the slave, it is perhaps equally true, that, in the present colonial system, the labour of the slave is more advantageous than that of the free man" (1812, p. 152).

by accusing of unproductiveness any labour which, after it is over, does not fix and realize itself in some permanent object” (1812, p. 87). Ganilh insists on the exchange-relationship. Lauderdale found Smith’s views on this division simply absurd. Ganilh’s position seems to be in tune with the judgment, made in the *Edinburgh Review*, that Smith having shown the productivity of sectors other than agriculture is simply and unwittingly carried back “to the theory of the Economists” (1804, p. 357). Ganilh is consistent. In the *Dictionnaire* he talks of “la subtile controverse du travail productif, du travail stérile, et du travail plus ou moins productif; controverse qui n’est pas encore finie, mais qui ne peut pas longtemps compliquer la science” (the subtile controversy of productive and unproductive labor and of work more or less productive; a controversy that is not yet finished, but which cannot for much longer complicate the science) (Ganilh 1826, p. 398). Significantly, Ganilh holds that a properly developed value theory would resolve the issue.

Lauderdale is not condemned wholesale. According to Ganilh, Lauderdale “triumphantly overturns” Smith’s “notion of an immutable standard-measure of value” (1812, p. 264).¹⁴ Ganilh is clear that so-called unproductive labor can be exchanged for material production or for money. His view of human motivation is not quite based on Smith’s *The Wealth of Nations* propensities, but on a motivational range reminiscent also of *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*: “If man’s propensity to truck and barter, or rather his desire of enjoyment and happiness, promotes the circulation of the produce of labour . . .” (1812, p. 275). This type of argument is dismissed by Malthus with respect to wealth creation, “so long as the definition is confined to material objects” (1820, p. 45). Ganilh, though maintaining his largely unqualified stance against the notion of “productive” and “unproductive” labor, also quotes Malthus with approval in the *Dictionnaire*. He shows, in his entry on “Travail,” that Malthus thinks that the line drawn between “productive” and “unproductive” is, under certain circumstances, too fixed (Ganilh 1826, p. 424).¹⁵ Ganilh’s early views on productive and unproductive labor and other issues, from the translated version, continued to be cited, albeit sporadically and only in passing, in American literature up until 1840.

Ganilh also evaluates some of Lauderdale’s arguments, including the role of capital-deepening in the growth of trade and prosperity, positively (1812, p. 275). His judgment on Lauderdale: “the criticisms of the noble Lord rather tend to subvert the established system, than to create a new one” (p. 70)—are ironic, for the analytical method adopted makes it difficult for Ganilh to offer, in his overall conclusion to his own work, a coherent synthesis. What emerges therein is the significance of “general labour” (see below) and of “economy” (meaning savings) as a sound basis for economic life.

Ganilh reaffirms his belief in a market approach to the question of balance between different types of labor, “As long as productive labourers pay freely and

¹⁴Boileau mentions that “Personal services are productive indirectly, as far as they cause other individuals to produce a greater value than what the consumption of those who perform these services amounts to” (Boileau 1811, pp. 192–93). He cites as his source an article in the *Edinburgh Review* rather than Ganilh. Ganilh was not alone in challenging the distinction but he works it up further. Boileau does not explore the income-generating capacity of services in the way that Ganilh does.

¹⁵Malthus is mentioned in the *Dictionnaire* under the entries for “Machines,” “Maximum,” “Profits,” and “Travail.”

spontaneously for such frivolous labours, we need not fear that they will exceed the bounds within which they ought to be confined for the good of private and public wealth” (pp. 90–91; see also p. 465). With the exception of luxury and pomp (“luxury” in such a context normally suggests a potential for “decadence” as well as for gross inequalities) often associated with “sovereigns or rulers of states,” “every kind of labour is necessarily productive” (1812, p. 91). Ganilh insists that, “all salaries, when paid freely and voluntary, are the price of a service” and that we need to look at “their concurrence with another labour.” In this respect, “enjoyments” are productive for they “induce” other laborers, “to bestow more attention, application, and care, on their labours” (1812, p. 464). Ganilh’s approach is potentially market-led in as much as willingness to pay indicates value and this he traces through with respect to demand (“enjoyments”) and the productive outcomes in terms of an increased capacity to supply human effort. He is aware that there are differing degrees of productivity of labour and that different resource endowments in different countries will suggest a range of productivities, though he writes, with a hit of mercantilism, in terms of absolute advantage:

Were nations reasonable and alive to their true interests, they would all direct their labour exclusively to the produce which they can obtain in greatest plenty, at the lowest price, and which is sure to find a ready sale every where, because all other countries are deprived of it, or cannot raise it but at great expence and of an inferior quality (1812, p. 467).

This insight in turn feeds directly into his support for commerce as stimulating demand and his distrust of monopolies.

