

RESEARCH IN THE HISTORY  
OF ECONOMIC THOUGHT  
AND METHODOLOGY

# RESEARCH IN THE HISTORY OF ECONOMIC THOUGHT AND METHODOLOGY

Founding Editor: Warren J. Samuels (1933–2011)

Series Editors: Luca Fiorito, Scott Scheall, and  
Carlos Eduardo Suprinyak

## Recent Volumes:

- Volume 34B: Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology: Including a Symposium on Albert O. Hirschman; 2016
- Volume 35A: Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology: Including a Symposium on the Historical Epistemology of Economics; 2017
- Volume 35B: Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology: Including a Symposium on New Directions in Sraffa Scholarship; 2017
- Volume 36A: Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology: Including a Symposium on Bruce Caldwell's *Beyond Positivism* after 35 Years; 2018
- Volume 36B: Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology: Including a Symposium on the Work of Mary Morgan: Curiosity, Imagination, and Surprise; 2018
- Volume 36C: Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology: Including a Symposium on Latin American Monetary Thought: Two Centuries in Search of Originality; 2018
- Volume 37A: Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology: Including a Symposium on 50 Years of the Union for Radical Political Economics; 2019
- Volume 37B: Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology: Including a Symposium on Ludwig Lachmann; 2019
- Volume 37C: Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology: Including a Symposium on Robert Heilbroner at 100; 2019

# EDITORIAL BOARD

Michele Alacevich  
*University of Bologna, Italy*

Rebeca Gomez Betancourt  
*University of Lumière Lyon 2, France*

John Davis  
*Marquette University, USA; University  
of Amsterdam, The Netherlands*

Till Düppe  
*Université du Québec à Montréal,  
Canada*

Ross Emmett  
*Arizona State University, USA*

Andrew Farrant  
*Dickinson College, USA*

Mary Furner  
*University of California, Santa  
Barbara, USA*

Nicola Giocoli  
*University of Pisa, Italy*

Harald Hagemann  
*University of Hohenheim, Germany*

Tiago Mata  
*University College, London, UK*

Steven Medema  
*Duke University, USA*

Gary Mongiovi  
*St. John's University, USA*

Mary Morgan  
*London School of Economics, London,  
UK*

Maria Pia Paganelli  
*Trinity University, USA*

*This page intentionally left blank*

RESEARCH IN THE HISTORY OF ECONOMIC THOUGHT  
AND METHODOLOGY VOLUME 38A

**RESEARCH IN THE HISTORY  
OF ECONOMIC THOUGHT  
AND METHODOLOGY:  
INCLUDING A SYMPOSIUM  
ON PUBLIC FINANCE  
IN THE HISTORY OF  
ECONOMIC THOUGHT**

EDITED BY

**LUCA FIORITO**

*University of Palermo, Italy*

**SCOTT SCHEALL**

*Arizona State University Polytechnic Campus, USA*

**CARLOS EDUARDO SUPRINYAK**

*Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Brazil*



United Kingdom – North America – Japan  
India – Malaysia – China

Emerald Publishing Limited  
Howard House, Wagon Lane, Bingley BD16 1WA, UK

First edition 2020

Copyright © 2020 Emerald Publishing Limited

**Reprints and permissions service**

Contact: [permissions@emeraldinsight.com](mailto:permissions@emeraldinsight.com)

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without either the prior written permission of the publisher or a licence permitting restricted copying issued in the UK by The Copyright Licensing Agency and in the USA by The Copyright Clearance Center. Any opinions expressed in the chapters are those of the authors. Whilst Emerald makes every effort to ensure the quality and accuracy of its content, Emerald makes no representation implied or otherwise, as to the chapters' suitability and application and disclaims any warranties, express or implied, to their use.

**British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data**

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-83867-700-8 (Print)

ISBN: 978-1-83867-699-5 (Online)

ISBN: 978-1-83867-701-5 (Epub)

ISSN: 0743-4154 (Series)



ISOQAR certified  
Management System,  
awarded to Emerald  
for adherence to  
Environmental  
standard  
ISO 14001:2004.

