A Critical Introduction to

CHARLES FOURIER'S

THEORY

OF

ATTRACTIVE INDUSTRY,

AND THE

Moral Harmony of the Passions.

~~TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH OF ABEL TRANSON,~~

~~CIVIL ENGINEER~~

TO WHICH IS PREFIXED,

A MEMOIR OF FOURIER.

BY

HUGH DOHERTY.

LONDON:

PUBLISHED AT THE OFFICE OF THE LONDON PHALANX,
No. 3 A, CATHERINE STREET, STRAND;
AND SOLD BY ALL BOOKSELLERS.

1841.

LONDON:

WILLIAM STEVENS, PRINTER, BELL YARD,
TEMPLE BAR.

MEMOIR

OF

CHARLES FOURIER.

CHARLES FOURIER was born at Besançon, in Franche Comté, on the 7th of April, 1772: he died at Paris, on the 10th of October, 1837. His father was a woollen-draper at Besançon, where he occupied the premises now held by Messieurs Ballanche, woollen-drapers, in that part of the Grand Rue which forms one of the angles of the Rue Baron. In that house Fourier was born; he breathed his last in his apartments, at No. 9, Rue St. Pierre, Montmartre, Paris. He was an only son, and the youngest of four children. One of his sisters, Madame Clerc, is still living at Besançon; another sister, Madame Parrat Brillat, is living at Belley, in the department of the Ain. The third sister died a few years before her brother. Two of these sisters have children, and they are the only immediate branches of Fourier's family.

His maternal uncle, Francis Muguet, was a rich merchant at Besançon. In 1780, this uncle purchased the title of nobility, and when he died, he left a fortune of two millions of francs.

From his earliest infancy, Fourier manifested an indomitable tenacity of opinion when he believed himself right, notwithstanding the opposition he might meet with on the part of prejudiced authority. We have heard him state, that he was first induced to conceive an implacable hatred against falsehood, on being punished for telling the truth in his father's shop, when he was only five years of age. This act of injustice weighed so heavily on his mind that he never forgot it; and it is a remarkable fact, that he was speculating on the possibility of introducing practical truth and honesty in commercial operations, when he discovered the universal laws of harmony; the means of substituting truth and equity, instead of falsehood and oppression, in all the branches of social intercourse. He was first led to perceive that agricultural association, and wholesale dealing, were the only means of neutralising fraud and falsehood in commercial operations, and the difficulties of association led him on till he discovered the theory of human instincts and desires, whence he progressed to the discovery of human destiny and the universal laws of attraction.

His sisters say that he was always very studious and very obstinate, even from infancy. In one of the old records of Besançon, for the year 1786, the only one in which the prizes gained in the college of that city are mentioned, it is stated that the two first prizes for French themes and Latin verses, in the third class, were gained the preceding year, 1785, by Charles Fourier. But we

have heard him say that his earliest favourite study was geography; and that, when he was very young, his mother refusing to give him more than an ordinary allowance of pocket money, he used to have a secret understanding with his father to obtain extra money for buying large geographical charts and globes. He had an exquisite taste for cultivating flowers; and his sister relates that when he was a boy, he had one room so completely filled with flowers, that a narrow passage from the door to one of the windows was the only space left unoccupied. His great pleasure consisted in cultivating all the different varieties of any favourite species of flower. He was also passionately fond of music, the theory of which he understood perfectly, though he was but an amateur in practice. Amongst other indications of reform in arbitrary methods, he has given a plan of musical notation, by which all the different voices and instruments may give the same name to the same note, instead of employing seven or eight different keys or particular scales. According to the present system, the same note occupies every position in the scale, so that eight different keys are required to explain eight different modes of notation, the function of the key being to show the particular position of the fundamental note, on which the respective positions of all the other notes depend. But, musical dissertation would lead us from our story, to which we must return.

Fourier was as remarkable for his kindness and generosity, as for his unflinching adherence to truth and justice; from his earliest youth to his last breathing, he was one and the same consistent character. A particular instance of his charity was revealed to his family when he left school to enter on his commercial career: as the college was not far from his father's house at Besançon, he slept at home, returning every morning to his class, and as he was always eccentric in his habits, it was not deemed extraordinary that he should breakfast earlier than every body else, or that he should take his meals irregularly, rather than conform to the regular hours of the rest of the family: after breakfasting alone, he was in the habit of putting in a paper, for lunch, whatever he thought fit in the way of bread, fruit, viands, &c.; and as he was a growing boy, the quantity he took was not remarked, though sometimes it might have appeared considerable: but the whole secret was disclosed soon after he had left his father's house for Lyons. About a week after his departure, a poor old cripple came to the door and asked if the young gentleman was ill, and on being informed that he had left Besançon, the poor man burst into tears, and said he had lost his guardian angel, who used every morning to feed and comfort him. The first time Fourier wrote home, he begged of them to protect the old man, whom he had forgotten in the hurry of departure, and his request was complied with; but the helpless creature lost his all when he lost his comforter, and though still protected by his absent benefactor, he pined away and died, as much from grief it is supposed, as from infirmity.

On leaving school, Fourier was sent to Lyons, where he entered as clerk in a commercial house. He was then about eighteen years of age, and after remaining some time as clerk, he became particularly desirous of travelling. It was not long before he was able to indulge his taste, by obtaining the confidence of a very respectable house, whose business extended over a great part of the continent, and for whom Fourier travelled through Germany, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, and France. Two circumstances favoured his views in this respect: in the first place, commercial travellers were not so numerous then as they are now, and rapid circulation was deemed less essential; secondly, the death of his father had left him perfectly at ease in money matters, so that, in travelling for his commercial patrons, he was able to remain as long as he thought proper in each city, by paying the extra expenses incurred on his own account. An insatiable thirst for knowledge caused him to change frequently from one firm to another, and from one branch of commerce to another, notwithstanding the many advantageous offers which were made to retain him on account of his well known probity and sagacity. Sometimes he was employed at Rouen, sometimes at Bordeaux, Marseilles, or Lyons; but the last of these cities was his favourite resting-place: there he passed more than twenty years of his life. From 1822 to 1837 he resided chiefly in Paris.

Nothing that was remarkable escaped his observation in the course of his travels, nor was his memory less retentive than his other intellectual faculties were powerful and methodical. The climate, the soil, the rivers, hills, forests, &c., the peculiarities of every province in every kingdom which he had visited, were regularly classed in his memory, and critically compared one with another. The number of inhabitants of each city, and their respective pursuits of industry, the principal buildings, both public and private, their respective dimensions, beauties and defects, the width and direction of streets, the heights of houses, the nature of building materials, promenades, fountains, vistas, every thing notable, in fact, was seen by his observing eye, wherever he passed; and, when once he had properly observed, he never forgot even the most trifling details. It often happened that those who visited him were astonished to hear him explain the defects of public buildings, the insalubrious distribution of streets, and the particular improvements which might be made in their native cities, through which he had only passed once or twice in his life, and then remained, perhaps, not more than a few hours. They had passed a great part of their whole lives in their native cities, without ever noticing those details which he pointed out to them. We remember an instance of this nature concerning Metz. One of his friends, a military engineer, who had been long stationed in that city, and who, from his profession, was well acquainted with it, on hearing him comment learnedly and familiarly on its beauties and defects, the deformities of certain buildings, and the nature of the improvements which might easily be made, was led to suppose

that Fourier had not only resided there many years, but that he had been employed as an edile of the city; on inquiring how long it was since Fourier had resided there, the answer was, that he had never resided there at all; that he had only been there once in his life, about thirty years before that time; and that he then only remained one day in that city: he was either going to, or returning from Germany; arriving in Metz early in the morning, he was obliged to wait for an evening coach, and, not knowing what to do with his time, he passed it in his usual recreation, that of observing the buildings and the neighbouring country. His prodigious facility for geographical and architectural studies, excites almost a superstitious belief in his providential mission for discovering the natural destiny of humanity upon earth. He never walked in the streets, or entered a public building, nor even a private house, without remarking the peculiarities of distribution, with their beauties, defects, conveniences, &c., as well as the improvements which might be made in them. His walking-stick was regularly marked off in feet and inches, and every thing remarkable which met his eye was instantly reduced to measurement and calculation.

He studied almost every branch of science, so as to acquire, at least, a general knowledge of each, and their relative degrees of importance in a universal point of view. The mathematical, physical, chemical, and natural sciences were those which he cultivated most: the metaphysical, political, moral, and economical sciences he abandoned as soon as he found their doctrines were based on arbitrary and uncertain principles. He discarded every thing which was not rigorously derived from the laws of nature, deeming it absolute loss of time to study arbitrary rules, even where they are more or less indispensable, as in languages; he paid little or no attention to rules of grammar and logical sophistry. He had a correct knowledge of Latin, but he gave himself no trouble to learn modern languages; he even neglected to acquire a critical knowledge of his native idiom, the French. This neglect of languages, was caused more by a positive knowledge of their imperfections, than by a natural distaste for the acquisition of words; one of his earliest discoveries revealed to him the natural scale of variety in the sounds of the human voice, and, as the most simple sounds were forty-eight in number, he saw the confusion which must necessarily arise, from the fragmentary attempts to represent a compound multiplicity of these distinct sounds, by means of twenty or thirty simple letters. Having also discovered the natural laws by which names should be given to things, he was aware of the inconveniences which must arise from an arbitrary system of forming words: that different persons would attach different meanings to the same word, appeared to him a natural consequence of the arbitrary formation of languages, and, as it is impossible for one man, or one generation, to remedy evils of this nature, he contented himself by indicating the natural process of reform, when society should be sufficiently advanced to think of undertaking such an operation. One of his principal rules of

study was, "to observe Nature as she reveals her laws, rather than delude himself by imagining or learning arbitrary principles."

In 1793, Fourier received about four thousand pounds (one hundred thousand francs), as his share of the property left by his father, after a suitable provision had been made for his mother. With this sum he commenced business in Lyons. He embarked the whole of his capital in colonial produce, but his little fortune was destined to perish in the revolutionary tempest which at that time desolated his unhappy country. The raw materials and spices which he had purchased at Marseilles, had not been long in his possession, when Lyons was besieged by the troops of the Convention; the town was taken, ransacked, and partially destroyed, and Fourier lost all his property. To complete his ruin, a vessel laden with goods which he had purchased at Leghorn, was wrecked on its way to Marseilles; so that, in less than one year, he lost every thing he possessed in the world. Not only did he lose all his property, but he was in constant danger of losing his life.

Exasperated at the bloodthirsty conduct of the Convention which then ruled the destiny of France, the city of Lyons rose up in arms against the tyranny of the government, and a desperate struggle was made to free themselves from the yoke of terror, but all efforts were vain. The city was regularly besieged; and during sixty days the inhabitants made an obstinate and courageous defence. Fourier's bales of cotton were taken, with thousands of others, to erect temporary barriers; his rice, sugar, coffee, &c., were sacrificed in a general seizure for the support of the hospitals, and the nourishment of those who were engaged in repelling the enemy. All the able-bodied men were obliged to take arms in defence of the city, and on one occasion during the siege, Fourier escaped narrowly with his life: he was one of a body of men ordered to sally out and attack the besiegers, and he was almost the only one who ever returned: the greater part of them, being undisciplined militia, were cut to pieces by the cavalry of the Conventionalists.

On the 9th of October, 1793, the city was obliged to surrender, and thousands of the inhabitants were slaughtered on a wholesale scale, for having rebelled against government. A great part of the city was demolished, and the whole of it was doomed to destruction, if a sudden change had not taken place in the National Assembly. Fourier was thrown into prison, where he remained five days, for having taken arms in defence of the city; he was destined to perish either on the scaffold, or in one of the divisions which were butchered on a wholesale plan. The fact of his having escaped may be deemed a miracle. This method of despatching whole bodies of unfortunate citizens, by firing grape shot amongst them, was invented by the blood-thirsty proconsuls, sent by the Convention to punish the population of Lyons; and the infernal massacre was called "*national justice.*"

We have heard Fourier say that he saved his life by telling lies

three different times in one day; and that notwithstanding his horror of falsehood and lying, he had never felt the slightest remorse for having made that exception to the heavenly laws of truth. If we remember right, the erroneous statements he had to make, as an excuse for having taken arms against the Conventionalists, were, that he was not a merchant, but merely an agent, and that he had been forced to enter the *city militia* against his will: that he had no alternative but that of entering the city ranks, or being sacrificed to the fury of the inhabitants.

After being released from prison he was several times visited by the agents of government, and only escaped the rigours of incarceration by abandoning to their cupidity all the money and articles of value which had escaped from the general wreck. When he had neither money nor clothes to satisfy their avarice, they took from him the only thing remaining in his possession, a beautiful collection of geographical maps and charts.

In this state of destitution, with his health declining from anxiety, privation, and fatigue, he escaped from Lyons and returned to his home at Besançon. Here, again, he was incarcerated as a suspicious person, because he did not join the revolutionists, and he only saved his life by conforming to the general requisition, which forced all ranks, sexes, and ages into the national service. This decree of the National Convention of France is one of the most extraordinary features in modern history. It commences thus:—

"23rd of August, 1793.

"*Art.* 1*st.*—From this day until the enemy shall be driven from the territories of the Republic, every French subject is under permanent requisition for the service of the army.

"All single men shall proceed to the field of battle. All married men shall forge arms and carry provisions for the army. All women shall be occupied in the service of the hospitals, in making clothes for the military, awning for tents, &c. &c. All children shall be made useful in preparing lint for the wounded; and all the aged, who are unfit for active service, shall be carried into the public places, to animate the courage of the youthful, excite an eternal hatred against kings, and inculcate the principles of unity in the Republic.

"*Art.* 2*nd.*—All public buildings shall be used as barracks; all public places and squares shall be converted into workshops for forging arms; the earth of cellars shall be washed to extract salt-petre for making powder.

"*Art.* 7*th.*—The rise shall be general. All single men, from 18 to 25 years of age, and widowers who have no children, will march immediately to the head-quarters of their district, where they shall be regularly drilled to the use of arms until they are called upon to join the army.

"*Art.* 18*th.*—The present decree shall be circulated throughout France by means of special couriers."

To this peremptory requisition, Fourier, then about 22 years of age, was obliged to conform; and, being a light active man, he was drafted into the eighth regiment of "*Chasseurs à cheval*," a sort of light dragoons. He joined the army of the Rhine and Moselle, in which he remained about two years. He obtained his discharge on account of ill-health, at Vesoul, on the 24th of January, 1795. His discharge from the army was found amongst

his papers after his death, and with it was found a letter from Carnot, the celebrated Minister at War during the time of the French Republic. In this letter Carnot acknowledges the receipt of a letter from Fourier, containing "*important observations*" relative to a plan for facilitating the march of the French troops in their passage across the Alps to the Rhine.

It is probable that his discharge was obtained through the influence of Colonel Brincour, who had married a Miss Pion, one of Fourier's cousins. He was incorporated in Colonel Brincour's regiment during his service in the army.

On obtaining his liberty, he entered again as a clerk in a commercial house, pursuing his studies with perseverance whenever he had leisure. In 1799 he was employed at Marseilles, in a wholesale warehouse, and in the early part of the year was charged with a commission which gave a powerful stimulus to his favourite speculation, of introducing the practice of truth and honesty in commercial dealings. He was chosen to superintend a body of men while they secretly cast an immense quantity of rice into the sea. (*In the hope of realising a great profit, this rice had been kept till it was completely spoiled.*) France had been suffering from exceeding scarcity during the past year; and notwithstanding the risk of famine amongst the people, these secret monopolisers of corn had allowed their stores to rot, rather than sell them at a reasonable profit. These abuses of monopoly, and many other fraudulent operations of commerce, with which Fourier was well acquainted, appeared to him in the light of real crimes against humanity, and he thenceforth resolved upon studying incessantly until he had discovered, not the means of detecting and punishing, but of permanently and effectually preventing them. This *holy* resolution, if we may be allowed the expression, was crowned with success before the end of the year.

In 1799, Fourier discovered the universal laws of attraction, and the essential destiny of humanity upon earth.

From his earliest youth, the great object of his ambition had been to discover the means of introducing truth, honesty, and economy in commercial operations. Being himself engaged in mercantile pursuits, his natural love of truth, and obstinate adherence to equity, were daily and hourly thwarted by the common practices of his profession. His predominant passion being constantly irritated, left him no respite from the task he had undertaken, notwithstanding the endless difficulties he encountered. Something or other constantly occurred to give him new courage in continuing the pursuit of inquiry, which had been several times well nigh abandoned, in the despondency of impossibility. Besides the every-day practice of lying and cheating in trade, there were certain anomalies which made an indelible impression on his memory. We have already mentioned the impression left on his mind by the injustice of being punished for speaking the truth in his father's shop, when he was only an infant: another fact which had a powerful influence in directing his thoughts, happened when he

was about eighteen years of age. Shortly after leaving school, he was allowed to visit Paris: it was in the year 1790, and his first visit to the capital. The things which attracted his attention most were the Boulevards, the public monuments, the general styles of building, and the excessive dearness of all the necessaries of life. One circumstance in particular seemed a most revolting instance of mercantile extortion: being exceedingly fond of fruit, he was obliged to pay *seven-pence* for *one apple*, of a particular sort, which he had often purchased at the rate of three-farthings a dozen in the country. This instance of a simple commodity like fruit, being augmented to one hundred and twelve times its original value, seemed to him an almost incredible anomaly. It is true that the year 1790 was an exceptional period in France; but the circumstance of the apple was not the less remarkable for its influence on Fourier's mind. From that period to 1799, a lapse of nine years, he laboured incessantly to accomplish his favourite project, but all his efforts were inadequate to the task:—the more he advanced in science and a true knowledge of the world, the more his hopes were chilled by the deep shadow of impossibility. Despair of success, however, did not quench his thirst for science in general; and, as we have already stated, he was again induced to resume his favourite meditation, by the painful idea of monopoly forcing the people to starve while an abundance of provision was exposed to rot in the secret clutch of guilty speculation.