IV. ECONOMIC INSIGHT, MERCANTILISM, AND THE FRENCH CONTEXT

Some of the questions that Ganilh thinks are significant seem, at first sight, wide of the mark. The question that terminates Book I is such a one: “The only problem which is actually to be resolved, is this:—Of those three causes, labour, capitals, and commerce; which is best calculated to produce public and private wealth?” (1812, p. 72). This phrase gives the impression of inputs that do not combine and of an analysis or set of understandings that are not integrated. It is an approach also adopted by Lauderdale. However, this elemental approach, central to Ganilh’s method, supports his conclusion that the systems essentially vary in detail and not in the view taken of the significance of key inputs. It also allows him to see the significance of commerce to the application of labor and for the direction of capital, an aspect of his work that has some claim to originality. He furthers his analysis of commerce in both of his later works. If it is accepted that classical political economy tended to start analytically with production, as in J-B Say’s formulation, then Ganilh is starting with an understanding of consumption. McCulloch, in his essay on *A Treatise on the Principles, Practice and History of Commerce*, published by the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge and hence also a work that seeks new audiences for political economy, makes a point that has much in common with Ganilh: “Facility of exchange is, in truth, the vivifying principle, the very soul of industry; and no

interruption is ever given to it without producing the most ruinous consequences” (1833, p. 2).

Ganilh’s review of the historical sources is thorough in the sense that he includes mercantilist writing and other pre-Smithian writing from a number of authors and countries. Marx thought enough of the works to include three quotes from it in his notebooks though Marx also expressed the view that Ganilh was a “vulgar” economist.¹⁶ Ganilh contributed through this work, to the re-evaluation, and eventual decline, of physiocratic economic thinking in France in the early years of the nineteenth century (Steiner 1995, p. 210). Ganilh states that he includes the Physiocrats only because of “the apology which one of our most esteemed writers [Garnier] on political economy, has lately made of this system” (1812, p. 75).¹⁷ There are some significant insights, such as Ganilh’s market-led discussion, highlighted by Marx, of the ways in which unproductive labor combines with productive labor to encourage increases in output or his sense of a market allocation of scarce labor resources based on willingness to pay. Ganilh locates all labor in the domain of product exchange and hence holds that all exchanged labor is income generating and hence wealth producing both directly and indirectly. The inclusion of all paid labor in productive labor distinguishes his work from that of Smith and his followers. At the same time, Ganilh has a very robust view, which he feels contrasts with that of Smith, on the role of commerce as a means of shaping and stimulating demand:

Commerce is not only the instrument of the interchange of commodities; it is its promoter, its instigator, and frequently its sole cause. It is by constantly exhibiting to all producers fresh enjoyments, by exciting their desires, flattering their taste, or gratifying their appetite, that commerce stimulates them to labour, develops their industry, keeps them in continual activity, and forces them as it were to augment the mass of their production, and to give them infinite variety and the highest degree of perfection (pp. 475–76).

Here “all producers” refers to laborers as well as capitalists. In this succinct statement of the benefits of commerce, Ganilh, though pithier than McCulloch, is less exhaustive than him. Ganilh sees the economy as demand driven. All free exchanges are mutually beneficial, an insight that he almost throws away, in the final chapter, through political statements disguised as moralizing (1812, p. 485). Even here judgment must be made with caution. Ganilh prefigures the world of international commerce ushered in by the end of the Napoleonic Wars.

The economy, given his interpretation, is driven by demand rather than by supply. A development of this thinking would have been a challenge to the emergence of production-led notions, such as “Say’s law” of what drives an economic system. It is

¹⁶Marx’s notion of “vulgar” economists can be approached through the idea of economic thinking that is merely a manifestation of the interests and prejudices of the capitalist and of capitalism. Vulgar economists content themselves with “systematising in a pedantic way, and proclaiming for everlasting truths, the banal and complacent notions held by the bourgeois agents of production about their own world, which is for them the best possible one.” Such thinking was superficial and not rooted in production relationships (Marx 1976, pp. 174–175n, 871). Marx also thought that some of Ganilh’s views were so much ‘twaddle’.

¹⁷Garnier’s construction of physiocratic thought was also later considered vulgar by Marx.

for this reason that he is suspicious of “obstructions, restraints and prohibitions” (1812, p. 476). While focusing on scientific argument, the “rien-dit” (that which is not said) here is Napoleon’s Continental System. Napoleon was not well-versed in political economy and was opposed to economic as well as political liberalism. His war aims were essentially mercantilist in nature and linked to his suspicion of paper money and his perceived need to obtain gold (Lacour-Gayet 1968, pp. 255, 256; O’Rourke 2005, p. 8). The Continental System set of a chain of mercantilist reactions, the outcome of which was a reduction in trade world-wide and related changes in the relative prices of imports and exports (O’Rourke 2005, p. 19). Napoleon, ever fearful of bread riots, also based his domestic economic policies on extensive economic regulation. It is of some importance for a careful economic and political evaluation of the work whether Ganilh is or is not a mercantilist.

Ganilh, with some relief, rejoices in the fact that “the price of labour is, after all, independent of human passions and combinations” (1812, p. 160). All labor is equal in this respect—such an outcome is in keeping with Ganilh’s republican values, hence the sense of relief—and the price finds its limits, in line with Smith’s thinking, “in the demand for labour; and this demand is constantly in proportion to the progressive, stationary, or retrograde state of national wealth” (see, for example, *WN*, I.xi.e. 35).¹⁸ Notions of baseness or indolence or other emotionally-charged judgments on different types of labour are thereby sidestepped.