Certificate Number 1985  
ISO 14001



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

# CONTENTS

<i>About the Editors</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>List of Contributors</i>	<i>xi</i>
<i>Volume Introduction</i>	<i>xii</i>

## PART I A SYMPOSIUM ON PUBLIC FINANCE IN THE HISTORY OF ECONOMIC THOUGHT

*Guest edited by Claire Silvant and Javier San Julián Arrupe*

<b>Chapter 1 Introduction: Public Finance in the History of Economics: a Field on Its Own</b> <i>Claire Silvant and Javier San Julián Arrupe</i>	<i>3</i>
<b>Chapter 2 British Public Debt Management Operations in the Early Nineteenth Century</b> <i>Nesrine Bentemessek Kahia</i>	<i>13</i>
<b>Chapter 3 Ricardo and His Contemporaries on Monetary Reform and the National Debt</b> <i>Christina Laskaridis</i>	<i>33</i>
<b>Chapter 4 The French Financial Controversies in the Aftermath of the 1848 Crisis: An Overview of Socialist and Liberal Positions</b> <i>Claire Silvant and Clément Coste</i>	<i>55</i>
<b>Chapter 5 An Expansionary Economist Against Fiscal Discipline in Mid-Nineteenth Century Spain: The Lonely Shepherd</b> <i>Javier San Julián Arrupe</i>	<i>77</i>
<b>Chapter 6 Public Credit, Capital, and State Agency: Fiscal Responsibility in German-language <i>Finanzwissenschaft</i></b> <i>Richard Sturn</i>	<i>97</i>

- Chapter 7 Would a State Monopoly over Money Creation Allow for a Reduction of the National Debt? A Study of the “Seignorage Argument” in Light of the “100% Money” Debates** 123  
*Samuel Demeulemeester*

**PART II  
ESSAYS**

- Chapter 8 Economic Thought and Social Institutions in Eighteenth Century England** 147  
*Cosma Orsi*
- Chapter 9 Reflections on the New Deal: The Vested Interests and Limits to Reform** 173  
*John F. Henry*

**PART III  
MEMORIAL**

- Chapter 10 Remembering Gabriel Oliva C. Cunha (1990–2019)** 199  
*Matheus Assaf*



## ABOUT THE EDITORS

**Luca Fiorito** received his PhD in Economics from the New School for Social Research in New York and is currently Professor at the University of Palermo. His main area of interest is the history of American economic thought in the Progressive Era and the interwar years. He has published many works on the contributions of the institutionalists and on the relationship between economics and eugenics.

**Scott Scheall** is Assistant Professor and Director of Graduate Studies in the Faculty of Social Science in Arizona State University's College of Integrative Sciences and Arts, as well as Project Director for the History of Economic Thought in Arizona State University's Center for the Study of Economic Liberty. He has published extensively on topics related to the history and philosophy of the Austrian School of Economics.

**Carlos Eduardo Suprinyak** is Associate Professor of Economics at the Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG), Brazil. He specializes in the history and methodology of economics, studying the interplay of social, political, and economic ideas in early modern England, and the institutionalization of economics in Brazil during the postwar era. He has published several papers on these and related themes in peer-reviewed scholarly journals, and is also the co-editor of *The Political Economy of Latin American Independence* (Routledge, 2017).

*This page intentionally left blank*

# LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

<i>Javier San Julián Arrupe</i>	University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain
<i>Matheus Assaf</i>	Universidade de São Paulo, Brazil
<i>Clément Coste</i>	Triangle/Sciences Po Lyon, Lyon, France
<i>Samuel Demeulemeester</i>	École Normale Supérieure de Lyon, Lyon, France and Université Paris 8, Paris, France
<i>Luca Fiorito</i>	University of Palermo, Palermo, Italy
<i>John F. Henry</i>	Levy Economics Institute of Bard College, USA
<i>Nesrine Bentemessek Kahia</i>	Université Paris-Est Créteil, Paris, France
<i>Christina Laskaridis</i>	SOAS, University of London, London, England, UK
<i>Cosma Orsi</i>	Catholic University of the Sacred Heart (Milan), Italy
<i>Scott Scheall</i>	Arizona State University Polytechnic Campus, Mesa, AZ, USA
<i>Claire Silvant</i>	Triangle/University of Lyon 2, Lyon, France
<i>Richard Sturn</i>	Institute of Public Economics and Schumpeter Centre, University of Graz, Graz, Austria
<i>Carlos Eduardo Suprinyak</i>	Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Brazil

