Reflections on the Revolution in France
Reflections on the revolution in France, and on the proceedings in certain societies in London relative to that event. In a letter intended to have been sent to a gentleman in Paris. By the Right Honourable Edmund Burke

It may not be unnecessary to inform the Reader, that the following Reflections had their origin in a correspondence between the Author and a very young gentleman at Paris, who did him the honour of desiring his opinion upon the important transactions, which then, and ever since, have so much occupied the attention of all men. An answer was written some time in the month of October, 1789; but it was kept back upon prudential considerations. That letter is alluded to in the beginning of the following sheets. It has been since forwarded to the person to whom it was addressed. The reasons for the delay in sending it were assigned in a short letter to the same gentleman. This produced on his part a new and pressing application for the Author's sentiments.


2 Depont's second letter to Burke pressing him for a fuller analysis of the prospects of the Revolution in gaining liberty, evidently written before he received the [Nov. 1789] letter referred to above, is Depont to Burke 29 Dec. 1789, Corr. vi, pp. 59–61. It is this request to which Burke refers at the start of Reflections. Depont, by this time a member of the Jacobins, was so appalled at the views expressed in Reflections that he published a reply to Burke telling him 'that if your opinions had been then known to me, far from engaging you to disclose them, I should have intreated you to withhold them from the public' (Answer to the Reflections of the Right. Hon. Edmund Burke. (London, 1791), p. 3).
The Author began a second and more full discussion on the subject. This he had some thoughts of publishing early in the last spring; but the matter gaining upon him, he found that what he had undertaken not only far exceeded the measure of a letter, but that its importance required rather a more detailed consideration than at that time he had any leisure to bestow upon it. However, having thrown down his first thoughts in the form of a letter, and indeed when he sat down to write, having intended it for a private letter, he found it difficult to change the form of address, when his sentiments had grown into a greater extent, and had received another direction. A different plan, he is sensible, might be more favourable to a commodious division and distribution of his matter.

DEAR SIR,

You are pleased to call again, and with some earnestness, for my thoughts on the late proceedings in France. I will not give you reason to imagine that I think my sentiments of such value as to wish myself to be solicited about them. They are of too little consequence to be very anxiously either communicated or withheld. It was from attention to you, and to you only, that I hesitated at the time, when you first desired to receive them. In the first letter I had the honour to write to you, and which at length I send, I wrote neither for nor from any description of men; nor shall I in this. My errors, if any, are my own. My reputation alone is to answer for them.

You see, Sir, by the long letter I have transmitted to you, that, though I do most heartily wish that France may be animated by a spirit of rational liberty, and that I think you bound, in all honest policy, to provide a permanent body, in which that spirit may reside, and an effectual organ, by which it may act, it is my misfortune to entertain great doubts concerning several material points in your late transactions.

You imagined, when you wrote last, that I might possibly be reckoned among the approvers of certain proceedings in France, from the solemn public seal of sanction they have received from two clubs of gentlemen in London, called the Constitutional Society, and the Revolution Society.

I certainly have the honour to belong to more clubs than one, in which the constitution of this kingdom and the principles of the glorious Revolution, are held in high reverence: and I reckon myself among the most forward in my zeal for maintaining that constitution and those principles in their utmost purity and vigour. It is because I do so, that I think it necessary for me, that there should be no mistake. Those who cultivate the
memory of our revolution, and those who are attached to the constitution of this kingdom, will take good care how they are involved with persons who, under the pretext of zeal towards the Revolution and Constitution, too frequently wander from their true principles; and are ready on every occasion to depart from the firm but cautious and deliberate spirit which produced the one, and which presides in the other. Before I proceed to answer the more material particulars in your letter, I shall beg leave to give you such information as I have been able to obtain of the two clubs which have thought proper, as bodies, to interfere in the concerns of France; first assuring you, that I am not, and that I have never been, a member of either of those societies.