Like Smith, he is concerned with the influence the wealthy have on consumption patterns, but Ganilh, drawing on an Italian source, is explicit about his views on equality and its impact on demand:

But it is more conducive to general wealth, that all orders of the community be in easy circumstances, than a few individuals should enjoy excessive affluence. The diffusion of wealth favours consumption, accelerates the circulation of productions, and causes all kinds of manufactures and trade to prosper. The concentration of wealth maintains but few kinds of industry and trades, and plunges the remainder of the people into indigence and despair (1812, pp. 149–50).

This insight, again, reinforces the demand-driven nature of Ganilh’s insight, even if he is incapable of constructing a full-scale analysis around it. Ganilh was a Republican and in this passage he asserts his concerns for economic equality and opportunity and the compatibility of free circulation with economic justice.

Although Ganilh modifies economic propositions, his conclusions to Book IV of *Systèmes* are translated clear and unhedged:

The different methods of circulating the produce of labour, such as corporations and privileged companies, the monopoly of colonial commerce, exclusive commercial treaties, and every combination that has been contrived to give another direction to the course of commerce, when it is supposed unfavourable or less beneficial, or to enlarge it when supposed to be favourable, are as many obstacles which restrict and skackle (*sic*) the progress of commerce, and are equally fatal to public and private wealth (1812, p. 430).

¹⁸Ganilh used the 1805 edition of *The Wealth of Nations*.

And his overview conclusion is equally bold, “In short, nations ought not to forget that the circulation of the produce of labour is always beneficial, and that the only way to reap all its benefits is to render commerce safe, free, easy and general” (1812, p. 430). There is not much in the way of “the static conception of economic life” that underpins mercantilism there (Heckscher 1922, p. 10) nor of the regulatory framework that underpinned the Continental System. For Ganilh, trade is expansive and mutually beneficial and always “more profitable and advantageous, the less it is confined and obstructed, and the more it is general” (1812, p. 418). Ganilh’s final paragraph is depicting a world in which “All advance by the side of each other without elbowing, without injuring, without crushing each other. All are benefited by their reciprocal efforts, and all owe their success to their general cooperation” (1812, p. 486). The notion that Ganilh pursued an analysis in support of the “restrictive system” is not one that is generally upheld by evidence drawn for this text. The liberal system of exchange was to remain an ideal for Ganilh even if he came to understand, in future works, that it required moderation in given circumstances.

There is also to be explored, the suggestion that he is a “neo-mercantilist.” “Neo-mercantilism” is just as hard to define as “mercantilism” but perhaps it could be accepted as an ongoing concern for finding a positive (pro-active) role of the state, nation or government in the creation of wealth.¹⁹ In such a context, how Ganilh treats the possibilities of manipulating “commerce,” particularly as revealed by his later writing, would seem to have central significance. Is Ganilh’s starting point a liberal Smithian economy or a state-directed mercantile one? In the context of his *Systèmes*, in translation Ganilh, who played a significant part in French political life, is interested in specifying a precise and analytically informed role for an enlightened state. He finds Smith ambiguous:

Adam Smith is not more consistent than the Economists. He laughs at a statesman who should attempt to direct the employment of the capital of the nation, and yet he points out the conduct government ought to pursue, to encourage manufactures necessary for the defence of the country, to facilitate the exportation of the manufactured produce, and to favour the importation of the raw produce to which the manufacturer superadds his labour (1812, p. 9).

He is not naïve about the relationship between sound government and wealth creation (p. 11). The outcome of Book III is that the “best thing enlightened and prudent governments can do” when there are economic problems relating to the balance between public and private wealth, “is to remove the accidental causes which may hasten the decline or impede the progress of national wealth” (p. 248; see also pp. 9–11). It is hard to see how the notion of “neo-mercantilism” relates to the general tenor of the ideas set out in the system as translated.

However, the basis for Marx’s classification of Ganilh as a “neo-mercantilist” is not related to the nature of economic power and possible manipulations of international trade available to states. Neither is it based upon any policy stand that Ganilh may have taken in other, political, contexts (such as the Continental

¹⁹Keynes rehabilitated the mercantilist method of thinking as an exercise in practical statecraft (Keynes 1936, p. 340). It is clear that Ganilh sees a need for practical statecraft in his text but he tends to urge caution on governments with respect to activity in relation to trade and the level of the rate of interest.

Blockade). It is based rather on Ganilh's rejection of the idea of productive and unproductive labor and in Ganilh's view of money as a commodity. Marx identifies Ganilh as holding a "mercantilist conception of exchange and exchange-value" (Marx 1863, pp. 359–61) and hence on his rejection of Smith's views on productive and unproductive labor. Ganilh certainly thought that a proper theory of value would sort out the issues. Ganilh's views of duality in Smith, influenced the development of Marx's views on labor and exchange value.

The notion of "neo-mercantilism" in Ganilh has to be set, however, within the idea of free circulation of trade that is a feature of all of his writings. Ganilh seems to be consistent with respect to his support for free exchange. "Neo-mercantilism" suggests that it is a revised form of mercantilism, whereas the general tenor of Ganilh's writing overall suggests a revision of the notion of classical economics as exemplified by Smith. Ganilh, as will be shown in the final section of this paper, maintains Smith as a reference point for his analysis.