# VOLUME INTRODUCTION

We are happy to present Volume 38A of *Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology*, the first of three volumes that we plan to publish in 2020. The volume features a symposium on public finance in the history of economic thought co-edited by guest editors Claire Silvant and Javier San Julián Arrupe. The symposium comprises the results of a research project on “*The Trade-off between Taxation, Debt and Money Creation in the History of Public Finance Crises, 1848–1914*” that was supported by a grant from the European Society for the History of Economic Thought between 2014 and 2017. In addition to essays by the co-editors, the symposium includes contributions from Richard Sturn, Christina Laskaridis, Nesrine Bentemessek Kahia, Clément Coste, and Samuel Demeulemeester.

The volume also features original general-research contributions from Cosma Orsi and John Henry.

Lastly, the volume includes a touching obituary by Matheus Assaf honoring his friend, Gabriel Oliva, winner of our first Warren Samuels Prize for Interdisciplinary Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology in 2016, who tragically and unexpectedly passed away this April.

Luca Fiorito  
Scott Scheall  
Carlos Eduardo Suprinyak  
The Editors of *Research in the History of Economic  
Thought and Methodology*

# PART I

## A SYMPOSIUM ON PUBLIC FINANCE IN THE HISTORY OF ECONOMIC THOUGHT

Guest Edited By Claire Silvant and Javier San Julián  
Arrupe

*This page intentionally left blank*

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION: PUBLIC FINANCE IN THE HISTORY OF ECONOMICS: A FIELD ON ITS OWN

Claire Silvant and Javier San Julián Arrupe

The spirit of a people, its cultural level, its social structure, the deeds its policy may prepare – all this and more is written in its fiscal history, stripped of all phrases. He who knows how to listen to its message here discerns the thunder of world history more clearly than anywhere else.  
(J. A. Schumpeter (1991 [1918]), p. 101)

### PRELIMINARY REMARKS

Political changes, even moderate ones, and economic progress occur *pari passu* with shifts in public finance, sometimes with reciprocal effects. Vices in public finance systems may be the cause of major or minor political breaks; conversely, changes in political regimes often come with financial reforms (tax reforms, increase or decrease in public expenditures, use of public debt, or monetary financing). Similarly, interest in these topics in the history of economic ideas has endured irregularities and jumps that simple narratives cannot capture. Debates on public finance have not followed a steady path, and public finance issues have been alternately in the background or the spotlight, according to their prominence in political debate. Throughout the nineteenth century, public finance was an increasingly discussed topic as the role of the state expanded in many countries in Western Europe and the United States in their liberal age (as presented in [Bonney, 1995](#); [Cardoso & Lains, 2010](#); [Dincecco, 2011](#); [Yun-Casalilla & O'Brien, 2012](#)) and as the concern for its financing became more imperative. The advance of political modernity was accompanied by a widespread revival of debates and writings on public finance.

---

Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology: Including a Symposium on  
Public Finance in the History of Economic Thought, Volume 38A, 3–12

Copyright © 2020 by Emerald Publishing Limited

All rights of reproduction in any form reserved

ISSN: 0743-4154/doi:[10.1108/S0743-4154202000038A003](https://doi.org/10.1108/S0743-4154202000038A003)

## PUBLIC FINANCE ISSUES AT THE ACADEMIC CROSSROADS

Since the eighteenth century, economists, philosophers, and practitioners have frequently investigated issues in public economics as well as in public finance. Many contributions of prominent economists can be associated with new developments in public economics. Through his economic calculations, Vauban tried to rationalize public expenditure as well as public revenue. Smith and Say aimed to formulate general principles regarding taxation, while J.S. Mill developed original thoughts about the legitimacy of state expenditures. Bentham inquired into the philosophical foundations of property rights and their consequences for public intervention. In this respect, public economics would be “one of the oldest fields in economics” and public finance “the oldest branch of economics,” respectively, according to [Kolm \(1987\)](#) and [Musgrave \(2008\)](#).