The first, calling itself the Constitutional Society, or Society for Constitutional Information, or by some such title, is, I believe, of seven or eight years standing. The institution of this society appears to be of a charitable, and so far of a laudable, nature: it was intended for the circulation, at the expense of the members, of many books, which few others would be at the expense of buying; and which might lie on the hands of the booksellers, to the great loss of an useful body of men. Whether the books so charitably circulated, were ever as charitably read, is more than I know. Possibly several of them have been exported to France; and, like goods not in request here, may with you have found a market. I have heard much talk of the lights to be drawn from books that are sent from hence. What improvements they have had in their passage (as it is said some liquors are meleriorated by crossing the sea) I cannot tell: But I never heard a man of common judgment, or the least degree of information, speak a word in praise of the greater part of the publications circulated by that society; nor have their proceedings been accounted, except by some of themselves, as of any serious consequence.

Your National Assembly seems to entertain much the same opinion that I do of this poor charitable club. As a nation, you reserved the whole stock of your eloquent acknowledgments for the Revolution Society; when their fellows in the Constitutional were, in equity, entitled to some

3 I.e. the English, ‘Glorious’ Revolution of 1688, not the French.
4 Long sea passages often spoiled wines transported in the barrel. Port, most famously, but also other ‘fortified’ wines were mixed with spirit or imported in re-used brandy barrels, to prevent the wine from spoiling on the voyage. Adding spirit killed the yeat before the natural fermentation process was complete, resulting in a sweeter wine which was also more alcoholic than normal fermentation allows, since yeast is killed in concentrations above about 15%.
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share. Since you have selected the Revolution Society as the great object of your national thanks and praises, you will think me excuseable in making its late conduct the subject of my observations. The National Assembly of France has given importance to these gentlemen by adopting them; and they return the favour, by acting as a committee in England for extending the principles of the National Assembly. Henceforward we must consider them as a kind of privileged persons; as no inconsiderable members in the diplomatic body. This is one among the revolutions which have given splendour to obscurity, and distinction to undiscerned merit. Until very lately I do not recollect to have heard of this club. I am quite sure that it never occupied a moment of my thoughts; nor, I believe, those of any person out of their own set. I find, upon enquiry, that on the anniversary of the Revolution in 1688, a club of dissenters, but of what denomination I know not, have long had the custom of hearing a sermon in one of their churches; and that afterwards they spent the day cheerfully, as other clubs do, at the tavern. But I never heard that any public measure, or political system, much less that the merits of the constitution of any foreign nation, had been the subject of a formal proceeding at their festivals; until, to my inexpressible surprise, I found them in a sort of public capacity, by a congratulatory address, giving an authoritative sanction to the proceedings of the National Assembly in France.

In the antient principles and conduct of the club, so far at least as they were declared, I see nothing to which I could take exception. I think it very probable, that for some purpose, new members may have entered among them; and that some truly christian politicians, who love to dispense benefits, but are careful to conceal the hand which distributes the dole, may have made them the instruments of their pious designs. Whatever I

5 The Assembly made much of the contact with British reformers. Le Moniteur (10 Nov. 1789) published resolutions and a letter from the Revolution Society, and reported the ‘great sensation’ the reading of them had produced in the Assembly, and the fact that the Assembly had unanimously instructed the president to write to Lord Stanhope ‘pour lui t´emoigner la vive et profond sensibilit´e de l’Assembl´ee `al ad ´emarche que fait pr`es d’elle la Soci´et´e de la R´evolution’ [‘to testify to him the lively and profound appreciation of the Assembly of the overtures made to them by the Revolution Society’].

6 The Society, like other reform and radical societies, had begun to send congratulatory letters to the leaders of the Revolution.

7 Burke insinuates that an innocuous society may have been infiltrated for political purposes. It is certainly clear that the Society, which had earlier provided benefits for poor ministers, had been revivified following the 1788 centenary dinner, publishing a history in which it claimed a continuous (and political) existence: although conceding that ‘no records have
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may have reason to suspect concerning private management, I shall speak
of nothing as of a certainty, but what is public.

For one, I should be sorry to be thought, directly or indirectly, con-
cerned in their proceedings. I certainly take my full share, along with the
rest of the world, in my individual and private capacity, in speculating
on what has been done, or is doing, on the public stage; in any place
antient or modern; in the republic of Rome, or the republic of Paris: but
having no general apostolical mission, being a citizen of a particular state,
and being bound up in a considerable degree, by its public will, I should
think it, at least improper and irregular, for me to open a formal public
correspondence with the actual government of a foreign nation, without
the express authority of the government under which I live.