[Those who take an interest in oddities, may find a subject of curious remark in the history of four apples: a striking contrast between the influence of two apples in antiquity, and two in modern history. According to tradition, the two first were the causes of original sin, and the celebrated Trojan war; the other two have been instrumental in causing the discovery of the universal laws of attraction: the material branch by Newton, and the spiritual branch by Fourier; those of antiquity were the causes of discord and suffering; those of modern date, highly influential in effecting harmony and happiness.]

His first inquiries concerning commerce, led him to discover the evils of incoherence and jarring individual interests. He perceived that the only possible means of introducing truth, equity, and economy in productive and distributive industry, was by means of agricultural association and wholesale trade. This discovery only increased the difficulty of realising his favourite project—commercial honesty. He was under the necessity of discovering the practical means of associating human beings, with their natural instincts and tastes, diversity of character and conflicting opinions, before he could proceed: but he was encouraged in his task, by a firm conviction of such a practical science existing in principle, and only remaining to be discovered in order to be applied. The immense advantages of economy, rapidity, equity, education, and science, which he saw might be realised by association, thoroughly convinced him that Providence had pre-ordained society as the natural destiny of man, and he believed that these pre-ordained laws of

association were permanently revealed in the general laws of nature. He found that attraction and repulsion were the two principal laws by which the Creator governs the world; and in order to obtain a complete knowledge of these laws, he resolved to study simultaneously the highest and lowest orders of creation in the universe. He considered the stars as the highest order of creation, mankind as the middle term, and the inferior orders of creation as the lowest step in the scale. He supposed that there must be certain general laws of unity common to these three orders of existence, or it would be impossible for them to compose one harmonious whole; and he hoped that by studying all that was known in the positive sciences concerning them, he might discover the natural laws of correlativeness, which bind them together in unity and eternity. His principal lever in the work of discovery was a sort of algebraical calculation, by which he supposed every law that was common to any two of these general terms, must be common to the third; and he never abandoned any branch of study until he had discovered those principles of nature which were common to the medium and the two extremes.

His first discovery was the universality of distribution, according to a law of ascending and descending progression, in every order of the creation, from the highest to the lowest degree of animate and inanimate beings. This law of progressive distribution he termed SERIES: accordingly, the first grand axiom which he established was this—"*All the harmonies of the universe are distributed in progressive series.*"

Having observed perfect analogy in the different orders of creation in the universe, he was led to infer, that, as the Creator was one and the same being, infinite and eternal, in his attributes, there must necessarily be a principle of unity and analogy in all his creations: that the CREATION must necessarily be a reflection of the attributes of the CREATOR; that the Creator being all in all, it was impossible for him to paint or represent any thing but himself in the creation. If he had represented anything foreign to his own attributes, that something must exist independently; and, in that case, the Deity would not be infinite. Such an hypothesis being perfectly absurd, we must admit that the Creator is infinite, and that it would be impossible for him to create any thing which was not analogous to some of his own attributes. From these considerations, Fourier derived his second axiom—"*The Creator being one infinite harmonious being, every thing in nature must be an imitation of his own attributes, and therefore there exists a universal analogy in every order of creation.*"

Considering attraction and repulsion as the universal laws of nature, and God as the original distributor of all sorts of attraction, it is perfectly rational to infer, that the respective faculties or impulses of attraction and repulsion in all orders of beings, are distributed exactly in proportion to their respective functions in the general harmony of the universe: the *affinity* which binds the atom to the atom, the attractive power which governs the harmony

of the planets, the *affections* which bind human beings to each other in society, are only so many different modes of the one universal law of attraction and repulsion; and from this self-evident induction, Fourier derived his third general axiom: "*The permanent attractions and repulsions of every being in the creation, are exactly in proportion to their respective functions and real destinies in the universe.*"

With these three axioms for his guides, he set out in quest of the grand principle of association and unity. The first thing to be discovered was, an exact knowledge of the nature of man; his natural impulses, attractions, and repulsions. The second object for consideration was, the progressive distribution of these faculties according to the general laws of *series*, which regulate the harmony of the universe: the third fact to be ascertained was, the analogy between the newly discovered principles, and the other known laws of nature, as a confirmation or refutation of the discovery.

It would be superfluous to enter further into these details at present; they will be fully developed in the following treatise:—

About the time of his discovery, Fourier returned to Lyons, and as he was not able to devote the whole of his time to study, he endeavoured to combine his favourite pursuits with a slight occupation, which would procure him the common necessaries of life. To be constantly confined in a warehouse or counting-house, would have occupied too much of his time; he preferred being free, and gaining less: he became what, in France, is termed "*Courtier Marron*," a sort of unlicensed commercial agent. This function, occupying very little of his time, formed a valuable link between practical application to business, and theoretical speculations concerning society. It is probable, that this every-day recurrence to the actual practices of the world, formed a very wholesome check to the illusions of theory; for no philosopher ever wandered so little from the confines of reality, or progressed so far in the intricate mazes of actuality, as Fourier: his most transcendent speculations are traced through analogy, down to the lowest orders of creation, the insect, and the atom; his critical analysis of history and existing society proceeds from the most minute details of every-day life, to the highest considerations of national policy. His favourite method of demonstration, consisted in contrasting the infinitely small, with the infinitely great, according to that universal law of nature, *the contact of extremes*, in every branch of the creation, in every series of natural classification.

While occupied in elaborating the principles of his discovery, he sometimes wrote political articles in the public journals. On the 17th of December, 1803, he published a short article in the "*Bulletin de Lyon*," heading it thus:—"*A Continental Triumvirate and Permanent Peace in less than Thirty Years.*" He supposes that Europe is approaching to a crisis which will put an end to war, and commence an era of universal peace. Amongst the great continental powers, he supposes Prussia will fall a victim to the ravages of war, and that Russia, France, and Austria will form a trium-

virate which will predominate in Europe; and as all triumvirates are composed of two rivals and one dupe, he supposes Austria the probable prey of the other two powers, who would fight for supremacy on the fallen remains of their prey. The conqueror he supposes would become master of the universe, for England would not be able to resist the overgrown power of such a rival. Her Indian possessions would be seized, her maritime monopoly abolished, and general peace secured under the influence of a superior power. These were the probable results which he foresaw in European policy, and the general tenor of the article was, advice to France concerning the policy which she ought to pursue in such circumstances. "Instead of wasting her resources in fighting for colonial and mercantile freedom," said he, "she ought to be prepared for the final struggle with Russia, which will be inevitable. If she neglects these precautions, and continues her chimerical policy with regard to commercial regulations, she will be outwitted by the Russians, who will not be long before they realise the predictions of Montesquieu concerning their supremacy."

The humiliation of Prussia and Austria, and the final rivalry between France and Russia, took place exactly as he had predicted, but fortunately for Europe, the Russians were ignorant of the advantages of their position, and lost the opportunity of seizing their prey: they may not, however, always remain as ignorant as they were then; and, as we shall elsewhere show, they are still to be either disarmed by the other European powers, or become the destroyers of civilisation in Europe. It is vain to suppose that the Russians are becoming more civilised by their commerce with other nations: they are becoming more powerful barbarians by taking advantage of modern inventions. Their apparent interest and natural policy are different from the policy and interest of every other power in Europe. In 1808, Fourier, speaking of incoherent civilisation in general, expressed the following opinion concerning Russian policy:—"In our own times, civilisation has been within a hair's breadth of destruction. The wars of the revolution might have ended in the invasion of France, and the political dissolution of the kingdom; after which, Russia and Austria would have divided Europe between them; and, in their final struggle for supremacy, Russia would probably remain victorious, and give the death-blow to civilisation in Europe."

The Emperor Napoleon instructed the secretary of police at Lyons, to inquire who was the author of the article on the probability of a Continental Triumvirate, and when the printer of the Journal informed him that it was a commercial agent who wrote it, no further inquiry was made. It is a remarkable fact, that the printer alluded to, has since become the celebrated philosopher, M. Ballanche, and it is not improbable that Fourier's writings and conversations were the original ground-work of Ballanche's philosophical speculations.

In 1808, Fourier published his first work, under the title of "*Théorie des quatre Mouvemens*,"—the theory of universal attrac-

tion and repulsion. The first volume was merely a prospectus of the work, intended to procure the means of publishing the rest by subscription; but little or no notice being taken of the prospectus, the publication was suspended. He had bestowed eight years' labour in working out the principles of his discovery, before he attempted to publish them; and having discovered that certain parts of his theory were still incomplete when he published the first volume, he resolved to withdraw it from circulation, and continue his studies. After seven years' additional elaboration, he was preparing to go to press, when Napoleon returned from the island of Elba, in 1815, and France was again thrown into a state of agitation. During the short reign from the time of his return from Elba until the battle of Waterloo, the Emperor Napoleon named the Count Fourier prefect of the department of the Rhone, and the Count placed his namesake, Charles Fourier, at the head of the statistical department of that provincial government. On the return of the Bourbons, Fourier retired to his sister's, at Tallissien, that he might quietly continue the preparation of his manuscripts. This sister was a widow, living in a country village near Belley, where her husband had been sub-prefect, a function similar to that of county-sheriff in England. Fourier had another sister living at Belley, where he resided chiefly from 1816 to 1821. Several of his nephews are now residing in that neighbourhood. One of them is a barrister, another a notary (a conveyancing attorney).

As he always led a very quiet and studious life, little is known of his particular habits and private transactions during his residence at Lyons from 1799 to 1816, but it is probable that they were in every way similar to his general bearing from that time to his death. He was thoughtful and reserved; more studious of comforting and assisting the poor, who surrounded him, than desirous of flattering the rich, or courting their acquaintance. Indeed, he had an absolute dislike to them; because they are generally hypocritical in proportion to their pretensions to politeness and good breeding. In the present state of society, falsehood and dissimulation are the very essence of politeness. Morality, justice, and the love of truth were the principal features of his private character. He was very moderate in his eating and drinking; but particularly desirous of obtaining the best quality of every thing, free from adulteration. He used to say that half the things we eat and drink are poisoned by adulteration, which is only one of the many evils of individual competition and *incoherent* civilisation. From a continual habit of study, he had acquired the habits and manners of a hermit, lived almost entirely alone, and appeared to avoid long conversations with strangers. He lived and died a bachelor; almost as great a stranger to his own family as to the rest of society. This taciturnity increased as he advanced in years; for those who knew him when young say that he was very lively and witty. General Pajol relates that he was in the habit of dining with him every day for several years, at a table d'hôte in Lyons, while Fourier resided in that city; and that his wit and gaiety ren-

dered him the admiration of all who knew him. Even in later years, particularly during the two last years of his life, he was cheerful and communicative with those persons whom he knew intimately, and who had the good fortune to possess his confidence. About four months before he died, on asking him for an explanation of certain parts of his theory, as we were wont to do whenever we met with a difficult point, he was more than usually gay, and in order to give a clear idea of one of the words which he used, he declaimed, with appropriate action, several verses from Molière, in which his meaning was happily expressed. Though we had been in the habit of conversing with him frequently, this was the first time we ever saw him laugh heartily. We had often seen him good-humoured, communicative, and wittily sarcastic; but the slightest indication of a smile was rarely seen on his lips.

Having withdrawn his first work from circulation, a few copies only were in the hands of the public, and no notice had been taken publicly either of him or his system. In 1814, however, one of those copies which were in circulation fell by chance in the way of an inquiring mind at Besançon, Fourier's native city; and the gentleman, M. Just Muiron, who had accidentally come in possession of the book, was so much struck with its originality, the sublime simplicity of the theory it announced, the immense importance of the discovery, if it were practicable, that he immediately resolved to find out the author, and learn more of the subject. This was no easy matter, as the book had been printed at Leipsic without indicating either the name or address of the author: the only clue to his residence was contained in a paragraph relative to the subscription for publishing the rest of the work. Those who were desirous of subscribing were referred to M. Charles, at Lyons. It was not until the beginning of the year 1816, that Muiron succeeded in discovering the retreat of Fourier at Belley. When informed of his real residence, he wrote to Fourier to inquire about the rest of the publication, and received a very simple, polite, and friendly answer. The correspondence was continued for some time; and Muiron, more and more convinced of the truth and importance of the discovery, became the intimate friend and the first disciple of Fourier.

Muiron soon became more anxious than Fourier himself concerning the publication of the system, now almost complete in every detail, and he offered to advance money for the necessary expenses. As Fourier had saved a little money, and had inherited about forty pounds a-year from his mother, he lived very economically, and laboured incessantly to prepare his manuscript for the press; but the materials were so immense, that nearly four years were occupied in the laborious undertaking. The publication was again purposely delayed by a new discovery which Fourier made in 1819; and though this discovery related principally to cosmogony, he deemed it prudent to delay publishing until he had thoroughly verified the unity and universality of his whole discovery. Having fully satisfied himself of the correctness of every

part, he removed to Besançon in 1821, where the two first volumes of his great work were printed. In 1822, they were published, under the modest title of *A Treatise on Domestic and Agricultural Association;* and he went to Paris in the hope of having them favourably reviewed, as a means of obtaining the necessary funds for realising the practical part of his system. After remaining more than twelve months in vain, he found that money was the only means of obtaining notice in journals and reviews; and his funds being exhausted, his book was left unnoticed. In this position he had no resource but that of patience. Not being able to live on forty pounds a-year in Paris, he was obliged to employ a part of his time in procuring the necessary means of subsistence. He returned to Lyons, where he remained about a year; but finding it inconvenient to be absent from the capital, he became corresponding clerk to a commercial house in the Rue du Mail in Paris, and remained five years without obtaining any serious review of his work, or making himself known to any influential person. At the end of that time, his friends in the country advised him to publish an abridgment of his work, which would be cheaper and less scientific. In accordance with this advice, he published a methodical elementary treatise in 1829. This volume met with the same reception as the others—absolute silence on the part of journalists and reviewers. Fourier still remained in Paris, sending his book to everybody he thought likely to understand it, and take an interest in the realisation of his theory. Silence and indifference, however, were still the only result of his efforts to obtain publicity, until a lucky occurrence brought him into notice in 1832.

In the beginning of that year, a new mystico-religious sect of economists, calling themselves St. Simonians, made a great noise in Paris, by their preachings and writings. Fourier had sent his works to the teachers of these new doctrines as early as the year 1830, informing them of the possibility of realising immediately that social regeneration for which they appeared so anxious in their predications. Instead of listening to the simplicity of Fourier's advice, they deemed themselves vastly superior to everybody else, and gave him to understand they were perfectly competent to the task which they had undertaken. They did not, however, neglect to read his works privately, adopting many of his principles without acknowledging the source from which they had drawn them, until, at length, several of their proselytes, who were really serious in their convictions, abandoned the illusive theories of St. Simonism, and publicly professed the principles of Fourier. It may not be improper to observe here, that these principles are directly opposed to all systems of community, and that it is quite erroneous to confound Fourier with Owen. Soon after the desertion of Transon, Le Chevalier, Paget, Lemoyne, and several other learned and influential men, the St. Simonians were dispersed, and a weekly journal was commenced for the diffusion of Fourier's principles of association and progressive policy. This journal, called *La Reforme Industrielle,* was conducted with spirit,

and obtained many adherents to its principles. A joint-stock company was formed to realise the new theory of association; and one gentleman, M. Baudet Dulary, member of parliament for the county of Seine and Oise, bought an estate which cost him five hundred thousand francs (twenty thousand pounds sterling) for the express purpose of putting the theory into practice. Operations were actually commenced, but for want of sufficient capital to erect buildings and stock the farm, the whole operation was paralysed; and notwithstanding the natural cause of cessation, the simple fact of stopping short after having commenced operations, made a very unfavourable impression upon the public mind. Success is the only criterion with the indolent and indifferent, who do not take the trouble to reason on circumstances and accidental difficulties.

Fourier was very much vexed at the precipitation of his partisans, who were too impatient to wait until sufficient means had been obtained. They argued, that the fact of having commenced operations would attract the attention of capitalists, and ensure the necessary funds: he begged them to beware of illusion; told them how he had been deceived himself in having to wait more than twenty years for a simple hearing, which, from the importance of his discovery, he had fully expected to obtain immediately. All his entreaties were in vain. They told him he had not obtained a hearing sooner, because he was not accustomed to the duplicity of intrigue: and, confident in their own judgment, commenced without hesitation, and were taught, at the expense of their own imprudence, to appreciate more correctly the sluggish indifference of an ignorant public.

Since that time, numerous partisans have been recruited amongst the learned and influential classes in France; many elementary works have been written on social science, and the epoch of a successful realisation is probably near at hand; but Fourier himself has descended into the tomb, as a martyr to the sceptical indifference of the age in which he lived. Sent by Providence to deliver humanity from the bondage of incoherence, to discover the promised land of peace and happiness, and bid the suffering multitude to enter and be glad, his body, worn with years, and exhausted with fatigue, yielded the spirit on the eve of success, that his soul might be crowned with a glory in heaven worthy of its more than terrestrial perseverance in the cause of truth and justice upon earth.