There is also the question as to how far his disagreement with Smith's views on the nature of labor undermines other aspects of Smith's thought. Ferrier, who stood, according to Romani, for administrative intervention, "against the pretension of universality of political economy" and which had much in common with "le protectionnisme des écrivains administratifs du XVIIIe siècle" (Romani 2002, p. 360; Maunier 1911, p. 486) stands in contrast to Ganilh's work of 1809. Ferrier starts with and remains focused on "la science de l'Administration," dismissed Smith as a Professor of *belles-lettres* and as someone who betrayed his principles when he accepted a post in the customs (Ferrier 1822, xij). Essentially Ferrier locates his thinking historically according to "des temps, des lieux et des homes" (Ferrier 1822, p. x). Ganilh takes Smith seriously and contrasts Smith's thought both with those of the Physiocrats and with experience and empirical evidence, more especially in the *Théorie*.

Ganilh is probably better classified, given the evidence of this translation, as a liberal supporter of a modified Smithian approach insofar as his initial work is concerned. He is, however, a supporter who finds detailed points of criticism in Smith's writing and who accepts the possibility of an active role for government. Ganilh is interested in the freeing of trade and interested in looking forward to a world where trade can play its innovative role without Napoleonic restrictions. He is also interested in the possibility of a positive role for government based on sound economic reasoning and experience. Ganilh's Smith is that of *The Wealth of Nations* as a whole, with a dash of *Theory of Moral Sentiments* as well. Boileau is sympathetic toward Ganilh because Boileau's own thought was influenced, as established earlier, by notions of national economy. Recognizing, by reference to Hume's *History of England*, the difficulties of acquiring "the principles of commerce" as compared to the simple insights needed for the "administration of justice," Ganilh nevertheless writes:

But it ought not to be supposed that a government intimately acquainted with the interests of a country, and attentive to follow the progress and direction of private industry, should be utterly unable to invigorate the impulse of this industry when it happens to be beneficial, to prevent its aberrations when they might prove hurtful, or to lead it into more enlarged, more extensive, and more profitable channels. *Elizabeth*

in England, *Richelieu*, and above all *Colbert* in France, are for ever entitled to the gratitude of their country and the veneration of all enlightened ages (1812, p. 8).

Ganilh's general orientation towards government action is that "It is only when a government is deficient in knowledge that its absolute inactivity is desirable" (p. 10).

The prospect towards which he is gazing is that of economics as an applied subject capable of guiding decision makers: "How greatly do they err, who suppose political economy a stranger to politics, legislation, and government, and judge it possible to have good laws with a bad system of political economy, or a good system of political economy with bad laws!" (1812, p. 11). Ganilh is concerned with the question of, to use a modern-day term, "governance." He is also in his first work, looking towards the restoration of commerce as a peacetime activity, free of Napoleonic restrictions though this is left implicit. He returns to the theme of "good" and "bad" laws, later in the text, especially in the summary chapters at the end of the "Books"—for example, at the end of the "Conclusion of the Second Book" he writes, "These happy results ought to encourage philosophical inquirers in their meditations, enlighten legislators in their labours, and guide practical statesmen in the choice of their measures" (p. 161).

V. MERCANTILISM AND GANILH'S WORKS AS A WHOLE

His works on political economy progressed from its starting point in the evaluation of various systems. His *Théorie* and his *Dictionnaire* still hold Smith's system in esteem but continue to modify some of Smith's doctrines in an act of refinement in the same approach (though not necessarily the same content) as McCulloch, Malthus, and Ricardo. His concern in the *Théorie* is transparent. His general concerns can be summed up, without too much violence, as: "Can all countries develop in the same manner, guided by the same set of philosophical speculations?" Boileau correctly identified the theme of national development in his earlier translation. Smith remains for Ganilh the most interesting of the "speculative" philosophers.

Ganilh's *Dictionnaire* is constructed as such with entries following in alphabetical order—to provide "la nomenclature de la science" with "clarté et simplicité" in the spirit of "les encyclopédistes" (Ganilh 1826, p. xxv). It is a continuation of the educational and systematic exploration that was first developed in his *Systèmes*. Ganilh sets out, at some length, the same educational concerns that moved him to produce his *Systèmes*, well aware of the derivative element in his writing: "Les livres ont fait les dictionnaires, et les dictionnaires ont fait les livres" ("Books have made dictionaries and dictionaries have made books," though this is probably better translated as "Books make dictionaries and dictionaries make books") (Ganilh 1826, p. xxv). Malthus's *Definitions* (published in 1827) consists of a review of the conceptual language and apparatus of the main contemporary British economists. It is more, in terms of format like Ganilh's *Systèmes* than his *Dictionnaire* and more parochial than both.²⁰ Both writers are concerned with methodological and practical

²⁰This raises an intriguing question: Was Malthus's *Dictionary* inspired in some sense by Ganilh's earlier work?

issues. Malthus's interests are made clear in the long title of his *Principles: The Principles of Political Economy considered with a View to their Practical Application* (1820). The revisions that Ganilh makes in Smith's doctrines are not inconsistent with revisions made elsewhere.