I should be still more unwilling to enter into that correspondence, under
anything like an equivocal description, which to many, unacquainted
with our usages, might make the address, in which I joined, appear as
the act of persons in some sort of corporate capacity, acknowledged by
the laws of this kingdom, and authorized to speak the sense of some
part of it. On account of the ambiguity and uncertainty of unauthorized
general descriptions, and of the deceit which may be practised under
them, and not from mere formality, the house of Commons would reject
the most sneaking petition for the most trifling object, under that mode
of signature to which you have thrown open the folding-doors of your
presence chamber, and have ushered into your National Assembly, with
as much ceremony and parade, and with as great a bustle of applause, as
if you had been visited by the whole representative majesty of the whole
English nation. If what this society has thought proper to send forth had
been a piece of argument, it would have signified little whose argument
it was. It would be neither the more nor the less convincing on account
of the party it came from. But this is only a vote and resolution. It stands
solely on authority; and in this case it is the mere authority of individuals,
few of whom appear. Their signatures ought, in my opinion, to have
been annexed to their instrument. The world would then have the means
of knowing how many they are; who they are; and of what value their
opinions may be, from their personal abilities, from their knowledge, their
experience, or their lead and authority in this state. To me, who am but a

regularly been preserved’, they claimed ‘there is no doubt . . . that it has annually met
without interruption from [the Revolution of 1688] to the present’ (An abstract of the
history and proceedings of the Revolution Society, in London. To which is annexed a copy of the
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plain man, the proceeding looks a little too refined, and too ingenious; it
has too much the air of a political stratagem, adopted for the sake of giving,
under an high-sounding name, an importance to the public declarations
of this club, which, when the matter came to be closely inspected, they
did not altogether so well deserve. It is a policy that has very much the
complexion of a fraud.

I flatter myself that I love a manly, moral, regulated liberty as well as
any gentleman of that society, be he who he will; and perhaps I have given
as good proofs of my attachment to that cause, in the whole course of my
public conduct. I think I envy liberty as little as they do, to any other
nation. But I cannot stand forward, and give praise or blame to any thing
which relates to human actions, and human concerns, on a simple view of
the object, as it stands stripped of every relation, in all the nakedness and
solitude of metaphysical abstraction. Circumstances (which with some
gentlemen pass for nothing) give in reality to every political principle
its distinguishing colour, and discriminating effect. The circumstances
are what render every civil and political scheme beneficial or noxious
to mankind. Abstractedly speaking, government, as well as liberty, is
good; yet could I, in common sense, ten years ago, have felicitated France
on her enjoyment of a government (for she then had a government)
without enquiry what the nature of that government was, or how it
was administered? Can I now congratulate the same nation upon its
freedom? Is it because liberty in the abstract may be classed amongst the
blessings of mankind, that I am seriously to felicitate a madman, who
has escaped from the protecting restraint and wholesome darkness of his
cell, on his restoration to the enjoyment of light and liberty? Am I to
congratulate an highwayman and murderer, who has broke prison, upon
the recovery of his natural rights? This would be to act over again the
scene of the criminals condemned to the gallies, and their heroic deliverer,
the metaphysic Knight of the Sorrowful Countenance. 8

8 Knight of the Sorrowful Countenance: a reference to Don Quixote. In Cervantes’ story,
Quixote misguidedly frees a group of criminals bound to be galley-slaves under the misap-
prehension that they have been illegally impressed for military service. Once free they set
on him. The image of Quixote, the untimely chivalric knight-errant, came back to haunt
Burke, who was himself lampooned as the old-fashioned knight in print and cartoon. See
Frederick Byron, ‘The knight of the woeful countenance going to extirpate the national
assembly’ (1790), reproduced in Nicholas K. Robinson, Edmund Burke: A Life in Caricature
(New Haven and London, 1996), p. 142; and in Iain Hampsher-Monk, The Impact of the
When I see the spirit of liberty in action, I see a strong principle at work; and this, for a while, is all I can possibly know of it. The wild gas, the fixed air\(^9\) is plainly broke loose: but we ought to suspend our judgment until the first effervescence is a little subsided, till the liquor is cleared, and until we see something deeper than the agitation of a troubled and frothy surface. I must be tolerably sure, before I venture publicly to congratulate men upon a blessing, that they have really received one. Flattery corrupts both the receiver and the giver; and adulation is not of more service to the people than to kings. I should therefore suspend my congratulations on the new liberty of France, until I was informed how it had been combined with government; with public force; with the discipline and obedience of armies; with the collection of an effective and well-distributed revenue; with morality and religion; with the solidity of property; with peace and order; with civil and social manners. All these (in their way) are good things too; and, without them, liberty is not a benefit whilst it lasts, and is not likely to continue long. The effect of liberty to individuals is, that they may do what they please: we ought to see what it will please them to do, before we risque congratulations, which may be soon turned into complaints.\(^{10}\) Prudence would dictate this in the case of separate insulated private men; but liberty, when men act in bodies, is power. Considerate people, before they declare themselves, will observe the use which is made of power; and particularly of so trying a thing as new power in new persons, of whose principles, tempers, and dispositions, they have little or no experience, and in situations where those who appear the most stirring in the scene may possibly not be the real movers.