More than once he was deluded by the apparent probability of realising his theory before he left this world, but some unfortunate accident always stepped in to bar his hopes. In the beginning of the year 1830, Fourier was introduced to the Baron Capella, then minister of the Crown for the department of Public Works; and that gentleman was studying the theory with a view to put it in practice, when the Revolution of July broke out, and dethroned the elder branch of the Bourbons. On the 24th of July, the Baron wrote to Fourier, saying that he was obliged to suspend for a while his examination of the system, on account of an extraordinary press of state business. The next day, the 25th of July,

Charles X. issued the celebrated "*ordonnances*;" and three days later, the monarch was dethroned and his ministers dispersed. Fourier's best founded hopes were dissipated in a moment, and he was again reduced to the necessity of seeking for the means of realisation amongst sceptical, indifferent, and ignorant strangers.

In 1835, he published the first part of another volume, entitled *False Industry*. There is little in this work which had not been given in his earlier publications, if we except the spirited criticisms which it contains on incoherence generally. He was on the eve of publishing the second part, when he was cut short in his career by the unsparing hand of death. There remained but one chapter to write, which he was obliged to defer on account of the rapidly declining state of his health. As those chapters which were written had been printed, he was asked, as an especial favour, to have a copy stitched before the work was complete. In compliance with this request, four copies were prepared in an incomplete state; and, as he did not live to finish the work, it is worthy of remark that the last words he wrote were,—

"*Exegi monumentum ære perennius.*"

In the early part of 1837, he met with a very serious accident, from which he never thoroughly recovered. On returning home rather later than usual one dark night, he missed his footing on the staircase, and in falling down two pair of stairs, his skull was fractured in a dreadful manner. The wound was healed in the course of a few months, but he never recovered his health. His strength failed him, his features became totally changed by swelling, his stomach refused the functions of digestion, and his whole frame was evidently hurrying on to dissolution.

Having no confidence in medical science, he constantly refused all medical aid. Though two of his intimate friends were physicians, he neglected their prescriptions, and confided in his own judgment. He had a particular dislike to being surrounded by servants and friends during his illness: accustomed to being alone, he preferred solitude to the tiresome assiduities of officious persons. He would not allow any one to attend him during his illness but the old woman who was in the habit of serving him on ordinary occasions. Many of his friends offered to sit up with him, and remain in the adjoining room that he might not be disturbed by their presence, but he refused peremptorily. He would not even allow the old woman to remain with him after midnight. He was perfectly sensible to the last moment. On the eve of his death, he sent the servant to bed about twelve o'clock, requesting her to be up at five the next morning. When she went to see how he was at the appointed hour, she found him out of bed. He had had the energy to get up, and go to the night table; and as he was making an effort to return, his spirit fled, and the dead body was left kneeling at the bedside. He could not have been long dead, as his corpse was warm two hours afterwards.

His body was embalmed, his head and bust were moulded, and

the conformation of his brain was minutely analysed. He was buried on the 11th of October, in the cemetery of Montmartre; and on his tomb are engraved the three fundamental axioms of his doctrine:—

1. "La SERIE distribue les HARMONIES."
2. "Les ATTRACTIONS sont proportionnelles aux DESTINEES."
3. "ANALOGIE UNIVERSELLE."

The third axiom is represented by mathematical symbols, instead of being expressed in words.

DESCRIPTION OF FOURIER'S PERSON.

The following sketch of the personal bearing and appearance of Fourier may not be uninteresting to those who are curious in such details. It was written soon after we had the advantage of knowing him, and as the description was drawn under the influence of first impressions, it is free from the bias of partiality. We transcribe it in the familiar style of epistolary correspondence in which it was written; observing that his personal bearing improved very much, as further acquaintance increased his confidence in professed friendship.

Charles Fourier is of small stature; about five feet seven inches in height (English measure). He is firmly built; his limbs are well knit and well proportioned, but his muscular system is rather indicative of quickness and energy than of superior power. His bones are small, and I should think his weight not more than 130 pounds (English weight). He appears to be healthy and active.

His head is decidedly small in circumference, but it is high, even, and remarkable for beauty of form. It is, perhaps, more remarkable for a general roundness and smoothness than for any peculiar developement of individual organs. The forehead is neither high nor low, depressed nor protuberant, narrow nor square; it is of ordinary size and harmonious form.

His complexion is fair; his hair a light brown, slowly becoming grey, and rather thin about the temples. His features are peculiarly expressive and aristocratic. The nose is aquiline, but neither long nor large; the bridge is very high, and the line from it to the end is very straight. It is fine and well formed, but slightly turned on one side, from a fall in his youth. His eyes are blue, and generally of a soft deep tone, but sometimes assuming a lighter and brighter colour. They are large, full, and expressive, and well protected by the eyebrows, which are neither so heavy as to give a sullen appearance, nor sufficiently raised to give a supercilious expression. Indeed, the eyes and forehead have a very intelligent, mild, and poetic expression, which almost seems to contradict the severity of the mouth. The lips are very thin, and the corners of the mouth, being considerably depressed, are very far removed from the slightest indication of a smile. The chin and the lower jaw appear to be rather large in proportion to the other features.

His countenance is generally grave, and his manners indicate indifference and disappointment to a degree which almost excludes the ordinary forms of politeness and attention to strangers; nor does he appear much less indifferent to the attention which is paid to him by them. He generally appears as if he would rather be alone than holding conversation. The appearance of indifference is so firmly stamped on his general bearing, that when he is in convivial society, where all eyes are directed towards him, and he is himself relating some remarkable anecdote, or commenting on particular facts and events which excite the highest degree of interest in his audience, he very rarely appears to be animated. I never saw him smile or look gay, though all around him might be laughing heartily. The only mark of interest on his part is the readiness with which he will at times relate an anecdote or elucidate the subject of conversation. He approves, or rectifies in proper terms, any opinion which may be expressed, and readily answers any question, but he generally does it with an air of polite indifference which does not invite a continuation of the conversation: indeed, the simple fact of his asking a question, or making a remark which is not called forth by direct solicitation, appears to be on his part a mark of approbation and politeness. The flippancy of superficial reasoners, and the habitual shallowness of the objections made against his principles, has reduced him to a state of morbid irritability, which is easily excited into absolute impatience. He does not, however, refuse discussion; nor does he press individuals to study his doctrines.

His general appearance, when at home, is that of a country gentleman of miserly habits. His papers lie about on different tables, as if they were never disturbed by any body but himself. Though he has resided many years in Paris, his habiliments are very plain and savour strongly of provincial simplicity. On being introduced to strangers, he appears absolutely indifferent, and, so far as I have been able to observe, he never directly invites any body to call and see him, though he makes a point of remaining at home from two to four o'clock to receive visiters.

This description, as we have already said, was written when we first knew him; but, when once his confidence was gained by prolonged acquaintance, he was cheerful, communicative, and attentive, without ever encouraging others to be more familiar with him than he was with them. He was as indulgent in excusing the errors of the ignorant, as he was severe in his remarks upon those of philosophers and economists. He spoke in public with ease, clearness, and simplicity, but he never made long speeches. His style of speaking was purely conversational, and free from all rhetorical flourish.

Though the first impressions which his appearance generally made on the minds of strangers, were those of stern independence, indifference, and irritability, still he was neither proud nor morose; nor was he really indifferent. He is known to have spent much time and money to serve poor people: indeed, he was more partial

to the poor than to the rich, because he deemed them generally more frank and sincere, when not depraved by low vices. He disliked the cold ceremony and the formal reserve of fashionable society, and though he rarely refused the invitations of his poor friends, he often appeared reluctant in accepting those of the rich. He was fond of caressing children and domestic animals; Angola cats were particular favourites with him. He used often to contrast the innocence of children with the deceit and hypocrisy of adults, and lament that the vitiating influence of *incoherent* civilisation should be allowed to deprave their minds. He generally preferred the friendship of single, to that of married people, because he deemed the necessity of providing for a family, one of the most powerful causes of selfishness and duplicity. The following remarks often recurred in his conversation: "*C'est un père de famille; il faut vous en méfier. En civilisation le mariage est une ligue individuelle contre les intérêts de la société.*" "He is the father of a family; you must be distrustful of his professions. In civilisation (incoherent) the institution of marriage generates private leagues against the public interest. Married people think they may sacrifice every thing to the interests of their family." This, however, was not, on his part, a tirade against the institution of marriage in itself, but against the incoherence of society which obliges individuals to become selfish, by leaving them and their families unprotected against the vicissitudes of fortune. He was systematically distrustful of every body, except children. This arose from an intimate conviction that incoherent institutions deprave the minds of individuals by forcing them to become selfish and designing. It was, no doubt, this deep-rooted distrust which stamped his manners with an almost repulsive indifference towards strangers.

He very rarely spoke of himself or of his own position, unless he was directly questioned on that subject; and even then his answers were very laconic. His most intimate friends knew nothing of the misfortune which befel him in 1793, until his sister, after his death, was desired to relate the circumstances of his early life. He never complained of fortune, and though he was particularly fond of luxurious refinement, he was perfectly resigned to his humble condition. From a constant habit of order and economy, he made the most of his limited means, and, as he always lived in studious research, he seemed hardly to feel that he was in the world, almost alone. He contrived to have about one hundred pounds sterling yearly income, by devoting part of his time to commercial pursuits when his family resources fell below that sum; but as he sometimes received legacies from different branches of his family, he remained for years together wholly occupied in his studies. When he died, he had an independent income of sixty pounds a-year, besides the profits arising from the sale of his works.

He was always very careful to give nobody any trouble, and he was so scrupulous about not putting his friends to expense on his

account, that in sending a letter, even by the twopenny post, he always paid the postage, unless it were in answer to one which had put him to unnecessary expense. It required no inconsiderable degree of delicacy in the mode of presentation, to prevail on him to accept the most trifling present; and when he did accept, it was a mark of great friendship and confidence on his part.

He was particularly scrupulous in keeping his promise. A few weeks before he died, he had promised to breakfast with four of his friends at a considerable distance from his own dwelling: on the appointed day he was so ill that he could hardly leave his bed, and yet he attended his appointment; merely observing on his arrival, that "he was very unwell, and that, if he had not promised, he should not have left home." This, we believe, was the last time he ever did leave it before his death.

VOCABULARY.

As a new science necessarily contains new ideas, it is often very difficult, if not impossible, to represent them by words, which represent old ideas only, and thence the necessity of creating new words for new meanings. We have endeavoured to avoid novel and singular expressions as much as possible, but absolute necessity obliges us to adopt the following words, which we hope will be easily understood when once they are explained.

Human, Humanitary.

We use the word *humanitary* in speaking of the whole human race, because the word human is applicable to single individuals or single tribes. For instance, human progress in science and industry is very considerable at the present day, but *humanitary* progress is very INconsiderable, for three fourths of the human race are ignorant savages. The word *humanitary*, then, always relates to the whole human race, but, the word *human* is sometimes used in relation to a small portion of humanity.

Corporate, Societary, Combinative, Associative, Social, Incoherent.

By the words *societary* and *corporate*, we mean *associated*, in contradistinction to *incoherent* and separate, interests in society. The word *social* relates to society under all forms, without distinguishing *incoherence*, or disunited interests from association. *Societary* combination means association, but social combination might mean the ordinary institutions of *incoherent* civilization. This last word is used to signify the present state of social incoherence in which the interests of different classes are not combined in association. By association, we mean *joint stock*, but not, *community: combinative principles* are the opposite of *incoherency* and jarring interests.

Passional { *sensual* { *physical or sensuous.* / *spiritual* { *moral and intellectual.*

The word *passional* relates to all the passions and desires of human nature, physical, moral, and intellectual; harmonic and subversive. The word sensual is not used in a corrupt sense; *physical, sensual* and *material* are used synonymously. The word *spiritual* is used in contradistinction to *sensual* or *material,* and comprehends both *moral* and *intellectual.*

Correlativeness, Co-ordain, Adaptation, Attunement.

Relative and *co-relative;* one thing may be relative to another; several things may be *co-relative,* or correlative to each other. Cause and effect are correlative.

To ordain, to ordinate; to appoint, to place in methodical order. To *co-ordain* or *co-ordinate,* to place one set of things or ideas in the same methodical order as another set of things, principles, or ideas. The forms of a pair of stays, are adapted or *co-ordained* to the shape of a woman's waist. The plan of a house should be regularly *co-ordained* to all the domestic wants of the family for which it is intended. If there are twelve radically different desires in human nature, a perfect set of social institutions should be *co-ordained* or adapted to those desires and all their secondary ramifications. All philosophical systems are *arbitrary,* when their principles are not derived *from* and *co-ordained with* the laws of nature. The particular difference of meaning between *co-ordain* and *adapt,* is, that the latter is used in a concrete, and the former in an abstract, sense; one thing is adapted to another thing; but a theory should be *co-ordained* to certain principles of nature considered in a general and abstract manner.

Essential, Organic, Accidental.

By the word *essential,* we mean that which is spiritual and inborn; or that which is permanent and contrary to *accidental.* By the word *organic,* we mean that which is instrumental, changeable, comparatively accidental or secondary. The spirit of man, and the inborn impulses of the soul, are *essential* and indestructible faculties, but his body and his *organic* faculties are transient and changeable: when the spirit leaves the body, the material *organic* faculties are dissolved, but the *essential* faculties are inherent in the soul: they constitute it, and can never leave it. The *organic* faculties are *co-ordained* to the *essential* faculties, because they are instruments exactly and appropriately adapted to their use. By the words *essential* and *accidental,* applied to the destiny of humanity, we mean to distinguish the transitive destiny of ignorance and suffering during the infancy of humanity, (in which the task of human genius is to discover the laws of nature,) from the ultimate and essential destiny of humanity, in which mankind will enjoy the fruits of science and social happiness upon earth.

Vehemence, Violence.

By these words we generally understand, *vehemence* of declamation, in contradistinction to *violence* of action: revolutionary *vehemence* in writing and speaking; revolutionary *violence* in civil war.

Agglomeration, Conglomeration, Aggregation.

These words refer generally to the present state of society, in which great numbers of people are crowded together in large cities and manufacturing districts, without being in any way united or associated.

Groups, Series.

These words are used in reference to Fourier's principles of *attractive industry;* the word *series* being analogous to a regiment of soldiers; and the word *group* being analogous to company.

Prevision, Foresight, Prescience, Anticipation.

These words are sometimes used synonymously.

Solidarity, Solidary.

Collective responsibility. Collectively responsible.

To Guarantee, Guaranteeïsm.

These words are used to signify legislative or other regulations to protect society from the evils of false association, and monopoly, on the part of privileged individuals and companies. A universal insurance institution would *guarantee* individuals against accidental and unforeseen losses. The bases of guaranteeism in partial association are *corporate organization* and *collective responsibility.*

Barbarous, Uncivilized.

These words are used synonymously, without direct reference to *cruelty;* but the word Barbarian, when used in a particular sense, applies to that state of social organization, which is based on military conquest. According to this definition, the Romans were Barbarians. According to our views of the philosophy of social progress, we distinguish eight different sorts of society, besides the mixed and intermediate degrees, thus:—

1. *Edenism;* or, a state of primitive happiness.
2. *Savageism;* or, a state of wandering independency.
3. *Patriarchalism;* or, a state of clanship and familial tribes.
4. *Barbarism;* or, a powerful state of military feudalism organized for conquest.
5. *Competitive Civilization;* or, that state of false association peculiar to the present state of society in Europe.
6. *Partial Association;* or, the association of industrial interests alone.
7. *Simple Association;* or, the complete association of domestic and industrial interests, confined to distinct classes in society.
8. *Contrasted Association;* or, the association of all classes and all interests, according to a graduated scale of inequality in rank and fortune.

A CRITICAL INTRODUCTION

TO

Fourier's Science of Attractive Industry & General Policy.

PROEM.

"*Ask, and it shall be given you: seek, and ye shall find: knock, and it shall be opened unto you.*"—(St. Luke, chap. xi. 9.)
"*There is nothing covered that shall not be revealed; and hid, that shall not be known.*"—(Matth. x. 26.)

An inquiry concerning the destiny of humanity upon earth, and the sources of misery and happiness in society, may at first appear too abstruse to interest the general reader; but the importance of the matter, and the increasing desire for knowledge, may, perhaps, serve to attract serious attention to a rapid and superficial view of the question. In fact, few subjects would excite more curiosity if we had any hope of really discovering the truth; and hence, despair of success may be deemed the chief cause of indifference. Yet, an absolute doubt of success in quest of true knowledge, betrays a lamentable want of faith in Providence, who has created in the soul of man an insatiable thirst for science concerning the mysterious laws of nature and his own destiny in the universe: confidence alone in divine justice leads us to hope for a full satisfaction of this naturally inquisitive desire, and the reward of success has at last crowned the faith of genius, by revealing the secret springs of human progress towards truth and happiness.

It would be vain, however, to expect that deep-rooted scepticism, generated by ages of disappointment, should at once yield implicitly to the mere announcement of such a discovery, or that the intellectual sight, which has been long confined in obscurity, should immediately be able to bear the rays of so powerful a light as the science of destiny; we shall, therefore, confine our dissertations to the subject of *progressive policy*, and *attractive industry*, the principles of which are as simple as they are interesting. When divested of systematic confusion, the elements of this science are as easily understood as the elements of music, and in both cases the theory of combination only becomes complex in its transcendental degrees; in social organization, as in musical composition, the same elements may produce either painful confusion or delightful harmony.