Maunier judged that Ganilh developed as "le plus intéressant des théoriciens du protectionnisme," ("the most interesting of the theorists of protectionism") without doing major violence to the general notions of classical economics (Maunier 1911, p. 489). Indeed, it is clear that Maunier also supports the idea that Ganilh, in 1809, "croyait que la liberté des échanges suffisait à assurer le progrès économique de chaque peuple" (believed that the freedom of exchange was sufficient to assure the economic progress of each nation) (Maunier 1911, pp. 491–92). It is in his later works, *Théorie* and the *Dictionnaire*, where we can presume that he progressively developed his own "voice," that the protectionist stance is developed. He appears to be convinced about the value of "le commerce extérieur" and indeed rejects Smith's understanding of the prior significance of internal trade over external trade (Maunier 1911, p. 490; Ganilh 1822, pp. 239–40). Smith's view of the progression of "natural" development was part of his artillery against the "retrograde" policies of mercantilism. Ganilh's elevation of external trade and his interest in attempting to manipulate it for developmental purposes suggests "la nécessaire intervention de l'Etat en matière de commerce extérieur, notamment des tarifs de douane" ("the essential intervention of the State with respect to external trade, especially with respect to tariffs") (Béraud, Gisland, and Steiner 2004, p. 8). This suggests a mercantilist orientation. Ganilh's protectionism is, in my view, a path towards "l'égalité des nations" and so "la liberté illimitée du commerce" is maintained as the ideal outcome of the development process (Ganilh 1826, p. 147; Maunier 1911, p. 492).

Ganilh's arguments for protectionism are limited; "Mais on doit sentir que ce système, tout prudent qu'il est, ne peut et ne doit être que temporaire et doit finir avec les causes qui l'ont fait établir et qui le justifient" ("But one must understand that this system, useful as it is, is not and must not be anything other than temporary and must finish with the ends which are to be achieved and which justify the system") (Ganilh 1826, pp. 146–47). The aim is to promote "une heureuse émulation parmi les producteurs" (a happy emulation among producers), and is essentially an infant-industry argument, an argument that can be encompassed within classical liberal thought as it is in Mill (Ganilh 1826, p. 146; Mill 1848, p. 922). Mill exempted the Navigation Acts (a protectionist measure) from economic evaluation on grounds of defence, though he thought the exception "invidious."

It is interesting to note that Ganilh analyzed the Navigation Acts in his *Dictionnaire* and had no doubt of their efficacy from the English point of view in providing in the end a competitive advantage to English shipping even in their withdrawal. His entry under "Systèmes" (1826) considers mercantilism as erroneous. In his own mind he is not engaged in modifying mercantilist principles. The section is cross-referenced to "Primes" and "Navigation." Ganilh adds a rider that "ces faveurs ne doivent être maintenues que pendant le temps nécessaire pour mettre toutes les branches de l'industrie en état de soutenir la concurrence étrangère dans tous les marchés" (these privileges must only be maintained up to the time needed to put all branches of industry in a state capable of sustaining foreign competition in all markets). He adds, with more than a hint of irony: "Déjà l'Angleterre, qui se trouve

dans cette situation, donne aux autres peuples l'exemple de la liberté générale du commerce, comme elle leur avait donné l'exemple de ses prohibitions et de ses restrictions (V. Navigavion)" (already England, which finds itself in such a situation, shows other nations the example of free trade just as she gave them the example of prohibitions and restrictions) (Ganilh 1826, p. 397). Ganilh appreciated, as did Smith though in a differing sense, the significance of stages in the development of economic life.

He also analyzed "Colonies" (part of the mercantilist set of discussions) and concluded that since the independence of the Americas, "l'on est disposé à croire que la liberté du commerce général est préférable à son asservissement partiel" (people are disposed to think that the liberty of trade is preferable to partial enslavement) though he remains convinced of their profitability (Ganilh 1826, pp. 119–20). He does not appear to make a mercantilist defense of colonies nor of colonial monopolies. Overall, although he sees mercantilism (and, indeed, physiocracy) as outmoded, he has a foot in both camps. Ganilh does not conceptualize his stance as based upon outmoded mercantilist doctrine but on contemporary "science."

Ganilh also argues that trade prohibitions should not be general but selective and never placed on products that are of a different nature from those of the national economy concerned (1815, p. 228). This is of course a distinction that a mercantilist such as Mun would have recognized. In the *Dictionnaire*, he makes positive or descriptive statements: "Par les douanes ils préservent le marché national de l'invasion des produits étrangers" (By tariffs the national market is protected from the influx of foreign products) (Ganilh 1826, p. 148), recognizes that there are disagreements: "On est divisé sur l'utilité et l'efficacité de ces mesures" (There is disagreement on the utility and effectiveness of these measures), and recommends that if they do not work towards appropriate ends, that the "mesures factices et illusaires" (artificial and illusory measures) should be removed (Ganilh 1822, p. 228; 1826, p. 148). He does not specify how the judgments should be made nor consider the political forces that may attempt to prevent policy change. Such changes are, given what we know of reform in the modern world, likely to be politically difficult to obtain. Tariffs as a source of revenue and of protection were hotly debated in Britain before the withdrawal of duties on hundreds of items in the reforms made between 1841 and 1846 (Kindleberger 1975, pp. 200, 11). Ganilh spotted the link between economic reform and financial reform, a link experienced in Great Britain and evidenced by Parnell's *Financial Reform* published in 1830. His approach to subsidies is to the point and nicely illustrates his thinking:

Le protecteur naturel de toute industrie productive est le consommateur de ses produits, et si cette protection ne lui suffit pas, on voudrait inutilement y suppléer par des primes, ou, ce qui est la même chose, par des tributs imposés sur toute la population pour la satisfaction d'un petit nombre de consommateurs. Dans ce cas, il faut s'en tenir rigoureusement au principe établi par Adam Smith (The natural proctor of all productive industry is the consumer and if this protection is not sufficient it would be useless to supplement it by subsidies, or, what is the same thing, by taxation imposed on all of the people for the benefit of a small number of consumers. In this case it is essential to hold firmly to the principle established by Adam Smith) (1826, pp. 340–41).

This would seem to be a robust statement of the effects of competition. Ganilh reinforces his judgment with a direct quote in French from a translation of Smith. The translation is not easy to identify but seems to be a version of the final sentence of Smith's discussion of the natural distribution of capital between home and foreign production (*WN*, II.v.31). The principle is not absolute, "sans exception et sans restriction." Taussig, writing at the end of the nineteenth century, held that with respect to capital theory, Ganilh merely paraphrases Smith (Taussig 1896, p. 157). In the English version of his first work, Ganilh is clear that "The theory of capitals is new, and entirely of Adam Smith's creation" (Ganilh 1812, p. 162).

According to Ganilh, "toutes les branches d'industrie" were established initially by restrictions (Ganilh 1826, pp. 341, 397). Ganilh's suggestions in the rest of the entry seem to meet Mill's criteria for "a fair trial" (Mill 1848, p. 922). His aims are developmental and he accepts that it is necessary to start with scientific doctrine without being doctrinaire. His argument for export subsidies is based on similar reasoning: a new product exported to a new market overseas will involve high risk. Off-setting the risk will bring benefits, making an irregular trade, regular. Given Ganilh's concern for proper and considered ways of thinking, he approaches the topic through concerns that legislators need to act with a degree of intellectual discrimination based on the relationship between principles and the facts of experience. Malthus also held "that a propensity to govern too much is a certain indication of ignorance and rashness" (Malthus 1820, p. 16).

According to the American editor of the fifth edition of the "internationally esteemed" J-B Say's *Treatise on Political Economy* (Philadelphia, 1832), Ganilh is one of the continental writers who rejected the "restrictive system" (mercantilism) and accepted the "doctrines of the freedom of trade and the rights of industry."²¹ The word ordering gets it right. The claim, in 1832, was that this coupling was generally supported by British and European political economists including Malthus and Ricardo. J. S. Mill refers to this kind of thinking as "a sort of compromise between free trade and restriction" (1848, p. 921). Boileau's translation brought his initial work to foreign audiences and his other publications were no doubt read as a result in contexts where the formation of a "national economy" based upon industrial development. In France, Ganilh could support the growth of industry as a challenge to what he saw as the outmoded elitism of Bourbon society—a society intent on destroying the Revolution (*Monthly Review* 1823, p. 495)—just as his promotion of "commerce" challenged the war-like pre-dispositions of Napoleon's France. J-B Say similarly disliked both Napoleon and the restored monarchy (Whatmore 2000, p. 194). United States policy was judged by McCulloch to be under the "noxious influence" of the "exploded sophisms of the mercantile system" (McCulloch 1833, p. 54). McCulloch's view, consistently maintained in his writing, in contrast to Ganilh, is that protectionism is simply retrograde.

Ganilh is motivated throughout by a desire to educate as well as to advise governments in practical contexts. Contrasting "la loi générale de l'administration"

²¹This is in contrast with the entry into the 1911 edition of the *Encyclopedia*. This states that "Ganilh is best known as the most vigorous defender of the mercantile school in opposition to the views of Adam Smith and the English economists" ("Ganilh, Charles" retrieved from the World Wide Web). Even with respect to later writings this seems an extreme judgment.

with the scientific insight is part of his general method, added to in *Théorie* by his use of statistical information. This is exemplified by his treatment of monopoly where he distinguishes a case based on an assessment of commercial risk in foreign trade or the rewards to scientific innovation from the case of “monopole ordinaire” (1826, pp. 305–306, 308). His political instincts are to look to particular circumstances and to remedies in the given contexts, filtered through economic thought as guided by “l’observation, l’expérience et la raison” (Ganilh 1826, p. j). By economic thought Ganilh essentially means Smith and the issues debated as a consequence of Smith’s thinking. The spirit in which Ganilh pursues this is in line with Malthus’s notion that the “science of political economy is essentially practical” and with Malthus’s notion that there are likely to be exceptions to general rules in a human-based subject such as political economy (Malthus 1820, pp. 6–7, 8–9, 10–11).