Public finance is viewed as a branch of public economics. If public economics can be described as “an interdisciplinary multi-level subject with a strong disciplinary core” ([Sturn, 2016](#), p. 480), public finance would be a complex strand of it. Public finance issues require normative as well as descriptive approaches incorporating contrasting materials: historical studies, normative treatises, specialized or general handbooks, monographs, and mathematically formalized essays. Usually, the studies on public finance present two sides: that of public resources (works on tax incidence, optimal taxation, fiscal policies, public debt management, its monetary side, etc.) and that of government expenditures (focusing on publicly provided goods and the scope of national government spending).

The chapters included in this symposium principally focus their analyses on the first side, that is, on the – in most cases competing – ways to finance public expenditures, from the perspective of the history of economic thought. The reverse question – that is, the analyses of legitimate public expenditure and its economic effects – is pushed into the background. In a way, we adopt a more restrictive definition than the economists from different national traditions that we study, who included in the public finance discipline many more issues: the scope of state intervention, the historical description of fiscal systems, etc.

From a historical perspective, two features characterize the constitution of the field of public finance in the academic and intellectual landscape: its progressive specialization and its late internationalization.

Before the nineteenth century, views and analyses on public finance were often included in general writings on economics; there were few specialized authors and few works exclusively and extensively dedicated to public finance issues, in the sense that we described above. The process of specialization predominantly occurred in the last third of the nineteenth century. In France, several liberal economists developed a special interest in public finance topics and contributed to the creation of a new academic field endowed with courses, *chaires* and textbooks ([Le Van-Lemesle, 2004](#)). The German-speaking *Finanzwissenschaft* arose in universities ([Holtfrerich, 2013](#)). The Italian fiscal tradition made important contributions to the modern theory of public finance ([Fausto, 2010](#)), and Spanish policymakers tried to modernize the tax system in the last quarter of the century ([Martorell Linares, 2000](#)).



The second characteristic feature of this field is its late internationalization. Faccarello and [Sturn \(2010\)](#) and [Sturn \(2016\)](#) highlight “the nation-specific institutional features embedding public budgetary processes” (Faccarello & [Sturn, 2010](#), p. 539) and other autonomous analytical grounds to explain the “late internationalization of public economics (late compared with general economics)” ([Sturn, 2016](#), p. 484). We agree with that view in that the internationalization of public finance, as a subfield of public economics, happened later since it is much more subject to the “nation-specific institutional features embedding public budgeting processes” ([Sturn, 2016](#), p. 485). This trend also explains the richness and diversity of approaches in public finance that remain at the end of the nineteenth century.

Our research intends to deliver new insights on public finance in the history of economic thought. The history of economic thought’s perspective on public finance issues has links to other fields, without which our understanding of these issues would be incomplete.

First, as Schumpeter stated, public finance is closely connected with the historical and political context; ideas and theories in public finance cannot be understood without considering the historical features in which they are embedded. Analyses and policy proposals on public finance are crucial to understanding the development of political regimes, the objectives of their rulers and the means to attain them. Indeed, recent research has stressed the importance of politics for the institutionalization of political economy and determined schools of economic thought ([Augello & Guidi, 2005](#)). However, public finance is also a powerful instrument to configure or change a determined political situation. [Cardoso and Lains \(2010, p. 1\)](#), referencing the liberal regimes of the West in the nineteenth century, assert that “reforms of fiscal and financial systems . . . were crucial for both the establishment of liberal regimes and the development of European economies in the century to 1914.”

The questions that the contributions in this issue address have explicit links to the development of institutions in a period of consolidation of nation-states. Understanding these economic debates reveals the bidirectional influence of economic ideas on politics and politics on public finance in this particular environment. In this respect, the history of economic ideas on public finance cannot avoid its necessary connection to economic and political history. Contemporaneous economic and political debates and facts are an essential complement to draw a complete picture of public finances as they were and the interests that were at stake. Contributors have connected ideas to the environment to avoid anachronistic hypotheses and reasoning deprived of their context. In contrast, this framework provides the basis for transformation, adaptation, and creation of economic thought, at times designed to modify precisely that political and social atmosphere, as evinced in [Laskaridis’](#) chapter, for instance.