The present state of society is far from being perfect, and the

possibility of uniting worldly interests may appear both difficult and doubtful; but to those who are unskilled in music, it might appear impossible to harmonize a great variety of instruments sounding different notes in noisy confusion; and so it is with social science: with jarring interests and heterogeneous institutions, it is indeed difficult to avoid discord and collision; but if it were deemed absolutely impossible to arrive at concord and happiness, where would be the utility of moral and legislative doctrines? Priests and statesmen? Religion and Politics? The possibility of order and progressive amelioration must be admitted, and we can hardly suppose that the ultimate degrees of perfection in society, are not to exceed the boundaries of mere palliative restriction. The question is, then,—

Whence the cause of misery in society? and where the remedy? The answer to this query is the object of the following dissertation:—

CHAPTER I.

OF THE PRESENT STATE OF SOCIETY.

"The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head."—(St. Matth. viii. 20.)

SECTION I.

Of the Dangers which threaten individual and political Existence in Great Britain.

Dark and gloomy is the political horizon of the British Empire, and many are the dangers which threaten, not only the political existence of the nation, but also the lives and fortunes of innocent people in all ranks of society.

The alarming increase of the poor and the destitute;

The physical privations and immoral habits of the labouring multitude;

The cold reserve, the narrow selfishness, and the general distrust which pervade all ranks and conditions;

The discordant claims of different interests;

The angry bickerings of political factions;

The increasing difficulties of government, and the perplexing defalcations of the revenue;

The sullen spirit of discontent that bestrides the kingdom from one extremity to the other;—these are the appalling signs of an approaching storm of revolutionary violence and general calamity.

But, to enumerate all the evils which corrode the present, and all the dangers which threaten the future existence of civilized society, would certainly tend more to deepen the gloom of despair than to brighten the rays of hope; and, as few people are either so blind or so giddy as not to observe the alarming increase of poverty and crime, we purposely hurry over these points, taking it for granted, that all serious people admit the necessity and even the urgency of a remedy of some sort or other; and thence, the *nature* of the remedy becomes a subject of paramount importance to all those who have any thing to lose, as well as to those who take a

religious interest in the destiny of humanity. It is, indeed, the duty of every enlightened and influential person to seek diligently for the means of bettering the condition of the poor, and thereby preventing the crimes and the sufferings which would be the inevitable consequences of revolutionary violence; nor can the neglect of such a duty, in the present critical state of things, be deemed any thing less than the result of *criminal* indifference, or obstinate perversity.

Section II.

Of the Utility of drawing public Attention to a minute Examination of Popular Interests.

The apparent difficulty of the subject, and the abstruse manner in which it has hitherto been treated by all philosophico-politicians, render the generality of readers disinclined to enter into speculative theories concerning the organization of society; and, from the first dawn of civilization in Greece to the beginning of the present century, the number of Utopian systems has been so great, and their utter impracticability so notorious, that the very mention of the words *social science* excites a suspicion of something wild and visionary, the mere dream of an excited imagination, absolutely incompatible with common sense and sound reason.

These preconceived notions have been strengthened in the public mind by the doctrines of "*atheism* and *community*," attributed to Mr. Owen, as the fundamental principles of his system; it becomes necessary, therefore, for us to state, positively, that such notions are diametrically opposed to what we deem the principles of a truly progressive policy. Real Religion, Corporate Combination, Distributive Justice, and Progressive Happiness for all, form the fundamental basis of Fourier's science.

Whatever may be the prevailing prejudice against "Utopian systems," it must be admitted by all parties, that statesmen and political economists have not been able to discover any effectual remedy for social evils—any positive and complete science of society: if, then, we really believe it possible to better the condition of the poor, and prevent revolution, we must look elsewhere for the principles of an effectual policy. Nothing can be more conducive to the discovery of such a science, and its immediate application, than a general examination and discussion of social interests. Hence the utility of mooting the question; and, as the beaten tracks of legislative and economical speculation have been proved to be illusive, we ought naturally to steer our course of inquiry in a different direction. A critical analysis of the basis of society will be more efficiently instructive, than learned disquisitions concerning government, or the summit of civilized community; though the summit and the base are necessarily connected, and must not be thoroughly separated. The one-sidedness of legislative speculation, in confining itself to principles of government alone, has been the chief cause of error in this branch of science, and the contrary extreme must be avoided, in order to guard

against the dangers of an opposite error. Social condition, therefore, is the primary object of investigation, and government, the ultimate point or summit to this basis of society.

It is, certainly, the duty of existing governments to improve the elementary conditions of social organization; but to fulfil this duty, the science of improvement must first be known and understood. This view of the question, then, as well as the natural mode of investigation, shows the utility of proceeding from the basis to the summit, in preference to descending from the summit to the base.

The importance of social organization becomes evident to every reflecting mind, on merely observing the helpless condition of human beings in an isolated state, even where the utmost efforts of energy and industry are displayed; and, from this fact alone, we may infer, that, besides the common advantages flowing from the aggregation of numerous individuals in towns and cities, so as to facilitate a constant interchange of different productions for mutual benefit, advantages of a still higher degree may result from the combined efforts of production, added to the facility of interchange, than it is possible to obtain by the latter only, without proper attention being given to the former. In the present advanced state of commercial intercourse and mechanical power of production, it is of the highest importance to know, whether or not it is possible to effect an increase of riches by a superior degree of combination in the various individual powers of production; whether or not it may be possible to *multiply* these individual powers by each other in corporate combination, instead of merely *adding* them together as we now do, in *disunited aggregation.*

The possibility of ameliorating the condition, not only of the poor, but of all classes in society, is perfectly evident to those who are acquainted with the newly-discovered principles of social science; and the practicability of these principles depends chiefly on their diffusion amongst a sufficient number of influential persons. A minute examination of the new science is, therefore, of paramount importance.

In exposing the elementary principles of progressive policy, we shall briefly examine the different forms of social organization which have been transmitted to us in history, as well as those which actually exist on different parts of the earth; we shall also enter into a few general observations, in order to discover the true basis of a natural and superior system. These reflections will lead us to a knowledge of the defective organization of all existing societies; and, in order to avoid tedious disquisitions, we shall purposely neglect metaphysical discussions, confining ourselves chiefly to historical matter and plain reasoning. By this means, we hope that the subject will become as interesting to general readers as to men of science; and, on that account, we deem it necessary to neutralize, as much as possible, those general prejudices which tend to condemn the subject from its very name; or, at least, confound it with what are commonly deemed "Utopian systems." It must be remembered, also, that the true principles of external or international policy are as clearly demonstrated as those of internal

progress; and this fact alone distinguishes the new science from all others. It is improper to call this science a system; for it explains the natural principles of all possible systems of internal and external policy. The *savage*, the *patriarchal*, the *barbarian*, and the *civilized* states of society are clearly analyzed, and the natural laws of future progress are shown to be exactly analogous to the laws by which these different states of social existence have necessarily succeeded each other in the progress of humanity. But, in the present deplorable state of things, the most important of all questions is,—What are the most efficient means of improving the condition of the poor?

Section III.

Industrial Organization the most effectual Means of Bettering the Condition of the Poor.

It is generally admitted that civilization has attained almost to the highest possible degree of perfection as far as regards the material means of producing wealth, and that *corporate* combination is now the most important source of practical regeneration. In fact, all undertakings of great importance in society are accomplished by means of *partial association*, or joint-stock companies, and we may easily conceive, that, in the present improved state of industry, the most interesting progress of humanity depends on the degree of excellence that may be practically effected in associative combination. Besides, as man is a gregarious animal, it is evident, *à priori*, that he is destined to live in society; and thence it follows, that terrestrial happiness must depend as much on the degree of excellence effected in social organization, as on the invention of productive power to supply our physical and worldly wants.

This will become evident as we proceed in examining the different forms of society already known, none of which we shall omit, from the savage state to the most refined degrees of *incoherent* civilization. For the present, however, we shall confine ourselves to a few general remarks on the principles of corporate combination, and the happy results which may be expected from their application; reserving all scientific details of progressive principles, until we have critically analyzed the defects of existing institutions.

CHAPTER II.

A SLIGHT SKETCH OF PROGRESSIVE PRINCIPLES.

Section I.

Definition of the Term Progressive Policy.

Before we sketch the general principles of *social science* and progressive policy, it may be well to examine the corresponding links between the *improvement of industry* and the *progressive transformation of society*; for, when once their nature becomes familiar to the mind, the importance of advancing in social organization, so as to keep pace with the discoveries of science, will appear obvious and paramount. This we shall endeavour to elucidate more fully

as we proceed, and barely state a few facts here, which may serve to generate an idea of the monstrous disproportion which exists between the present power of creating wealth, and the comparative indigence of the labouring multitude. A moment's thought is almost sufficient to show, that such unbounded powers of production only wait for a proper direction and general application, to become fully adequate to the physical wants of many millions of human beings; and a slight comparison between the ancient and modern states of civilization (hardly different from each other, notwithstanding the incomparable superiority of modern industry) cannot fail to show that the present state of society is absolutely disproportioned to the magnitude of modern inventions. By a more extensive and better regulated application of mechanical force, by general and practical education in the various branches of industry, and by more economical combinations of domestic arrangements, the whole human race may be placed in conditions of ease and comfort, and thousands upon thousands may be favoured with the exquisite refinements of a princely affluence. These and many other advantages may be attained by proper attention being given to the interests of humanity; and thence the importance of correct principles and a truly *progressive policy*.

For those who have been long accustomed to the study of history and politics, it may be superfluous to dwell on a fact so well known as the necessary connexion which exists between the *discoveries* of science, and the *improvement* of social organization; but those who are not familiar with such studies, may feel an interest in the fact; and both the erudite and the unlearned may derive pleasure from being led to conceive that an infinitely higher degree of enjoyment than that which is generally possessed, may be procured for all classes of society, by a more natural and scientific organization of our present means, without any additional invention of productive mechanism. This we shall endeavour to prove beyond the possibility of a doubt, before we conclude, and the simple extract of a passage in Dr. Robertson's History of America may suffice to fix the reader's attention on the general law of correlativeness to which we now allude.

"In tracing the line by which nations proceed towards civilization, the discovery of the useful metals, and the acquisition of dominion over the animal creation, have been marked as steps of capital importance in their progress. In our continent, long after men had attained both, society continued in that state which is denominated barbarous. Even with all that command over nature which these confer, many ages elapse before industry becomes so regular as to render subsistence secure; before the arts which supply the wants and furnish the accommodations of life, are brought to any considerable degree of perfection, and before any idea is conceived of the various institutions requisite in a well-ordered society. The Mexicans and Peruvians (*aborigines*), without knowledge of the useful metals, or the aid of domestic animals, laboured under disadvantages which must have greatly retarded their progress; and, in their highest state of improvement, their power was so limited, and their operations so feeble, that they can hardly be considered as having advanced beyond the infancy of civil life."

This quotation shows, that, in the opinion of philosophical historians, society is indebted to the discoveries of science, for the

advancement of civilization; and a very little attention will enable us to see that our present social and political arrangement is not so much superior to that of ancient Greece or Rome, as the prodigious advantages of modern inventions may reasonably lead us to expect.

It may not be superfluous to state here, that the principles of social science bear almost no resemblance to the ordinary doctrines of Political Economy. Besides the economy of production and consumption, the science of society enables us to divine the secret springs of *humanitary progression*, and the various degrees of social refinement which may be obtained by human industry in different conditions of scientific and mechanical improvement. (By the words *humanitary progress* we mean that which relates to all the nations of the globe, in contradistinction from the words *human progress* relating to civilized nations only.)

If it be objected that the possession of wealth is not of itself sufficient to make man happy, it must be admitted that ease and comfort afford a more solid basis for religion and morality, than want and privation, the constant stimulants to crime and depravity. The production of wealth, however, is neither the only nor the principal object of corporate combination, though it is of primary importance in the present state of universal misery. Until the human race can be generally put in possession of ease and affluence, it will be almost impossible to obtain a high degree of general morality. The prodigious efforts of Christianity during the last 1800 years, afford abundant proof of this fact, which is our chief motive for dwelling principally on topics of industry. Besides, we have but little to say beyond what is already well understood by enlightened Christians concerning religion; and the few observations we shall have to offer on that subject, will be deferred until we arrive at general conclusions. As we have no subversive doctrines to propound concerning religion, our remarks will be confined to a simple contrast between the religion of—

Pure Faith,	And that of *Superstition,*
Love,	*Fear,*
Evidence,	*Mystery,*
Reason,	*Ignorance,*
Sincerity,	*Hypocrisy,*
Joy,	*Mortification,*
Toleration,	*Persecution,*
CONCORD;	DISCORD.

But, to return to our immediate subject, we may define social science to consist in a correct knowledge of the natural laws of *humanitary* existence, and its general modes of developement, both retrograde and progressive; according to which, society may either fluctuate between indigence and affluence, depravity and morality, or be made to advance steadily in the progressive acquisition of superior wealth and pure enjoyment.

The progressive invention of science and mechanical power is

the necessary groundwork of civilization; and the science of social organization consists—

1st. In generalizing, to the greatest possible extent, an amount of worldly comfort proportionate to the known powers of production;

2nd. In facilitating the practice of Truth, Justice, Morality, and Religion;

3rd. In producing these advantages by the greatest economy of labour and of legislation;

4th. In showing exactly what degree of perfection it is possible to obtain, in each of these points, with a given amount of power to create wealth and diffuse science, with religious discipline.

It would become tedious to enter into a more elaborate definition of abstract principles, and, therefore, we proceed at once to a rapid sketch of practical results.

Section II.

A faint Idea of the Results to be obtained by Corporate Combination.

The first operation of organic science is to combine the interests of *property*, *industry*, and *science*, so as to produce on the one hand, and economize on the other, more than it is possible to effect, with the same amount of means, in an incoherent state of separate and individual interests; and, as far as speculative reasoning can enable us to judge, without the aid of practical demonstration, it has been proved beyond a doubt, that a proper combination of *capital* and *science*, with domestic, agricultural, and manufacturing *industry*, would produce at least four times as much wealth as may possibly be produced in the present state of social organization. Besides the advantages of superior production, the economy of associative combination would be infinitely greater than any thing already known in practice might lead us to surmise; but the most astonishing, and, perhaps, the most interesting result of social speculation, is the discovery of the means of rendering almost every branch of industry as agreeable as it is lucrative, and thereby making the occupations of the most humble individuals one continued series of uninterrupted pleasure. The philosophy of human progress proves that the natural destiny of man upon earth is to be active and industrious; and that monotony and excessive fatigue in the present mode of conducting laborious occupations, added to the coarseness, ignorance, and immorality of the labouring classes, are the chief causes of disgust in the general branches of industry. It will be difficult, however, so long as we are unacquainted with the general principles of progress, to conceive how the greatest pleasures of life are intimately connected with the various pursuits of industry in a natural state of society, and therefore we shall defer the explanation of this branch of science until we have exposed the more elementary principles of associative policy. The chief object of this dissertation is to show that, in the present state of *incoherent* civilization, corporate combination is the principal, and perhaps the only, real means of bettering the condition of the poor, and thereby preventing revolutionary violence, anarchy, bloodshed, and uni-

versal collision. [These observations relate to internal policy alone, for, before we expose the principles of foreign policy, we deem it necessary to dwell on domestic improvements and corporate combination only.]

If we can once become conscious of the possibility of producing four times as much as we now do, so that an income of one hundred pounds may be raised to four hundred pounds; and if, besides this augmentation of positive wealth, we are enabled, by a general system of economy, to purchase as much for one pound as would cost at least ten in the present state of society; it is evident that the whole nation would be forty times as rich as it is now, and no one will deny that all classes of citizens might be benefited by such an arrangement.

According to the true spirit of Liberalism, which tends to benefit all classes and spoliate none, the rich as well as the poor would be entitled to a share in this general augmentation of wealth and social advantages; and though the condition of the labouring classes would be the primary object of improvement, still the interests of the rich would be greatly advanced, besides being rendered more permanently secure.

Such are the material advantages to be derived from the principles of combination, and the moral advantages are infinitely more interesting. This may appear incredible, from the known difficulty of bringing a small number of families to agree together, where their interests and dispositions happen to be of a contrary nature; but the science of our natural attractions and repulsions proves that association, on a large scale, is the only means of avoiding the discord of individual antipathies, and the inconveniences of aggregation on a small scale, in furnishing an abundant choice and variety of natural sympathies, by means of which, each individual may frequent those persons whom he prefers, and avoid those for whom he has no direct sympathy. If human nature be destined to function in large bodies, in which a constant change and infinite variety may easily be procured for every individual, it becomes evident that small conglomerations are inadequate to the full developement of our natural desires; for, when once the mind is soured by monotony, and the frequently recurring contact of insipid neighbours, the inevitable result is discord, envy, hatred, injustice, revenge, and general subversion. The difficulty, then, or the impossibility, of association on a small scale, does not prove the impossibility, or even the *difficulty*, of association on a large scale. On the contrary, if society is the natural destiny of man upon earth, it is probable that certain modes of association are superior to others, and that the most perfect of these superior modes would naturally lead to the greatest sum of concord and terrestrial happiness; consequently, the further we were from the natural mode of association, the smaller would be the degree of concord and happiness, and the greater the degree of discord and suffering. Besides, if speculative reason can prove that the advantages of large associations are infinitely superior to those of small aggregations, and the disadvantages infinitely less, is it not pro-

bable that Providence has so ordained the natural laws of society that small conglomerations and an incoherent state of individual interests should be attended with discord and disadvantage, in order to stimulate man, by suffering, to seek the true mode of social organization and its superior advantages, instead of remaining in a state of mediocrity and imperfect happiness? This presumption will become an absolute certainty when we are thoroughly acquainted with the science of human nature; for the study of our innate *attractions* and *repulsions*, *sympathies* and *antipathies*, *instincts*, *tastes*, &c. &c., will prove that human nature is destined to a particular function upon earth; and, as truth, justice, and mathematical precision are the natural elements of excellence and harmony in the universe, so falsehood, injustice, and disorder are the natural causes of inferiority, discord, and suffering in society: consequently, the most natural modes of association must be those in which it is the interest of every individual to practise truth and justice, activity and regularity, religion and morality.