In the end his writings overall tend towards a modified liberal economy and even in his later works his admiration for, as well as criticism of, Smith is undiminished. In British terms his works can be contextualized within a general educational movement, exemplified by Boileau and by the better known women writers. Malthus, who knew Martineau, and McCulloch were also motivated in some of their writing by a concern to educate. However, his English contemporary reviewers saw Ganilh’s thinking as pro-trade and anti-war and this gave him his initial market in Britain. In educational terms, in France, he may well have influenced future writers such as Coquelin and Guillaumin, who give him an honorable mention, even if only directly through the expectations established for the economics dictionary as genre, to develop a commitment to “une appréciation raisonnée des principaux ouvrages” of key writers (Hébert, 1987, p. 483; Coquelin et Guillaumin 1864, p. 819). Though Ganilh sustained his educational concerns, and although his *Systèmes*, in translation was used as a textbook at the University of Maryland (Hoffman 1817), for example, this context is an appropriate but inadequate contextualization for Ganilh’s works overall. The way the initial text was framed determined to some extent how it was read. In the United States, for example, it was read as educational but also as promoting a policy role based upon the capacity of an enlightened government to operate economic policy in the national interest.

He can also be located in the progressive moderation of Smith that occurs in Britain, as it does also in France. Ganilh acknowledges his debate with Malthus who gave him, according to Ganilh, “l’honneur de me faire figurer nominativement” (the honor of mentioning me), though of course Malthus disagreed with Ganilh’s views on the division of labor (Ganilh 1826, p. 415; Malthus 1812, n. 1.13). While it makes sense to evaluate Ganilh’s initiating text in the context of the more general search for an accommodation between Republican values—“le nom sacré de la liberté”—and ideas about political economy, the concern of Condorcet, J-B Say and others (Ganilh 1822, p. 33; Rothschild 2001; Whatmore 2000), Ganilh engages, in his later works, much more with British literature beyond Smith—with Malthus in particular—as he does with comparable French literature. It tends to be forgotten that a number of British economists supported a prohibition of exports of machinery in the 1820s and later (Kindleberger 1975, p. 10) and that there was as much a march towards regulation as there was to *laissez-faire*. The period has been characterized as one of “counterpoint” between “Smithian laissez-faire in trade matters and, after the Reform Bill, Benthamic intervention” (Kindleberger 1975, p. 10). In reaching his

own accommodation, Ganilh adopts a Smith-like stance in as much as he takes a broad approach to economic ideas—acknowledging the social, political, and legislative dimensions, as well as the significance the free circulation of goods—while maintaining the possibility of an economically informed approach to directing and regulating the course of national economic life. This aspect, found also in the translated work, was the context within which he was read in the United States. For Ganilh “science” suggested, much in the manner of Malthus, an encounter between principles and the facts of experience. In a sense Ganilh, like others, both in France and in Britain, interested in adjusting principles to the problems of economic policy, develops a distinction between a “pure” (“philosophical”) and a “practical” (“applied”) political economy.

REFERENCES

- Anonymous. 1812. “Review of Charles Ganilh’s *An Inquiry into the Various Systems of Political Economy*.” *American Review of History and Politics* (October): 306–53.
- Anonymous. 1812. “Review of Charles Ganilh’s *An Inquiry into the Various Systems of Political Economy*.” *Monthly Magazine* 33 (229): 612–34.
- Anonymous. 1813. “Review of Charles Ganilh’s *An Inquiry into the Various Systems of Political Economy*.” *Monthly Review* LXX1 (May August): 419–22.
- Béraud, Alain, Jean-Jacque Gislain, and Philippe Steiner. 2004 “L’économie politique néo-Smithienne en France (1803–1848).” *Économies et Sociétés, Histoire de la pensée économique*, série PE, *Economia* février (34): 325–420.
- “Boileau, David.” 1990. Entries at 079, 080 and 145. In David Bank and Antony Esposito, eds., *British Biographical Index*. London: K.G. Saur.
- Boileau, David. 1810, 1814. *Elisabeth ou les Exilés de Sibérie par Madame Cottin*. Paris et Londres chez Colburn: Libraire.
- Boileau, David. 1811. *An Introduction to the Study of Political Economy; or, Elementary view of the manner in which the wealth of nations is produced, increased, distributed and considered*. London: T. Caldwell and W. Davies.
- Bridel, Pascal. 1987. “Ganilh, Charles.” In John Eatwell, Murray Millgate, and Peter Newman, eds., *The New Palgrave: A Dictionary of Economics*. London: Macmillan.
- Coquelin, Charles and Gilbert-Urbain Guillaumin. 1873. *Dictionnaire de l’économie politique contenant l’exposition des principes de la science*. Paris: Guillaumin.
- D’Hauterive, le Comte. 1817. *Eléments d’économie politique suivis de quelques vues sur l’application des principes de cette science aux règles administratives*. Paris: Fatin.
- Ferrier, F. L. A. 1822. *Du Gouvernement Considéré dans les Rapports Avec le Commerce*, 3rd edition. Paris: Pélicier.
- Ganilh, Charles. 1806. *Essai politique sur le revenue publique des peuples de l’antiquité, du moyen âge, et des siècles modernes, et spécialement de la France et de l’Angleterre*. Paris: Treuttel et Wurtz.
- Ganilh, Charles. 1809. *Des systèmes d’économie politique, de leurs inconvénients, de leurs avantages et de la doctrine la plus favorable aux progrès de la richesse des nations*. Paris: Xhrouet.
- Ganilh, Charles 1812. *An Inquiry into the Various Systems of Political Economy; their advantages and disadvantages and the theory most favourable to the increase of National Wealth*, translated by D. Boileau. London: Henry Colburn.
- Ganilh, Charles. 1815. *La théorie de l’économie politique, fondée sur les faits résultans des statistiques de la France et de l’Angleterre; sur les expériences de tous les peuples célèbres par leurs richesses; et sur les lumières de la raison*. Paris: Deterville.