Second, public finance issues are enmeshed in controversies on the role of the state, its attributions, not only economic, and its right to interfere in the private lives of individuals. A renewed interest in public finance often intersects with new insight into state intervention, as demonstrated by the chapters of [Coste and Silvant](#), [San Julián](#) and [Sturn](#). In this respect, there is a connection with political science. Public finance can also be a topic of inquiry for public law and

administrative law. Indeed, in periods such as the eighteenth century, the separation between law and economics was sometimes unclear. In this fashion, the nineteenth century – the period of analysis of most of the chapters in this volume – is particularly fertile. In the central decades of the century in France, the liberal school of economic thought held a vision of the state as a mere insurer of lives and properties, fully deprived of the right to interfere in the private sphere. The majority of economic authors from southwestern European countries – Portugal, Spain, and Italy – accepted this vision, which contrasted with the German tradition, more prone to consider political economics as the science of government. These anti-statist views shifted when the economic and social panorama started to change, yielding more nuanced positions (among them the Liberals’ themselves) that included studying limits on free trade, conferring privileges of money-issuing to a central bank, taxing personal income, and erecting programs of social insurance for workers.

Third, ideas on public finance have a direct connection with the techniques of the “science of finance” that deserves to be researched. As far as the state increases the scope of its interventions, it becomes necessary to develop a series of instruments, institutions, and procedures to intervene in the economy efficiently and successfully. This “technicization” must be associated with the specialization of the field described above. Economists that specialized in applied economics (public finance in all its dimensions) emerged and delivered technical writings, analyzing particular problems, proposing specific solutions and financial techniques, or delivering more generalist treatises. In fact, over time, extensive and comprehensive works emerged in all these countries, some of them reissued several times, such as Leroy-Beaulieu’s *Traité de la science des finances* (1877), Léon Say’s *Dictionnaire des finances* (1889–1894), Adolph Wagner’s monumental *Finanzwissenschaft* (1877–1901), Bastable’s *Public Finance* (1892), Piernas Hurtado’s *Tratado de Hacienda Pública y Examen de la Española* (1884–1885), the writings of Seligman in the 1890s, or those by the Italian school of public finance, starting in 1883 with the writings of Pantaleoni. The renewed interest in the practices of public finance regarding public debt management is developed in Bentemessek’s and Demeulemeester’s papers.

In summary, studying historical controversies in public finance is a challenging task since public finance issues are simultaneously embedded with public economics, political science, and economic history. Therefore, we find it necessary to seek broader perspectives and complementary approaches from other fields of knowledge.

## **PUBLIC FINANCE IN THE HISTORY OF ECONOMIC THOUGHT**

Compared to other topics, historians of economics have not devoted much attention to public finance issues. This situation has changed, perhaps under the influence of other fields, such as economic history, political history, or legal history, which have approached the analysis of public finance issues from a variety of perspectives.

Recent interest in public finance is not alien to economic events, notably the 2008 global crisis, which triggered reactions from economists, such as the noted paper by [Reinhart and Rogoff \(2010\)](#) and its subsequent controversy, and the presidential address of [Olivier Blanchard \(2019\)](#) at the American Economic Association conference.

It can be asserted then that public finance is now a subject of increasing interest in the history of economic ideas. The publication of the collection of classics on the theory of public finance by [Musgrave and Peacock \(1958\)](#) was a starting point, which not only incorporated key foundational texts but also illustrated the diversity of traditions in public finance. Since then, many contributions have been published. This process has accelerated in the last two decades, which have witnessed numerous initiatives of broad scope, epitomized by recent publications like the special issue on public economics of the *European Journal of the History of Economic Thought* (2010), with valuable contributions specifically on public finance, or [Cardoso and Lains' collective book \(2010\)](#), with a trans-disciplinary approach. Contributions from economic historians, such as those from [Yun-Casalilla and O'Brien \(2012\)](#), have not neglected economists' diverse views on topics such as the functions of the state, public expenditure, taxation, and debt financing. This kind of work allows valuable synergies with historians of economics. Many research projects in economic history seek to understand ideas on public finance with an interdisciplinary focus in the manner of Schumpeter, emphasizing the importance of the institutional contexts and historical determinants. This requires approaches open to other social sciences. These collective efforts, not yet abundant, do not overshadow investigations on particular matters and authors, which have shed much light on the development of public economics in different nations and periods.