Section III.

Definition of the Problem of Human Happiness.

"Un problême convenablement posé est bien pres d'être resolu."—(Ampère.)

"When once a problem is properly defined, it is in a fair way for being solved," says Mons. Ampère, and, in conformity with this idea, we will endeavour to state our problem as fully and as clearly as a general definition will admit of.

"Take man with his innate faculties, his physical, moral, mental and religious aspirations, and determine what are the conditions of a social and political organization best adapted to his nature."

The proper solution of this problem, consists,—

1st. In the discovery of the general laws of human nature;

2nd. In the discovery of the general laws of human activity and industry;

3rd. In the discovery of those general laws of social organization which are most capable of harmonizing human nature with itself and with the external world in moral and religious discipline.

This may be resumed in one word; the discovery of the real destiny of humanity, or the solution of the Christian problem of regeneration.

According to the unceasing aspirations of our nature, happiness is the ultimate destiny of mankind, and terrestrial happiness consists,—

1st. In the complete satisfaction of all natural attractions and desires;

2nd. In the absorption of all causes of physical, moral, intellectual, and religious suffering.

Man is a gregarious animal, destined to live in society; and the principal function of human reason, is to discover the natural laws of social existence, in order to obtain the highest possible degree of physical, moral, and intellectual perfection.

Until human intellect has accomplished this task imposed on

man by his position in the general scale of creation, humanity is necessarily exposed to ignorance and privation: instinct alone is not sufficient to lead us immediately to our real and essential destiny in this world, as it does the inferior animals of our earth. Reason, engrafted on the feelings of unlimited faith in Providence, was given to man that he might discover the general laws of the creation, and his own destiny in the universe; that he might govern the earth according to these laws, and justify the ways of God to man.

But, before we inquire into the natural method of giving full satisfaction to the innate desires of humanity, it is absolutely necessary to know what these desires are, and thence the necessity of a correct psychological analysis. It is the want of this science of human nature which has caused society to remain in misery and degradation. Philosophers have long proclaimed the doctrine that "*the proper study of mankind is man,*" but they have not been able hitherto to solve the problem thus proclaimed; and men of science, tired of metaphysical bewilderment, and speculative theories of "sensation," and "cognition," and "perception," and mere idealogical sophistry, have abandoned one extreme for another; they have turned their whole attention to "inductive philosophy," or the mere analysis of matter and material phenomena. This course of study has led to many very useful discoveries in the subordinate spheres of industry and material mechanism, but something more is wanting to improve society. It has been truly said, "the proper study of mankind is man;" and therefore the mere analysis of physical phenomena, or that of mental action only, in conceiving and expressing our ideas,—which have hitherto engrossed the whole attention of physicians and of metaphysicians generally,—must be made subordinate to that superior study of the *principles* of human nature and activity, the *passions* and *attractions* of the soul, the springs of life, the causes of all human happiness and misery in society, according to their moral or immoral training and effects.

This is the proper method of studying human nature and society; and Fourier is the first who can be truly said to have discovered and revealed to man the science of his physical, his moral, his religious, and his intellectual faculties, in all their infinite varieties of shade, and colour, and distinction; with the laws of social combination, which admit of different degrees of moral harmony, in proportion to the means adopted for absorbing and repressing individual deviations and depravity.

It would be impossible for us to give a thorough explanation of this science in a few short pages, but the following elementary sketch of psychological principles may suffice for the present, until we are better prepared for a more detailed developement.

Section IV.

Definition of the Innate and Essential Faculties of Human Nature.

According to the analysis of human passions and attractions published by Fourier, (which we deem the most correct and complete that has ever been made, insomuch as it agrees perfectly with

ancient tradition, and with that innate conscience by which we immediately perceive truth and harmony,) man is a miniature image of God and of the universe.

The eternal principles of nature, are a trinity in unity:—

1st. The *active* principle, or *spirit* of the universe:

2nd. The *passive* principle, or *matter* of the universe:

3rd. The *neutral* principle, or *mathematical* laws of eternal justice and harmony, according to which the spirit of the universe modifies matter in all its transformations, and maintains eternal unity and harmony in creation.

The nature of man is exactly co-ordinate with the unity of this trinity:—

His *physical* nature is adapted to the *passive* principle;

His *moral* nature, to the *active;* and

His *intellectual* nature is adapted to the *neutral* principle of reason and justice; his whole being is a trinity in unity.

In accordance with these three principles of nature, there are three centres of human desire; and these subsidiary focuses all concentrate in one superior tendency, which is that of general harmony and unity.

The common centre of all physical desires, is, *sensual enjoyment:*

The common centre of all moral desires, is, *sentimentality or mutual affection:*

The common centre of all intellectual desires, is, *order and association:* and the general centre of this trinity, is, universal *religion and unity.*

A General Table of Analytical Degrees, pertaining to the Innate and Essential Faculties of Human Nature.

1. The essential or innate faculties of the soul.
2. The graduated scales of difference in activity and disposition, with regard to different individuals.
3. Particular and individual attractions, with regard to physical objects and pursuits.
4. Particular and individual repulsions, with regard to physical objects and pursuits.
5. Particular instincts or aptitudes for practising certain branches of art, science, or industry.
6. Particular tastes for the passive enjoyment of certain branches of art, science, or industry.
7. Natural and inherent discords.
8. Natural contrasts of character, disposition, preferences, &c.
9. Natural sympathies.
10. Natural antipathies.
11. Natural rivalities, or emulative instincts.
12. Natural and inherent vices, or apparent defects.

The whole of which may be resumed in two sentences:

Graduated scales of inequality in every order of attraction and repulsion.

Individual and collective impulses of self-interest; or social and individual selfishness.

This general table merely indicates the analytical degrees which relate to the ESSENTIAL, or primordial faculties of the soul, without reference to the secondary and *organic* faculties of body and of mind. The essential faculties stimulate to action, and the organic faculties (muscular force, memory, imagination, reflection, &c.) obey the command, as mere instruments of action.

It would be premature, in this chapter to analyse these general scales of innate faculties; but a superficial division of the first category may be interesting as a specimen of psychological analysis.

The general sphere of our natural unitary or religious impulses is refracted into three subsidiary and distinct tendencies, physical, moral, intellectual; and these, being again subdivided, form twelve radical desires or attractions: *five* modes of sensual desire, *four* modes of moral expansion, and *three* varieties of intellectual impulse.

5 Sensual faculties, or modes of enjoyment.

1. Sight.
2. Hearing.
3. Taste.
4. Smell.
5. Touch.

4 Moral desires, or modes of affection.

6. Friendship: affection between individuals of the same sex, or without regard to sex.
7. Love: affection between individuals of a different sex.
8. Family affection: affection between parents and their children.
9. Social affection: affection between individuals of similar opinions and pursuits, with or without the intimacy of friendship: the mere ties of federal corporation, or social affection.

3 Intellectual impulses, or modes of action.

10. The desire of *refinement;* emulation, or *reflective* zeal for progressive improvement.
11. The desire of *alternation;* periodical variety in functions of pleasure and industry.
12. The desire of *cumulation;* combining the pleasures of sense with those of affection: such as the enjoyment of an exquisite feast in the company of friends, rather than one without the other; or music and poetry, rather than music alone: generosity and *enthusiastic irreflective* zeal.

The inferior details, such as affection for animals, &c. are purposely omitted in this secondary scale of essential faculties, as our only object here is to give an idea of *psychological* analysis. In a complete subdivision, each of the twelve general categories would

furnish a particular scale of different modes, and each variety of mode would be distinguished into different degrees, so that the minute details, being as numerous as they are various, would be more tedious than interesting to the general reader. When we state that a complete analysis shows that there are more than twelve hundred different sorts of individual character and disposition, exclusive of minor differences and shades of difference, the reader may form an idea of the extent and minuteness of our *essential* faculties.

We may observe here, that phrenologists have made a very confused classification, by intermingling the *essential* and the *organic* faculties; the *stimulating* impulses of instinct and passion, with the mere *instrumental* faculties of the mind. The science of phrenology, no doubt, may be greatly advanced by a proper attention to psychological principles, but that science is yet in its infancy.

Even the twelve hundred different sorts of individual character to which we have just now alluded, only relate to general degrees of difference, analogous to those which distinguish an apple-tree from a pear-tree in the vegetable kingdom: but the details of analytical subdivision would be infinite in number and variety, if minor shades of difference in the same general character were to be enumerated.

For the sake of precision, distinct names have been given to the seven spiritual impulses and the general tendency of the soul to religion and unity: thus,—

- SPIRITUAL ATTRACTION.
  - *Generous motives.*
  - *Selfish motives.*
- UNITEISM. (*Religious unity and Attraction*).
  - MORAL AFFECTIONS.
    1. Friendship.
    2. Love.
    3. Familism.
    4. Ambition (laudable).
  - INTELLECTUAL DESIRES.
    5. The emulative desire.
    6. The alternant desire.
    7. The composite desire.
- SPIRITUAL REPULSION.
  - *Natural dislike, or permanent and harmonic repulsion.*
  - *Temporary passion, or accidental and subversive repulsion.*
- DISCORD. (*Angry repulsion.*)
  - DISCORDANT PASSIONS.
    1. Hatred.
    2. Loathing dislike.
    3. Peevish aversion from family connexions.
    4. Ill will towards colleagues or associates.
  - SUBVERSIVE MOTIVES.
    5. Envy.
    6. Apathy, or lethargic indifference.
    7. Narrow selfishness.

(It is difficult to find expressions of repulsion exactly corresponding to our harmonic attractions, because hatred and dislike are almost always expressed in a general sense, without regard to motives: we have chosen those expressions which appeared to us the most approximate).

This table of the spiritual impulses merely applies to the *generous* motives of attraction and the *subversive* motives of repulsion, without regard to the *selfish motives* of the one, and the *natural antipathies* of the other. We repeat, also, that this analysis is *psychological* and not *ideological:* it applies to the *essential* faculties of the soul, and not to the *organic* faculties of the mind. Both of these orders of faculty are *innate,* but the organic faculties, physical and mental, (muscular force, memory, imagination, &c.) are merely instruments which serve to satisfy the essentially stimulating passions of the soul. For a more complete idea of what we understand by *organic* faculties, see the chapter on analogy in the 2nd vol. (not yet published).

The harmonic desires of the soul may all be soured into their contrary and subversive modes of passion, and the degrees of intensity may vary as much in one mode as in the other: the degrees of affection may vary from mere good feeling to doting fondness, and the intensity of repulsion may fluctuate between cool indifference and absolute loathing.—The absorption of subversive passion is the object of moral training, but certain natural antipathies are as necessary to social harmony as the physical laws of repulsion are to those of attraction. The difference between natural antipathy and subversive repulsion, is exactly analogous to the difference between *dissonance* and *discord* in music. Certain harmonic notes, the first and second and the first and seventh of the diatonic scale, disagree together, but these dissonances are highly useful in certain combinations, while absolute and continuous discords are subversive of all melody and harmony.—To give a full explanation of the difference between the harmonic functions of natural antipathy, and the subversive effects of discordant passion, would lead us into those minute details of analysis which must be reserved for a more scientific part of our exposition; and as the general scale of human desires or principles of activity might be extended almost to infinity, we shall content ourselves, at present, by indicating the differences which distinguish the *active* from the *passive* modes of satisfying the senses; the *spiritual* from the *material* motives of affection; and the *simple* from the *combined* sources of mental pleasure. This will constitute a scale of twenty-four degrees in that general principle of human activity which is commonly called the *soul.*

On the strictest examination it will be found that these immortal or indestructible principles of life and activity have a complete set of organic physiological faculties at their command, acting as mere instruments of their *will,* either individually or collectively considered.

These *organic* faculties are,— *memory, imagination, reflection, physical power, &c.,* each of which may be called into action to suit

the will and pleasure of any or all of those *essential* and eternal principles of activity in the soul.

It is in this branch of psychological analysis that the phrenologists have hitherto been most defective. They have supposed that the developement of the brain corresponded directly to the *essential* as well as to the *organic* faculties; but our opinion is, that it only corresponds to the degree of exercise to which the organic faculties have been subjected by one or by several of the essential passions of the soul. There is nothing, we believe, in the material developement of the brain to indicate which is the particular desire of the soul that has caused a certain degree of exercise and developement in the organic faculties of *imagination, reflection, comparison, &c.;* the same physical or mental faculty may have been exercised equally in two different persons, to satisfy two very different passions or innate desires. The same faculty of reflection may have been exercised to meditate a crime or to benefit society, and yet an equal degree of exercise in these two different cases would probably produce an equal degree of physical developement in the brain.

But to return to our theory of motives, or the immortal principles of activity in the soul:

We have distinguished twelve radical desires in human nature, and two springs of action in each of those desires. These we will analyze under the three primitive divisions of *physical, mental, and moral* faculties; or, to speak a language more technically correct, *sensual, affective,* and *intellectual* desires.

Firstly.—Of the five radical passions which constitute the sensuous sphere of the soul.

It is through the medium of the five senses that the human soul is in a direct state of relation to the material harmonies of the universe, and according to the degrees of harmony and discord which exist between the external world and these elementary faculties, so are the degrees of pleasure or of pain felt, more or less intensely, by the mind, through the medium of the senses.

Each of these innate desires of sense, has a special organ or set of organs in direct communication with the soul through the medium of the nervous system; and from this fact we may infer that each of the other radical desires of the soul has a special set of organs in the physiological system, besides the mere organic faculties of physical and mental instrumentality; but the observation of phrenologists has not yet enabled them to make these distinctions perfectly clear and satisfactory. They have indicated certain parts of the cranium as the special organs of the innate faculties of paternal affection (philoprogenitiveness), social affection, (benevolence), religious sentiment (veneration), &c.; but, instead of supposing that each of these radical elements of the soul had the command of all the instrumental faculties of memory, imagination, comparison, &c., they have jumbled the radical passions and the instrumental faculties altogether in one confused map of the brain. As we have already stated, however, it is our opinion that the form of the brain merely indicates the degrees of developement of the

instrumental faculties, and that it gives us no clue to the intensity of any of the radical principles of activity in the soul; for, as far as the organs of sense are concerned, they certainly do not indicate the intensity of the innate passions to which they correspond: the superiority or the inferiority of the organ of sight is not indicative of the passion for enjoying the pleasures of sight through the medium of painting, or architecture, or any other refined mode of indulging that passion of the soul which corresponds to the sense of sight. If we may place any reliance on the common method of feeling and observation, we should say that the heart is the seat of affection, and not the head.

In that radical element or source of activity in the soul which corresponds to the sense of sight, we may easily distinguish two degrees; the active and the passive modes of enjoyment, or motives to action. Indeed, we may make a similar distinction respecting all the senses; and in the general definition of psychological analysis, these distinctions are called *instincts* and *tastes.*

If we take the five senses *seriatim,* we shall find that there is a marked difference between an *active instinct* and a *passive taste* in each of the senses, both with regard to actions and the motives to action.

First.—With respect to that radical element of activity in the soul which is commonly called the sense of sight, we find that in some individuals there is a predominance of the active instinct derived from that elementary source of activity, while in others there is a predominance of the passive taste which is derived from the same source.

The active instinct of sight, when it constitutes a predominant motive to action in individuals, causes them to take an active part in producing those works of art which contribute to the refined pleasures of the sense of sight. It is the predominance of this active instinct which constitutes a genius for painting, sculpture, architecture and other branches of art which harmonize directly with the sense of sight.

The passive taste of sight, when it constitutes a predominant motive to action, in individuals, causes them to seek pleasure in viewing those works of art which appeal directly to the sight, but it does not induce them to take a very active and persevering part in the production of those works.

The active instinct constitutes the creative genius, and the passive taste constitutes the admiring amateur.

Second.—The same may be said of the sense of hearing. The active instinct produces the accomplished musician; and the passive taste, the insatiable dilettante.

Third.—The active instinct derived from the sense of smell causes us to deight in combining perfumes; and the passive taste which is derived from the same radical source, causes us to delight in the pleasures of aromatic exhalations; but it does not induce us to study and practically generate harmonious combinations of aroma.

Fourth.—An active instinct derived from the sense of taste,

would lead us to take great pleasure in culinary science and practice, as they relate to the pleasures of the palate and the healthy adaptation of peculiar viands to different temperaments; while a passive taste derived from the same sense, would only lead us to consult our own individual preferences, and seek their indulgence without being at the trouble of culinary preparation.