All these considerations however were below the transcendental dignity of the Revolution Society.\(^N\) Whilst I continued in the country, from whence I had the honour of writing to you, I had but an imperfect idea of

\(^9\) Wild gas, the fixed air: CO\(_2\). According to contemporary scientific theory, carbon dioxide was a kind of air (gas) that was fixed in material but given up on combustion – so initially fixed but then free – wild. The most famous contemporary experimental chemist to subscribe to this view was Joseph Priestley,\(^N\) whom Burke met and knew – and later castigates for his political and religious dissidence. However the term ‘wild’ air or spirit (spiritus silvestre) predates Priestley, being associated with the founder of gas chemistry, the Fleming, Jan Baptist van Helmont (1580–1644).

\(^{10}\) Cf. Montesquieu: ‘dans les démocraties le people paroit faire ce qu’il veut; mais la liberté politique ne consiste point à faire ce qu’il veut’ [‘in democracies the people may do what they wish; but political liberty does not at all consist in doing what they wish’] (De l’Esprit des Lois, Bk xi, ch. 3).
their transactions. On my coming to town, I sent for an account of their proceedings, which had been published by their authority, containing a sermon of Dr. Price, with the Duke de Rochefoucault’s and the Archbishop of Aix’s letter, and several other documents annexed. The whole of that publication, with the manifest design of connecting the affairs of France with those of England, by drawing us into an imitation of the conduct of the National Assembly, gave me a considerable degree of uneasiness. The effect of that conduct upon the power, credit, prosperity, and tranquillity of France, became every day more evident. The form of constitution to be settled, for its future polity, became more clear. We are now in a condition to discern, with tolerable exactness, the true nature of the object held up to our imitation. If the prudence of reserve and decorum dictates silence in some circumstances, in others prudence of an higher order may justify us in speaking our thoughts. The beginnings of confusion with us in England are at present feeble enough; but with you, we have seen an infancy still more feeble, growing by moments into a strength to heap mountains upon mountains, and to wage war with Heaven itself. Whenever our neighbour’s house is on fire, it cannot be amiss for the engines to play a little on our own. Better to be despised for too anxious apprehensions, than ruined by too confident a security.

Solicitous chiefly for the peace of my own country, but by no means unconcerned for your’s, I wish to communicate more largely, what was at first intended only for your private satisfaction. I shall still keep your affairs in my eye, and continue to address myself to you. Indulging myself in the freedom of epistolary intercourse, I beg leave to throw out my thoughts, and express my feelings, just as they arise in my mind, with very little attention to formal method. I set out with the proceedings of the Revolution Society; but I shall not confine myself to them. Is it possible I should? It looks to me as if I were in a great crisis, not

---

11 Archbishop of Aix: Jean de Dieu Raymond de Boisgelin de Cucé (1732–1804), a prominent moderate churchman, representative of the Clergy to the Estates General who left with the Third Estate and was for five days President of the National Assembly 25–30 November. A constitutional royalist, he supported the abolition of feudal rights but opposed the nationalisation of Church property and the Civil Constitution of the Clergy (Exposition des principes . . . par les évêques députés à l’Assemblée nationale de France (1791)). He emigrated to England in 1792, but returned under Napoleon’s Concordat in 1801 and as Cardinal Archbishop of Tours.

12 The third edition of Price’s Discourse on the Love of our Country contained an appendix printing these enthusiastic reactions that the first edition had elicited in the National Assembly.