Historians of economic thought examining the public finance phenomena have delivered extremely diverse pieces of research. While any attempt at taxonomy would be far from satisfactory, particular types of contributions can be discerned. An important group of works focuses on the analysis of the writings of economists who have decisively contributed to the creation of the conceptual framework of public finance as a particular aspect of a doctrinal paradigm. Such are the contributions on the concept and scope of public finance by authors such as Smith, Ricardo, J.B. Say, and J.S. Mill, which are bricks that have built the classical liberal standard. The works of these economists have been the objects of much research, both in books that address a wide panorama of authors or schools (for instance [O'Brien, 2004](#), on classical economists, which contains a chapter on classical public finance, or [Dome, 2004](#), on the political economy of public finance in England) and in articles that concentrate on particular aspects. The same is true for writings that examine authors who formed the conceptual bases of Marshallian economics, like Pigou, Pareto, and Wicksell, and those on later economists, such as Musgrave and Buchanan, at the root of the modern development of public economics. It is not the objective of this introduction to discuss all these contributions, but a quick search of the main international journals in the history of economics reveals a vast amount of recent works of high quality, indicating that the interest in this field of research is far from diminishing. The papers on the ideas on public finance of Smith ([Coutinho, 2001](#)), Steuart ([Bentemesek, 2012](#)), Ricardo ([Churchman, 1995, 1997](#)),

Pareto (Fossati, 2012), Musgrave and Buchanan (Desmarais-Tremblay, 2014; Johnson, 2006, 2014a; Sturn, 2010), Keynes (Aspromourgos, 2014, 2018), and Samuelson (Pickhardt, 2006) are examples.

The second group of contributions focuses on specific national features in the processes of arrangement and organization of public finance in different countries. A variety of institutional settings, economic backgrounds, and historical determinants have led to the formation of diverse national traditions of public finance, with singularities that have deserved specific attention by researchers. The relevance of the institutional, political, social, and historical elements that compose a particular tradition is apparent in cases such as the French or Italian. Faccarello and Sturn (2010, p. 539) note that French authors have been rediscovered only recently, but this seems true for other cases also. Research in this area has increased significantly in the last two decades. Contributions by Faccarello (2006, 2010), Brandy (2007), Kolm (2010), Orain (2010), and Silvant (2010) on French public finance in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and those by Mastromatteo (2003), Fausto (2003, 2008, 2010), and Fossati (2010) on the Italian school of public finance are evidence of this phenomenon. German cameralism has been restudied recently by Wakefield (2009), Wagner (2012), and Seppel and Tribe (2017). Public finance in the German historical school is analyzed in Backhaus (1997), whereas the specificities of public finance thought in the Iberian Peninsula are the subjects of analysis by Astigarraga and Zabalza (2014), among others.

The third group of contributions concentrates on particular problems, such as taxation, public debt, and budget policies, or debates between different actors in a precise geographical context or period or with a comparative perspective. This is, for instance, the case for the recent works by Churchman (1999) on the Malthus–Ricardo debate on public debt, San Julián (2011) on income tax, Fossati (2013) on taxing savings in Italy, Signorino (2016) on Smith and Ricardo’s ideas on the sinking fund, Johnson (2014b) on the consolidation of public finance since the creation of economics departments in American universities, and Mattei (2017) on the policies of austerity during the fascist period in Italy. Augello and Guidi (2002, 2003, 2005) edited a series of contributions on economists and political economics in the political sphere, in Italy and in the West, with thorough analyses on public finance debates.

## OUTLINE OF THE SYMPOSIUM

The symposium is organized chronologically, starting with British debates of the early nineteenth century and ending with American monetary propositions of the 1930s.

Nesrine Bentemessek-Kahia’s chapter is devoted to the debates around British public debt at the beginning of the nineteenth century. She reveals that an extremely high level of debt caused by the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars paradoxically coexisted with the early progression of the industrial revolution and explains this concomitance by the effective policies of sovereign debt management implemented by the state and the Bank of England. The chapter