Fifth.—With respect to the universal sense of touch, the same distinctions are equally applicable. An active instinct derived from that sense leads us to discover different methods of protecting ourselves from the inclemency of the seasons, and also of affording actual pleasure to the sense of tactility, by means of elastic cushions and other inventions; while a mere passive taste for the refined pleasures of that sense only leads us to take advantage of the discoveries and productions of others, without exerting ourselves to improve and refine the arts of tactile comfort.

We have, then, in the sensual sphere of activity, ten distinct sorts of motives to action, or innate desires of the soul, according to this scale of psychological analysis; and each of these radical causes of human activity produces a corresponding peculiarity of will and action, which is, necessarily, influenced by circumstances. If these active instincts and passive tastes be allowed to follow their respective impulsions, they will give satisfaction in the best way they can; and if they are thwarted in their developement, they will cause unhappiness in the individual and disorder in society, until they are enabled to find their natural current in the harmony of universal movement and activity.

The freedom of the will, as far as these elementary passions are concerned, individually and collectively, depends upon the expansion of liberty by the creations of science; and though the passions of the human soul are not free to alter either their own nature, or the nature of the circumstances which actually exist, still they are free to choose the modes by which they seek their own immediate satisfaction, and by which they may modify those circumstances in which they are placed. That is to say, they are free to reason according to the light of science and experience; but they are not free to like that which they dislike. They are free to prefer a slight degree of present suffering to an intense degree of future suffering, where circumstances afford them that degree of liberty; and this is all that is understood by the word free-will, in the common acceptation. The mind, considered collectively, is also free to satisfy one passion in preference to another, when circumstances do not afford the means of satisfying each; and when, in such cases, there are several natural desires claiming immediate satisfaction, the supreme arbiter, commonly called reason, may repress an imperious individual desire, in order to do equal justice to the other innate desires of the soul. And though the Necessitarians say that in such cases the will is controlled by the strongest motive, still we maintain that no rational man or woman ever understood the word free-will to mean anything more than this arbitral power of reason. No man in his senses ever could suppose that the will of man was free to alter the universal laws of necessity.

We may observe, however, that there can be no will without a motive; and, in that confined sense of the word, the will is not free to be contrary to the motive in which it originates, any more than any other effect is free to be independent of its natural cause.

Before we proceed with this psychological analysis or theory of motives, we will just observe that, in the present state of society, in which it is almost impossible to receive a natural education, it often happens that individuals who are endowed with a *passive taste* of a high degree, derived from one of the sensual passions, mistake that *passive taste* for an *active instinct*, and pass their whole lives in the active cultivation of an art in which they never can excel.

This would never take place in a natural state of society, because every individual would there have an opportunity of cultivating his real instincts; and as every person is born with a certain number of predominant active instincts as well as passive tastes, no individual would be liable to mistake one for the other, if there were equal facilities for cultivating all. It is only where a person's natural genius is not called forth by circumstances, that a passive taste usurps the place of an active instinct. When the soul is prevented from satisfying all its natural desires, it is apt to indulge to excess those individual desires which are least thwarted by uncongenial circumstances. The elementary passions of the soul are not less, however, the only principles or causes of human activity under all circumstances: and, as we have just distinguished the active instincts from the passive tastes in the sensual sphere of human passions, we will now take a similar view of the active and passive distinctions in the moral sphere of human passions.

Secondly.—Of the four elementary passions which constitute the moral or affective sphere of the soul.

These elementary principles of moral attraction and repulsion, are—

First.—FRIENDSHIP.

Second.—LOVE.

Third.—PATERNITY.

Fourth.—BENEVOLENCE, OR NOBLE AMBITION.

Each of these principles of moral attraction has its counterpart in moral repulsion; or hatred, loathing, paternal dislike, and party malevolence; but as every degree of attraction has its counterpart in repulsion, we neglect the latter, and confine our analysis to the former, in order to avoid a tedious multiplicity of analytical distinctions.

The four radical sources of moral attraction, then, may be distinguished into spiritual and material motives: thus—

FRIENDSHIP, or Individual Affection.	*Spiritual Affinity*, from similarity of feeling and disposition.
	Material Affinity, from similarity of taste in industry or pleasure.
SOCIAL SYMPATHY, or Corporate Affection.	*Spiritual Affinity*, from motives of opinion only.
	Material Affinity, from motives of interest only.

LOVE, or Sexual Affection.	*Material Affinity*, from carnal motives only.
	Spiritual Affinity, from Platonic sympathy only.
PATERNITY, or Family Affection.	*Material Affinity*, from the ties of consanguinity.
	Spiritual Affinity, from the spontaneous ties of adoption.

These affinities or principles of moral connexion may unite individuals in affection, either from being identical or contrasted in their consonances. For instance, two persons may love each other, from the same motives, either spiritual, or material, or both, and in those cases the affinities or causes of attraction are identical; but, if the spiritual motive be predominant in one of the lovers, and the material motive in the other, then the motives are contrasted, but the union takes place just the same.

We may observe, however, that where an individual is placed between two objects of affection, having on the one side a perfect reciprocity of both spiritual and material affinity, while on the other there exists only one of those motives, the double reciprocity will cause a union in preference to the single reciprocity. And that preference has its analogy in the physical world; for, we find that certain chemical substances unite very well when alone, but they separate and form new alliances, the moment a substance, which has a stronger affinity for one of the two, makes its appearance in the compound.

Thirdly.—OF THE THREE ELEMENTARY PASSIONS WHICH CONSTITUTE THE INTELLECTUAL SPHERE OF THE SOUL.

First.—The Desire of Progressive Refinement. This desire may be considered under a two-fold aspect, as well as those of the moral and the sensual spheres of activity; and the two distinctions may be termed either selfish and social, or internal and external, or simple and combined. The desire of progressive refinement is simple or selfish, when it is confined to the personal improvement and advantage of the individual only, without regard to other people. For instance, a man who wishes to improve his own fortune and present condition, without regard to the improvement of his fellow-beings, has only a simple desire of refinement: but a man who wishes to improve his own mind and his condition in society, that he may be able to enjoy the high social pleasure of improving the mental and physical condition of his fellow-beings, is actuated by a social as well as a personal motive of progressive refinement; and the one is as much superior to the other in degree, as the Platonic affection is superior to the carnal desire in the passion of love: the distinctions being exactly analogous.

Secondly.—The natural desire for change has also an individual and a social bearing. When we desire a change of pleasure for our own personal gratification alone, such as a change of diet, or a change of scenery, we are actuated by the simple selfish impulse; but when we desire to vary our habits and occupations for the sake of increasing the pleasures of our fellow-beings as well as our own, then

the motive has a combined and elevated character, which distinguishes it from its counterpart, the selfish motive.

Thirdly.—The same law of duality is applicable to the intellectual desire of cumulating the pleasures of sense with those of the mind. For instance: we may desire to cumulate physical and mental pleasures, for our own personal gratification only; and we may also desire to associate our friends and fellow-beings in the rapturous participation of cumulated physical, moral, and mental enjoyment. The one is social and divine; the other, selfish and indign.

We may, therefore, resume this superficial analysis of the theory of motives, derived from the passions or principles of activity in the soul of man, by contrasting the twelve social passions with the twelve individual passions, which are constantly acting either individually or collectively in the human breast; and though these twelve contrasted pairs of elementary motives are naturally classed under three distinct heads, still they all concentrate in one superior unity of being, which has a twofold character in all its bearings;—namely, the *social being* and the *individual being.*

The social man has five active and productive instincts, four spiritual or moral affinities, and three mental principles of associative harmony.

The individual man has five passive tastes or principles of individual gratification, four principles of material or selfish affinity, and three mental desires of purely personal gratification.

In the individual and competitive states of society, the individual appetites of the soul are almost exclusively called into action; but in a well-organized state of associative harmony, the truly social nature of the human soul will reign predominant, and transform the present collectively organized being called *competitive civilization* (which ought to be termed, collectively organized human tigers), into an angelic choir of terrestrial spirits, constantly modulating from the harmonies of sense to those of affection, in accordance with the laws of mental variety and religious unity.

It will be observed that, in this general scale of the elementary faculties of the soul, we have not mentioned those intellectual faculties which are purely instrumental, such as *memory, imagination,* and *comparison;* and this omission is quite premeditated, for we deem it highly important to distinguish the *essential* from the *instrumental* faculties of the soul. It is a confusion of those distinct orders of faculties which has hitherto bewildered metaphysicians and phrenologists in their attempts at psychological analysis; and before we can have a truly scientific knowledge of the natural theory of motives, we must know what are the elementary passions of the soul which give birth to the *will,* and what are the merely instrumental faculties which are called into action by the individual or collective will of those innate principles of the human soul.

The sensual nature of man gravitates attractively and repulsively towards luxurious enjoyment, internally and externally: *i. e.*—

Internal luxury, or health;
External luxury, or wealth.

The moral nature of man gravitates attractively and repulsively towards social affinity, internally and externally: *i. e.*—

Material affinity, or the physical enjoyment of sociality;

Spiritual affinity, or the moral enjoyment of sociality.

The intellectual nature of man gravitates attractively and repulsively towards universal harmony, internally and externally: *i.e.*—

The internal harmony of all the individual passions of the soul;

The external harmony of all the social passions of the soul.

If we were not afraid of becoming abstrusely tedious by too great a multiplicity of analytical details, we might give a general idea of the different degrees of passional consonances and concords in the theory of passional or social harmony, with their respective analogies in the theory of musical harmony; but as none but those who are deeply versed in the science of music would clearly understand these analogies, we will only give one example of the different degrees of consonance in moral affinity; and we will confine this one example to the limits of what is commonly called a *diatonic scale*, in the natural method of classification. Before giving this example, however, of the diatonic degrees of passional consonance, it may be well to give a general idea of musical consonances, to render the illustration more intelligible to those who may not be acquainted with musical science.

First, then, the diatonic scale contains the seven notes which are represented by the seven white keys in the octaves of a piano-forte, and when the five black keys of the same octave are included, the twelve notes form what is called a chromatic scale. The diatonic scale of white keys only contains seven full tones, and the octave or note of echo; the chromatic scale of white and black keys contains twelve half tones, and the octave or note of repetition.

The full notes of the diatonic scale, when they are sounded in pairs, furnish different degrees of consonance and dissonance. Thus:—

The first and the eighth notes being sounded at the same time form a perfect unison;

The first and the second sounded together form a dissonance;

The first and the third sounded together form a consonance;

The first and the fourth sounded together form a semi-dissonance;

The first and the fifth sounded together form a semi-consonance;

The first and the sixth sounded together form a consonance;

The first and the seventh sounded together form a dissonance; but this dissonance has a particular colour or character, which requires a certain method of solution.

Now, by observing the natural combinations of those elementary degrees of affinity which constitute what is commonly called *family affection*, we shall find that they are exactly analogous to these different degrees of consonance and dissonance in musical affinity.

For instance; if a single note be sounded once only, there can be no relation either of consonance or dissonance between it and those notes which are not sounded; and if a child has neither

father nor mother, brother nor sister, uncle nor aunt, it is an orphan in the most complete sense of the word; and, therefore, as far as family affection is concerned, it is like a single note sounding alone, without being responded to in any degree of consonance or dissonance.

We will just observe here, that, as we are only comparing the seven full tones of music to the full and direct degrees of family relationship, we shall not mention those secondary degrees of family affinity, such as uncles and aunts, grandfathers and grandmothers, &c., which are analogous to the half tones of the musical scale.

The family affection of an orphan, then, is analogous to a note sounding alone, without either consonance or dissonance: and the same may be said of a parent who has lost an only child.

The mutual affection of children who have lost their parents is analogous to a constant repetition of the same sound, without variety. The family affection between parents and children, where the same father has legitimate children by his wife, and illegitimate children by a concubine, is analogous to the *dissonance* of the first and second notes of the musical scale.

The affection between parents and children, of the same marriage, and where all are living together in harmony, is analogous to the *double consonance* of the first, third, and fifth notes of the musical scale, which is the most perfect of all accords, except that of full unison. When one of the parents only is living, the family concord is analogous to a simple consonance between the first and the third notes in music.

It must be borne in mind here, that we are only speaking of *attraction and concord,* and that it would be easy to enumerate the corresponding analogies of *repulsion* and *discord* in all these degrees.

Where parents have as strong a liking or degree of spiritual affinity for the child of another person as they have for their own; and when they adopt that stranger's child as one of their own family, without the consent of their natural offspring; the result is a *semi-dissonance* amongst the natural and the adopted children, similar to the semi-dissonance of the first and fourth notes in music.

When the parents adopt strange children, while their own are living, and the children are adopted by strangers at the same time, and in both cases without the full knowledge and mutual consent of all parties, the result is a *semi-consonance* between the natural parents and children, or a partial affinity only on both sides, which is analogous to the semi-consonance of the first and the fifth notes in music.

When the same thing takes place with the full knowledge and mutual consent of all parties, the result is analogous to the *consonance* of the first and sixth notes in the musical scale.

When people adopt orphans from motives of pure charity, without knowing them, or being actuated by spiritual affinity, the result is analogous to the *dissonance* of the first and seventh notes of the diatonic scale, for though neither one nor the other are direct affinities

or consonances, still the one tends powerfully towards social unity, and the other towards musical unison in higher combinations.

We will conclude this superficial view of analogy between the different degrees of passional and musical consonances, by observing that it is easy to distinguish forty-eight degrees of consonant and dissonant affinity in each of the twelve elementary passions, and in each of the chromatic scales or octaves of a musical instrument. And here it must be understood that the word *dissonance* does not mean *discord* or repulsion; it means a partial or imperfect consonance in music, and a one-sided affinity in morals. From this it will be seen that the theory of motives, or the analysis and the synthesis of human *attractions* and *repulsions, sympathies* and *antipathies, instincts* and *tastes*, &c., &c., is an immense science, which is not to be thoroughly understood by a few hours' study. And yet it is the only science which furnishes a complete and satisfactory solution of the problem of *liberty* and *necessity, free-will* and *responsibility*. The elementary passions are the principles of activity and desire in the soul of man, and therefore they are the primitive sources of the will, as well as the responsible agents for the violation of all natural laws.

By the immutable laws of necessity all the elementary principles of activity in the soul are permanently and incessantly impelled to seek, individually and collectively, their own satisfaction, and, therefore, the will can only be free in so much as external circumstances afford a choice in the modes of satisfying these natural impulsions. Free-will depends, then, upon the various degrees of liberty which circumstances allow to the developement of the passions; and responsibility corresponds to the degree of re-action produced by the discordant developement of those passions considered individually and collectively in all their bearings.

As falsehood and evil are necessarily generated by subversive desires, so truth and equity are the natural results of benevolence and unity. The discordant passions are evidently deviations of our natural impulses, and the well regulated alternate satisfaction of our innate and harmonic desires is the primary object of human industry and social organization: whence it follows, that terrestrial happiness depends chiefly on the degree of perfection which may be realized in society.

If we judge from the history of humanity, and the present state of civilization, this may appear much more desirable than attainable, but it must be allowed that many things, which are now familiar to every body, were deemed absolutely impossible before they had been realized; and we confidently hope that an attentive perusal of the following pages may serve to dispel the intellectual mist which causes an object of such paramount importance to appear remote and indistinct, while, in reality, it lies within our immediate reach. We must, however, *beg the principle*, by *supposing* the possibility, until we have fully explained the general modes of its practicability; for, in a rapid sketch, it is hardly possible to do more than indicate first principles, and we purposely hurry over psychological questions, in order to arrive at those of practical application.

We may observe, however, that the primitive nature of our essential attractions, is perfectly neutral; and that good and evil in society, depend merely on the *modes* of action. The same essential impulse may produce good effects, in accordance with truth and equity, or bad effects in falsehood and iniquity, according to its harmonic or its subversive *mode* of developement. If God had created us naturally wicked, there would be no remedy; but such is not the case; he has endowed us with good essential faculties, and given us the superior faculties of reason and free-will, that we may choose between the *harmonic* and the *subversive modes* of action. Consequently, we should always ask ourselves one question, before we proceed to satisfy a natural desire; *i. e.* Is the mode of action we are about to adopt, harmonic or subversive? right or wrong? just or unjust? If it be of a subversive nature, we should refrain from it, and seek a just and harmonic mode of satisfying our natural desire.

It is often very difficult for *poor* people to find perfectly just modes of satisfying their natural wants, and the degree of crime in committing injustice, depends upon the degree of facility with which the culpable person might have avoided it. So that, when it is absolutely impossible to find a just and moral mode of satisfying a natural desire, there is no absolute crime in having recourse to a subversive mode of satisfaction. Christ has expressed himself to this effect, in the 12th chapter of St. Matthew: when the Pharisees reproached him for permitting his disciples to break the sabbath, he replied thus:—

"*Have ye not heard what David did, when he was hungred, and they that were with him; How he entered into the house of God, and did eat the shewbread, which was not lawful for him to eat, neither for them that were with him, but only for the priests?*"

But these considerations lead us from our immediate object, to which we must return.

Section V.

A General Notion of Corporate Combination.

The association of the three primary agents of production, for the mutual advantage of each, and the common benefit of all, in the various pursuits of industry, forms the principal basis of associative combination. *Capital, science,* and *manual labour* combined in due proportions, and applied to *agriculture, manufacture, commerce,* and *domestic industry, art, science,* and *education,* so as to produce the greatest possible amount of wealth and advantage, with the least possible expense of attention and labour, are objects of no trifling importance; and a science which professes to realize this combination, is worthy of our most serious attention.

There are three principal modes of combining the three great instruments of production; *capital, labour,* and *science.* (The word *capital* is applicable to all kinds of property.)