- Ganilh, Charles. 1822. *La théorie de l'économie politique, fondée sur les faits résultants des statistiques de la France et de l'Angleterre; sur les expériences de tous les peuples célèbres par leurs richesses; et sur les lumières de la raison*, 2nd edition.
- Ganilh, Charles. 1826. *Dictionnaire analytique d'économie politique*. Brussels: Ladvocat librairie.
- Hébert, Robert F. "Garnier, Clément Joseph." In John Eatwell, Murray Millgate, and Peter Newman, eds., *The New Palgrave A Dictionary of Economics*. London: Macmillan.
- Heckscher, Eli F. 1922. *The Continental System: An Economic Interpretation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Henderson, Willie. 1995. *Economics as Literature*. London: Routledge.
- Hoffman, David. 1817. *A Course of Legal Study; respectfully addressed to the Students of law in the United States*. Baltimore, MD: Coale and Maxwell.
- Holmberg, Tom. 2002. "Code Civil," NapoleonSeries.org. Retrieved April 5, 2004.
- Holmberg, Tom. 2004. "The Finances of France in 1799." NapoleonSeries.org, retrieved May 27, 2004.
- Jennings, Jeremy. 2007. "The Debate about Luxury in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century French Political Thought." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 68 (1): 79–105.
- Keynes, John Maynard. 1936. *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*. London: Macmillan.
- Lacour-Gayet, Robert. 1968. "Napoléon et l'économie." In Jean Mistler, ed., *Napoléon, Naissance d'un empire*, Veanrviers: Marabout, pp. 255–81.
- Malthus, Thomas Robert, 1812. *Definitions of Political Economy*. London: John Murray.
- Malthus, Thomas R. 1820. *Principles of Political Economy Considered with a View to Their Practical Application*. London: John Murray.
- Malthus, Thomas R. 1827. *Definitions in Political Economy, Preceded by an Inquiry into the Rules Which Ought to Guide Political Economists in the Definition and Use of Their Terms, with Remarks*. London.
- Marx, Karl. [unpublished 1857–1858.] *Grundrisse*, translated by M. Nicolaus. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973.
- Marx, Karl. 1976. *Capital*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Maunier, René. 1911. "Les économistes protectionistes en France de 1815 à 1848." *Revue Internationale de Sociologie* 19: 485–510.
- McCulloch, John Ramsay. 1824. *A Discourse on the Rise, Progress, Peculiar Objects and Importance of Political Economy*. London: A. Constable.
- McCulloch, John Ramsay. 1833. *A Treatise on the Principles, Practice and History of Commerce*. The Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. London: Baldwin and Craddock.
- Mill, John Stuart. 1848. *Principles of Political Economy*, edited by W. J. Ashley. London: Augustus M. Kelley, 1987.
- O'Rourke, Kevin H. 2005. "The Worldwide Impact of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars." Working paper 11344, Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Romani, Roberto. 2002. "Political Economy and Other Idioms: French Views on English Development, 1815–48." *European Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 9 (3): 359–83.
- Rothschild, Emma. 2001. *Economic Sentiments: Adam Smith, Condorcet and the Enlightenment*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Say, Jean-Baptiste. 1855. *A Treatise on Political Economy*, translated by C. R. Prinsep, edited by C. C. Biddle. Philadelphia, PA: Lipincott, Grambo & Co. Retrieved February 20, 2004 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.econlib.org/library/Say/sayT0.html>.
- Smith, Adam. 1776. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Glasgow edition of The Works and Correspondence of Adam Smith, edited by R. H. Campbell and A. S. Skinner, textual editor W. B. Todd. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
- Staum, Martin S. 1998. "French Lecturers in Political Economy, 1815–1848: Varieties of Liberalism." *History of Political Economy* 30 (1): 95–120.

- Steiner, Philippe. 1995. "Quels principes pour l'économie politique? Charles Ganilh, Germain Garnier, Jean-Baptiste Say et la critique de la physiocratie." *Economies et Sociétés, Série Oeconomia, Histoire de la Pensée économique*, P.E. 22–23, pp. 209–30.
- Taussig, Frank William. 1896. *Wages and Capital*. New York: D. Appleton and Co.
- Whatmore, Richard. 2000. *Republicanism and the French Revolution: An Intellectual History of Jean-Baptiste Say's Political Economy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.