1. *With a view to mere economy of expense and consumption*:— The association of a number of different families, in one large and commodious dwelling, where all the advantages of purchasing the

best qualities at first hand, and on a wholesale scale, might be united with those of economical arrangements for education, domestic comforts, and agreeable society. The collective mansion to contain as many sets of private apartments as there might be different families belonging to the association, and each family to occupy small or large apartments according to their respective degrees of opulence and splendour. Besides the various gradations of private dwellings, there would, of course, be suitable suites of public rooms for education, and other objects of general advantage.

It would not be necessary that all those families whose interests were combined according to this partial mode of association, should be of the same rank, or on visiting terms with each other: they might visit as much or as little as suited their respective tastes and sympathies, and meet in public assemblies as perfect strangers to each other. The business of the society might be transacted by trustees chosen by the whole body of associates; or any other mode of election and internal administration might be adopted.

This mode of association would require a proximate degree of rank and fortune, or social condition amongst the families who belonged to the same corporate body. The gentry and the labouring classes could not well belong to the same association: each class should form separate combinations, with not more than three principal gradations of fortune in the same society.

2. *With a view to the mere advantages of superior production and equitable distribution*:—The association of artisans, capitalists, and men of science, for the mutual benefit of each class. By uniting their means to produce the greatest possible amount of wealth with the greatest economy of capital and labour, and receiving dividends in due proportion to their respective efforts of labour, and the sums of capital invested, all parties would be equally interested in the success of the establishment, and no improper advantage could be taken by one party over another. Capitalists would no longer be able to spoliate and oppress the labouring population, and society would not be continually exposed to the dangers of universal depravity and revolutionary violence.

This mode of associating capital, labour, and science, might be applied to agricultural, as well as to commercial and manufacturing industry.

3. *With a view to render the various pursuits of industry positively agreeable, recreative, and attractive,* INSTEAD OF BEING, AS THEY NOW ARE, *monotonous, fatiguing, and disagreeable.*

This operation would require the two simple modes of association to be combined with a variety of other arrangements which will be explained in other chapters.

Besides these fundamental modes of association, there are numerous varieties of intermediate sorts of combination, and there are several modes of guaranteeing society against fraud and oppression, without deranging the present system of isolated *familial* existence; but we purposely defer entering into scientific details, until, by a critical analysis of social evils and prejudices, the mind of the reader be thoroughly prepared to understand and appreciate

the nature of the remedy. Those who are too impatient to proceed with us gradually, may easily satisfy their curiosity by referring, at once, to the tenth and following chapters; but we deem it inexpedient to commence as mathematicians do, by a complete and scientific statement of the problem we propose for solution. When mathematicians address themselves to men of science, they may state their problems scientifically without disadvantage, because they speak to mathematicians only, who admit the possibility of a solution, and can easily understand the deductions by which it is to be obtained; but the case is very different with us; we have to state the problem of human happiness, and indicate the theorems of association which afford the solution, to a public who are unacquainted with the principles of *social science*, and who are neither disposed to admit the possibility of a solution to the problem, nor prepared to understand, without considerable efforts of attention, the theorems and deductions of the science of association. For this reason, a gradual initiation into the elementary principles is indispensably necessary, before we can enter into a rapid and scientific solution of the problem.

But, with respect to the practicability and the efficiency of association, as a universal remedy for social evils, it may easily be admitted, *à priori*,—

1. *With respect to Practicability* :—That a system which directly and permanently promotes the interests of all classes in society, must have every chance of success, when once it is generally understood and duly appreciated. Truth must finally be successful; and if the principles of association are not in accordance with truth and equity, they will deservedly fall into contempt and oblivion; but if, on the contrary, they are truly natural, we may rest assured that they are really practicable.

2. *With respect to Efficiency* :—If the principles of association enable us to create and generalize wealth, morality, science, and religious unity, to an extent which will banish absolute poverty, depravity, ignorance, and discord, from an aggregation of several hundred families, (a number equal to a small parish or district,) it is clear that a whole nation may be rendered flourishing by the prosperity of all its combined elementary districts; and the same principles which enable one whole nation to become learned and industrious, may confer the advantages of superior civilization on all the nations of the earth.

We may fairly conclude, then, that the principles of association, if complete and strictly in accordance with the laws of nature, are immediately practicable, and permanently efficient. Whence it follows, that we have only to examine their natural connexion with the eternal laws of truth and equity, to determine their relative degrees of practicability and efficiency.

But, in order to meet the objections, and neutralize the prejudices, of those who believe every thing to be impracticable, which they have not seen realized, or do not clearly understand in theory, we will briefly examine the history and progress of the principal discoveries which have enriched humanity at different periods of

modern civilization; and after having shown the pernicious influence of prejudice on the first dawning of all important discoveries, we will critically analyze a series of other sources of objection.

If we frankly admit the following list of serious objections, and fully refute them one by one, the reader cannot fairly refuse to follow us in a more scientific and complete developement of our principles; and, after being partially initiated by means of this critical dissertation, he will be much better prepared to understand the true elements of *social science.*

List of Objections.

1. Such pretended discoveries concerning the perfection of social institutions, are mere arbitrary combinations, incompatible with human nature.
2. The science of society would have been discovered long ago, if it existed in principle.
3. Such ideal perfection never has been, and, therefore, never can be, realized on earth.
4. All theoretical systems are impracticable. The improvement of society must be the work of time, in gradually reforming political institutions.
5. The condition of the poor must always depend on the state of trade, and be subject to its fluctuations.
6. The political economists have explained all the secret springs of production and economy.
7. Commercial intercourse affords the most effectual means of generalizing civilization amongst barbarous nations.
8. Malthus has proved that all systems of improvement in society are rendered inadequate by the principles of population.

These, and many other objections, shall be fully answered before we enter into a regular exposition of elementary principles. Ere we proceed, however, it may not be amiss to remind those well-disposed persons, who, from a natural indolence, might feel inclined to abandon the subject, and rely on others for a minute examination of the principles of improvement, as well as for their execution, that, unless the public in general become sufficiently acquainted with social science, to desire the practical application of its doctrines, it is probable that statesmen and other influential persons, who are constantly occupied in pursuits of business or pleasure, will neglect them merely because they are not generally known and adopted; hence the propriety of examining them, at least, sufficiently to acquire a general idea of their nature. This task it shall be our endeavour to render as easy as possible, by a proper attention to clearness and simplicity.

A superficial view of general principles is all that we shall venture to present in this simple introduction. The public in general cannot be expected to enter deeply into scientific analysis; they have neither leisure nor inclination for such studies, and only require to understand as much as is necessary to form a correct opinion. It is the business of statesmen to become thoroughly ac-

quainted with all the details of social science; and, after having written this elementary treatise for all classes of readers, it is our intention to treat the subject more scientifically for the particular use of statesmen and studious persons. This simple introduction contains nothing abstruse or difficult to understand. It is merely a critical dissertation, intended to clear away prevailing errors, and prepare the mind for receiving new truths. In our opinion, the best mode of proving that the principles of association are true, is to begin by proving that those of *incoherence* are erroneous. In accordance with this opinion, the first volume will contain a superficial analysis of *incoherent* civilization; and the second, a methodical exposition of the principles of social science. Those readers who are too impatient to follow the plan we have adopted, may begin by reading the second volume first.

CHAPTER III.

SECTION I.—*Of the Slowness of Human Progress, and the Influence of Chance, in Useful Discoveries.*

Those who are not familiar with history, are apt to think that the present state of science and industry is hardly different or superior to that of former ages; and even the erudite are but little accustomed to draw the natural inference of future improvement rendering society as much superior to its present condition, as this is to the enslaved ignorance of antiquity; and yet, nothing is more rational than such an inference, if we examine the progression of scientific discoveries, and the consequent advancement of civilization.

When we read in the histories of Athens and Rome the picturesque descriptions of their conquests and their splendour, our imagination heightens the colouring of eloquence so as to dazzle the eye of reflection, and conceal from its view the monstrous contours of reality; but, when we close the classic page, and abandon ourselves to sober thought, the fascinating power subsides, and with it vanishes the shadow of magnificence which masked the brutal forms of ignorance and oppression.

The triumphal cars of Pericles, Alcibiades, the Great Pompey, and Julius Cæsar, were hardly superior to common donkey carts or painted wheelbarrows; and in many other branches of industry, the Greeks and the Romans were as little advanced as they were in the art of coach-building. They were ignorant of the use of the stirrup; and for want of this simple contrivance, they contracted ruptures and other dangerous maladies, resulting from the excessive fatigue of sitting constantly on horseback. The tribulations of military service, and the infirmities of old age, were thus increased beyond the ordinary bounds of violent exercise and declining nature. The simple contrivance of the stirrup, and the application of springs in suspending carriages, are inventions of modern date; nor were these eminently useful discoveries made before the comparatively recent date of the twelfth century; and even then, they were made by mere grooms or stable-boys, and not by men of science: in fact, all the most useful inventions are

of modern date, and many of them are due to chance rather than to science. The first notion of the telescope, the principal instrument of modern astronomy, was discovered a few centuries ago, by two peasant children of Middleburg, who happened to put the glasses of an old pair of spectacles at each end of a tube; and though this instrument has been greatly improved by science, still chance claims the merit of the discovery.

But these are mere trifles compared to other modern acquisitions of art and science. The simple invention of printing has done more to facilitate the progress of civilization and generalize its effects, during the last four centuries, than all the efforts of antiquity were able to realize during thousands of years.

The modern results of mechanical inventions are not less remarkable for number than for magnitude; for, though the Chinese and the Indians are said to have made numerous inventions, equally useful and scientific, many centuries before they were known in Europe, still, it is very evident that they were inferior to us in civilization, from the mere fact of not generalizing their knowledge so as to civilize their neighbours. Besides, whatever may be the amount of science possessed by the Oriental priests, it is clear that they have made little use of it in society, for they still retain many barbarous habits and customs; such as those of exposing children, secluding females, enslaving the labouring population, &c. &c. These barbarian customs tend to prove that exaggeration has magnified the importance of their science; that the poetical propensities of Oriental climes have had considerable influence on the imagination of Northern travellers, who cannot resist the temptation of clothing meagre realities with the splendid and illusive draperies of fiction.

When we reflect that almost all the useful discoveries of science and industry which now enrich humanity, have been made in Europe within the last two or three centuries, and that the boasted learning of antiquity was ignorant of these resources; that slavery, in its most absolute and hideous forms, was the lot of the whole population during thousands of years, in all the most civilized nations of the earth: may we not ask ourselves, in deep compassion, if we are still subject to privation and suffering, notwithstanding the advantages of modern industry, what must have been the condition of the multitude in former ages?—It must indeed have been deplorable. And this conclusion becomes still more impressively evident, when we behold their stupendous remains of public monuments, and reflect on the prodigious efforts of sheer labour, which must necessarily have been spent in their construction. The monuments and the history of Egypt, Greece, and Rome, may be splendid pictures of by-gone grandeur; but if we turn our thoughts to the living realities which they represent, and the amount of suffering which animated them, we may compare the whole to an exquisitely painted picture of a beggar in tatters, blind and helpless, suffering from hunger and fatigue in the midst of a wild, uncultivated, and oppressive luxuriance. The gaudy picture may delight our imagination; but to reflect on the real

mortifications of such an unfortunate existence, is deeply painful to the feelings of benevolence.

The historical and the material monuments of antiquity show that, during thousands of years, a constant stream of human sufferings flowed through the successive generations of humanity, merely to quench the thirst of blind ambition; and though, as we have just now said, the imagination may feast on the stately ruins of fallen empires, the scrutinizing eye of reflection will easily discover the deadly cancer of ignorance and slavery, which preyed upon their vitals, poisoned their existence, reduced them to corruption, and finally effected their complete dissolution.

If the ignorant despots of antiquity did not know that the ordinary pressure of the atmosphere was sufficient to force water through any degree of sinuosity within the limits of certain physical laws of nature, they knew how to enslave their still more ignorant brethren, forcing them to toil incessantly in constructing enormous piles of brick-work, to serve as aqueducts, *thermæ*, triumphal arches, and theatres of bloodshed; where both man and beast were slaughtered, to quench an insatiable thirst for infernal diversion. If they did not know how to invent mechanical force to facilitate production, they knew how to convert human beings into beasts of burden, and make them the perpetual slaves of brutal ignorance.

And, in as much as we are superior to them in science, without proportionally relieving our unfortunate brethren from drudgery and slavery, ignorance and depravity, privation and immorality; in so much are we more than they guilty of treason to humanity, and obstinate contempt of our religious duty to the Creator.

But, setting aside all useless recriminations, if we consider the slowness with which the most important discoveries have hitherto succeeded each other, it will not appear strange that the principles of *spiritual* attraction, and the consequent theory of *social science*, should have been so long unknown to humanity: on the contrary, if the functions of human genius be to discover the laws of nature, and the useful application of those laws to the wants of society, is it not probable that each successive generation may find wherewithal to exercise its inventive faculties, until society has attained to that ultimate degree of perfection which is its natural destiny? And, if humanity has already progressed through the *savage*, the *patriarchal*, the *barbarian*, and the *incoherently civilized* forms of society, is it not more than probable, that we may continue to progress until we arrive at a state of society as much superior to the present, as this is to the ignorant slavery of barbarous nations, and the wandering condition of savage tribes?

These questions must necessarily be answered in the affirmative, by those who are deeply read in historical erudition, and who, from a positive knowledge of the slow progression of discovery in science, are enabled to conceive enlarged ideas of the ultimate degrees of perfection in society, while they justly estimate the present indigent state of humanity, and its ignorance concerning the means of procuring that which is absolutely necessary to general happiness.

Two centuries ago, our forefathers had not invented that simple instrument of every-day use, the wheelbarrow; and it would be difficult for us to conceive an adequate idea of the waste of time and labour to which they were exposed for want of this comparatively insignificant machine.

Nor is there any thing wonderful in the very recent date of this simple contrivance: elastic springs for carriages, printing type, the stirrup, the mariner's compass, the true science of planetary motion, and the real form of the earth, are all modern discoveries and inventions. The application of steam, gas, and the principal powers of machinery, have all originated within the memory of persons still living; and every body must admit, that innumerable advantages may arise from merely spreading a knowledge of these powers, so as to generalize their application, even were the true principles of association still hidden amongst the most profound mysteries of nature.

To suppose that nothing new can be discovered in a science which has already occupied the minds of philosophers in all ages, is to suppose that they were all stark mad in imagining the possibility of discovering a real science of society. Besides, it is notorious in the history of humanity, that more discoveries have been made by chance than by scientific research. The virtue of coffee was first discovered to man by the exhilarating effects it produced on the animals which fed upon it in the plains of Moka; and many other things have been discovered in a similar manner. We have heard it said, that an ass, the most stupid of animals, first taught man the utility of pruning the vine in order to obtain a superior quality of grapes. The animal ate away the superior and other superfluous branches of several vines; and it was observed that those very plants which were thought to have been greatly damaged, produced the finest quality of fruit, and that the advantages of quality might be thus obtained at the expense of quantity. But the utility of this discovery was more palpable and more easily admitted than that which was made by the goats of Moka. When the exquisite quality of coffee was first made known in Europe, the discovery was rendered almost useless for a considerable length of time, by the blind influence of obstinate prejudice.

It must be admitted, however, that modern discoveries have found more easy access to general practice, than those of antiquity. If a real and useful discovery is more than fifty years in gaining admission to public confidence and general application, it is an extraordinary case; and very often, ten or twelve years are sufficient to ensure success: but hundreds of years elapsed, in former ages, before certain inventions could be generally known, admitted, and usefully applied to the wants of society. A few short extracts from history will fully corroborate this assertion.

Montucla, in his *History of Mathematics*, gives the following account of the progress and general adoption of the present method of notation by figures and ciphers:—

"While among the Greeks and the Romans, the only method

used for the notation of numbers was by the letters of the alphabet, which necessarily rendered arithmetical calculation extremely tedious and operose; the Indians had from time immemorial employed for the same purpose the ten ciphers of figures, now universally known, and by means of them performed every operation in arithmetic with the greatest facility and expedition. . . . . The Arabians, not long after their settlement in Spain (during the eighth century), introduced this mode of notation into Europe, and were candid enough to acknowledge that they had learned it from the Indians. Though the advantages of this mode of notation are obvious and great, yet so slowly do mankind adopt new inventions, that the use of it was for some time confined to science; by degrees, however, men of business relinquished the former cumbersome method of computation by alphabetical letters, and the Indian arithmetic came into general use throughout Europe."—(*Montucla, Hist. des Mathemat.*, i. p. 360, &c.)

If figures were not generally adopted as the ordinary signs of computation, until a considerable length of time after they were known in Europe, the science of geography was infinitely more slow in its progress. "Fortunately for that science," says Dr. Robertson, "Ptolemy, in forming his general system of geography, (eighty years after the death of Pliny,) adopted the ideas and imitated the practice of Hipparchus, who lived near *four hundred years* before that time. That great philosopher was the first who attempted to make a catalogue of the stars. In order to ascertain their position in the heavens with accuracy, he measured their distance from certain circles of the spheres, computing it by degrees, either from east to west, or from north to south. The former was denominated the longitude of the star; the latter, its latitude. This mode was found to be of such utility in his astronomical researches, that he applied it with no less happy effect to geography; and it is a circumstance worthy of notice, that it was by observing and describing the heavens, men were first taught to measure and delineate the earth with exactness. This method of fixing the position of places, invented by Hipparchus, though known to the geographers between his time and that of Ptolemy (five hundred years), and mentioned both by Strabo and Pliny, was not employed by any of them."—(*Dr. Robertson's Disquisition on India*, § 2, page 11.)

These considerations naturally lead us to examine the influence of prejudice in retarding discoveries of a more modern date.

Section II.

Of the Influence of Prejudice in retarding the Practical Application of New Inventions.

In reading the biography of men of genius, whose inventions have conferred the greatest blessings on humanity, we are painfully struck with the injustice and ingratitude with which their contemporaries never failed to repay them; and it is a remarkable fact, that the influence of prejudice is hardly less general in the most advanced periods of civilization than in the darkest ages of

ignorance and superstition, though it may not be quite so obstinate now as it was formerly.

Such revolting injustice can only be attributed to ignorant vanity and mistaken selfishness; and yet one would naturally conceive that these sources of prejudice could hardly be general, and that all others must be totally destroyed after so many victories finally gained over them by genius; but, notwithstanding the repeated triumphs of invention, malignity, ignorance, and prejudice are still all-powerful over public opinion, to the bitter disappointment of real merit, and the temporary, if not permanent, disadvantage of humanity. If we are at a loss to conceive the influence of ignorant prejudice over the judgment of our forefathers, our descendants will be no less embarrassed to account for our blind obstinacy in refusing to examine or admit the most interesting discoveries.

What excuse can be found for the Church of Rome persecuting Galileo, because he affirms that scientific principles prove the earth to be a planet, of combined movement, revolving round the sun and its own axis?

What excuse is there for a pope excommunicating Columbus, merely because he affirms that the earth is spherical, and that by sailing round it, unknown regions may probably be discovered?

Why was Newton abused for discovering the compound nature of light?

What excuse is there for a parliament passing an act to forbid the use of coffee and potatoes, under the pretext of their being poisonous or unwholesome substances? were they actuated by real science, or by prejudice, in their conduct? What degree of confidence can a reasonable person place in the sapient decrees of a parliament chosen from amongst men who are not required to furnish any qualification of science, practical or theoretical; who, so lately as the year 1808, gravely discussed in a British House of Commons, such silly questions as the following:—"*Which has proved a more striking instance of public credulity—the gas lights of Mr. Winsor, or the cow-pox inoculation?*" We may fairly assert that a greater instance of public credulity than the confidence in either of these scientific inventions, is the public faith in the political science of men who are chosen to legislate without giving any real proof of scientific qualification: men who seriously discuss such questions as the preceding, and sapiently conclude that "vaccination and lighting by gas are both scientific illusions, deservingly consigned to contempt and oblivion."—(See details, in the "*Life of Dr. Jenner.*")

The man who made the most useful of modern improvements in music died of grief, in consequence of the injustice of his contemporaries.

"Galin learnt music without the aid of a master; and having discovered the advantages of a new method, he wished to promulgate his theory that the public might benefit by it. After having tried his system with considerable success in his native city, Bordeaux, he came to Paris, in the hope of finding fortune and fame;

but grief and a premature death were his only reward. He died in 1822, at the age of thirty-five, six years after he had made his discovery. He died of consumption, accelerated by grief, from knowing that professors of music sought to deprive him of the merit of this discovery, by disfiguring it with a view to call it their own."

In almost every age, contempt and persecution have been the rewards of genius during a life of the most devoted perseverance; and in most cases the dawn of justice has been preceded by the darkness of the tomb.

If these facts were duly appreciated, the empire of prejudice and injustice would certainly be more limited; the discoveries of genius would be more carefully distinguished from arbitrary systems. A few extracts from the history and philosophy of chemistry, one of the most useful of modern sciences, may suffice to fix our attention on the effects of ignorant opinion, and show the utility of dethroning it as soon as possible, where the interests of humanity are deeply concerned.

"When a new discovery is announced to the world, there are people who immediately say, 'It is impossible,' or that 'it is not true;' and when the truth and possibility of the discovery are both proved to them, they console themselves by saying, 'It is not new;' nor is it difficult to prove the assertion, for, by consulting ancient documents, it is always possible to find some idea similar to that in question. Objections of this sort were made against the discoveries of Lavoisier."—*Dumas, Philosophie de la Chimie*, 173.

"But that is not all, gentlemen; Lavoisier's theory was published in 1772, and from that period up to 1783, when it was completed in all its principles, Lavoisier was still alone in his opinion. When I say alone, I am wrong, for the great mathematician, Laplace, approved his theory, but not one of the chemists had admitted its principles. You will probably be surprised, and you will easily conceive the mortifications to which a man of genius is doomed, when you reflect that ten years after the publication of his theory, Lavoisier had not a single partisan amongst the chemists, either of France or of foreign nations. In Germany he was opposed by Bergmann, and in England nobody accepted his system."—*Id.* 176.

"It was not until 1787, fifteen years after its promulgation, that it was first admitted; and then it was styled, 'The System of the *French Chemists*,' and not of Lavoisier individually."

Such confusion was very painful to his feelings. "This theory is not that of the French chemists; it is mine," said he, in a written declaration. "I claim it as my invention, from the justice of my contemporaries and of posterity."—*Id.* 178.

"By this invention, Lavoisier annihilated all the imaginary systems which the vanity of philosophers had cherished during the last two thousand years; and, at the same time, he proved the fallacy of those doctrines of Stahl, which had been suggested by incomplete experiment."—*Id.* 189.

The theory of chemical affinities was treated in a similar manner.

"The first table of chemical affinities, published in 1718, by Mr. Geoffroy, was the result of experiments tolerably well made, and,

consequently, it was the expression, more or less correct, of real facts; but that was not the light in which it was viewed by his contemporaries: for, when it was presented to the French Academy, it was not well received. The idea of affinities, or attractive and repulsive forces, was indignantly rejected by the academic authorities, who obstinately refused to listen to such a speculation; and when the reporter of the committee for examining scientific papers and propositions took notice of Geoffroy's *table of affinities*, he said that it was difficult, if not impossible, to explain the cause of chemical action and reaction, the natural effects of superior laws of harmony; and, that the *theory of affinities* might do very well to explain these effects, if *affinities* and *attractions* were any thing more than imaginary notions.

"In 1731, thirteen years later, when Geoffroy died, and his eulogium was pronounced at the Academy, by the same person who had made the report on his *table of affinities*, it was stated as a thing to be regretted, that he had imagined a *singular system* of *chemical affinities*, which gave great annoyance to men of science, through fear of these *affinities* being a sort of *disguised attractions*, the more to be dreaded, because some talented people had already clothed them in seductive forms."

"Such was the cry of alarm, made by the professors of the fallacious physical theories of that time, who made no attempt to detect the merits or defects of Geoffroy's ideas on chemical affinities.—(*Dumas, Phil. de la Chimie*, 368.)

"At length, however, the Academy of Rouen offered a prize for the best table of *affinities;* and the prize was gained in 1758 by Limbourg, who examined the subject in a practical point of view."—(*Id.* 370.)

"Newton also admitted the effects of attraction in chemical operations."—(*Id.* 372.)

In speaking of the discovery of the composition of water, Mr. Dumas expresses himself thus;—

"Water was decomposed (by electricity): the hydrogen gas was attracted to the negative pole, and the oxygen to the positive. The composition of water was not generally admitted when this took place (in the beginning of the 19th century), though the experiments of Lavoisier had long before established the fact beyond a doubt: a great number of prejudiced minds refused to believe the thing possible, and it is difficult to conceive the influence which prejudice and false notions had over the judgment of men of science."

These extracts prove that men of science are not less subject to the chilling influence of prejudice than the ignorant multitude; and, therefore, it would be folly to rely on them implicitly for sound opinion, even in matters which fall within the limits of their special competence. When Newton discovered the laws of attraction which govern the planetary motion, he was contradicted by almost all the mathematicians of his time; nor were his principles generally admitted until fifty years after publication, as the following extract will clearly prove:—

"Long after the publication of his *Philosophiæ Naturalis Principia Mathematica*, the principles which it contained were contested by very celebrated mathematicians; and, amongst others, by John Bernoulli. Fontenelle never admitted the principles of attraction; but persisted to the last in preferring the whirling planetary systems or *Tourbillons* of Descartes. In fact, more than fifty years elapsed before Newton's principles of attraction were admitted by mathematicians and astronomers."—(*Biographie Universelle.*)

The history of navigation, and the discovery of America, furnish additional proof of the blindness of prejudice.

OF NAVIGATION AND THE DISCOVERY OF AMERICA.

The principal element of improvement in navigation was the invention of the mariner's compass, the origin of which is more or less obscure and uncertain: some authors say that it was imported into Europe by merchants from the East, while others contend that it was invented by a European. Dr. Robertson, in his *History of America*, page 20, gives the following account of this invention:—

"The compass may be said to have opened to man the dominion of the sea, and to have put him in full possession of the earth, by enabling him to visit every part of it. Flavio Gioia, a citizen of Amalfi, a town of considerable trade in the kingdom of Naples, was the author of this great discovery, about the year 1302. It hath been often the fate of those illustrious benefactors of mankind, who have enriched science and improved the arts by their inventions, to derive more reputation than benefit from the happy efforts of their genius. But the lot of Gioia has been still more cruel; through the inattention or ignorance of contemporary historians, he has been defrauded even of the fame to which he had such a just title. We receive from them no information with respect to his profession, his character, the precise time when he made this important discovery, or the accidents and inquiries which led to it."—(*Collinas et Trombellas, de Acus Nauticæ Inventore. Instit. Acad. Bonon.* tom. ii. part ii. p. 372.)

It is said that the Chinese made use of this instrument more than a thousand years before the Christian era; but whether this be true or not, it is certain that it was not known in Europe before 1300.

This invention, and the improvements of geographical and astronomical science, added to the impulse of a mercantile spirit in the fifteenth century, excited considerable speculation concerning the science of navigation, and the advantages which might be derived from the discovery of a western passage by sea to India; but prejudice stepped in, as usual, to thwart the attempts of genius, and prevent public opinion from encouraging the spirit of discovery. It is curious to compare the short-sighted reasonings of prejudice against the rational speculations of genius concerning navigation and discovery in the fifteenth century, with those that are commonly opposed to the science of association and its probable results in the nineteenth century; and, as the results of Columbus's specu-

lations and previsions concerning navigation and the discovery of unknown regions are familiar to every body, we cannot do better than transcribe the sophistical reasonings which were opposed to him at that time. These sophisms will show what degree of credit should be given to similar reasonings in present circumstances. The following extracts are taken from Dr. Robertson's *History of America*, and, as this authority will hardly be disputed, we may form a very correct idea of the influence of prejudice in that age, as well as in our own.

As the Portuguese were the first who conceived the idea of sailing in unknown seas, we will quote a passage concerning them before we speak of Columbus and the Spaniards.

"Hitherto (in 1433) the Portuguese had been guided in their discoveries, or encouraged to attempt them, by the light and information which they received from the works of the ancient mathematicians and geographers. But when they began to enter the torrid zone, the notion which prevailed amongst the ancients, that the heat, which reigned perpetually there, was so excessive as to render it uninhabitable, deterred them, for some time, from proceeding. Their own observations, when they first ventured into this unknown and formidable region, tended to confirm the opinion of antiquity concerning the violent operation of the direct rays of the sun. As far as the river Senegal, the Portuguese had found the coast of Africa inhabited by people nearly resembling the Moors of Barbary. When they advanced to the south of that river, the human form seemed to put on a new appearance. They beheld men with skins as black as ebony, with short curled hair, flat noses, thick lips, and all the peculiar features, which are now known to distinguish the race of negroes. This surprising alteration they naturally attributed to the influence of heat; and if they should advance nearer to the line, they began to dread that its effects would be still more violent. Those dangers were exaggerated; and many other objections against attempting further discoveries were proposed by some of the grandees, who, from ignorance, from envy, or from that COLD AND TIMID PRUDENCE which rejects whatever has the air of novelty or enterprise, had hitherto condemned all Prince Henry's schemes of discovery. They represented that it was altogether chimerical to expect any advantage from countries situated in that region which the wisdom and experience of antiquity had pronounced to be unfit for the habitation of men; that their forefathers, satisfied with cultivating the territory which Providence had allotted to them, did not waste the strength of the kingdom by fruitless projects, in quest of new settlements; that Portugal was already exhausted by the expense of attempts to discover lands which either did not exist, or which NATURE DESTINED TO REMAIN UNKNOWN; and was drained of men, who might have been employed in undertakings attended with more certain success, and productive of greater benefit. But neither their appeal to the authority of the ancients, nor their reasonings concerning the interests of Portugal, made any impression upon the determined philosophic mind of Prince Henry. The

discoveries which he had already made, convinced him that the ancients had little more than a conjectural knowledge of the torrid zone. The Portuguese ventured at length to cross the line, and, to their astonishment, found that region of the torrid zone, which was supposed to be scorched with intolerable heat, to be not only habitable, but populous and fertile."—(*Robertson's History of America*, page 25.)

The objections made against the conjectures of Columbus at the court of Spain, fifty years after these sophisms had been opposed to Prince Henry of Portugal, were not less puerile or presumptuous, as the following extracts will clearly prove:—

"Ferdinand and Isabella, though fully occupied by their operations against the Moors, paid so much regard to Columbus, as to refer the consideration of his plan to the Queen's confessor, Ferdinand de Talavera. He consulted such of his countrymen as were supposed best qualified to decide with respect to a subject of this kind. But true science had hitherto made so little progress in Spain, that the pretended philosophers, selected to judge in a matter of such moment, did not comprehend the first principles upon which Columbus founded his conjectures and hopes. Some of them, from mistaken notions concerning the dimensions of the globe, contended that a voyage to those remote parts of the East, which Columbus expected to discover, could not be performed in less than three years. Others concluded, that either he would find the ocean to be of infinite extent, according to the opinion of some ancient philosophers; or, if he should persist in steering towards the West beyond a certain point, that the convex figure of the globe would prevent his return, and that he must inevitably perish, in the vain attempt to open a communication between the two opposite hemispheres, which Nature had for ever disjoined. Even without deigning to enter into any particular discussion, many rejected the scheme in general, upon the credit of a maxim, under which the ignorant and unenterprising shelter themselves in every age—'that it is presumptuous in any person to suppose that he alone possesses knowledge superior to all the rest of mankind united.' They maintained, that if there were really any such countries as Columbus pretended, they could not have remained so long concealed; nor would the wisdom and sagacity of former ages have left the glory of this invention to an obscure Genoese pilot.

"It required all Columbus's patience and address to negotiate with men capable of advancing such strange propositions. He had to contend, not only with the obstinacy of ignorance, but with what is still more intractable—the pride of false knowledge. After innumerable conferences, and wasting five years in fruitless endeavours to inform and to satisfy judges so little capable of deciding with propriety, Talavera, at last, made such an unfavourable report to Ferdinand and Isabella, as induced them to acquaint Columbus that, until the war with the Moors should be brought to a period, it would be imprudent to engage in any new and expensive enterprise.

"Columbus, however, had convinced some gentlemen at court;

and they, three years later (eight years in all), prevailed on Isabella to enter into the scheme of Columbus. Accordingly she fitted out three small vessels, but so sparingly, that the whole expense did not amount to more than four thousand pounds. But notwithstanding the insufficiency of such an equipment, Columbus put to sea, and realized the conjectures of his *wild* theory."

He set sail from the port of Palos, in Andalusia, on Friday, the third day of August, 1492.

These were the short-sighted reasonings of prejudiced incredulity, which the most influential and well-informed men of that age opposed to the discoveries of genius, merely because they were unable to understand a rational theory which had never been realized: those who have sufficient time and patience to examine the principles of association, and the objections made against them by prejudiced and unqualified opponents, or even by philosophers and politicians, who may be deemed best qualified for judgment in such matters, will find that the objections are equally groundless in both cases, and the theories equally rational. We shall therefore conclude our remarks on the blindness of prejudice, by showing the utility of neutralizing its influence. It may, perhaps, be urged by modern sophists, that Columbus was deceived in his *previsions*, and that, instead of discovering a western passage to India, the object of his speculations, he fell by chance upon the discovery of a New World, &c. To this we reply—1st. That he discovered more than he expected by finding the American continent; and that this fact alone proves the utility of exploring unknown worlds. The same reason holds good with regard to the moral, as well as to the material world. 2d. That his *previsions* were not altogether erroneous; they were only incomplete; for the western passage to India is really guaranteed by the economy of Nature, with the sole reserve of a trifling effort on the part of man, either for effecting a practical road across the Isthmus of Panama, or by cutting a navigable canal through it. Such an operation would be a mere trifle for several nations uniting their means to achieve it. When civilization has passed from a state of *incoherency*, maintaining armies of destruction, to a combination of social interests, with armies of peaceful industry, to destroy physical difficulties, and facilitate universal commerce—such an undertaking as that of cutting a navigable canal through the Isthmus of Panama would be easily accomplished—as well as that of planting trees in deserts, and otherwise rendering barren regions fertile and habitable: but these operations will be impossible, so long as nations continue to war with each other, and destroy themselves, instead of uniting in federation for useful purposes.

The original idea of Columbus, then, was not erroneous; a western passage does exist in reality: it only requires a slight exertion on the part of humanity (we say *humanity*, because the labour would be too great for an individual nation) to render it effectually and permanently practicable. The economy of Nature has left hardly anything for man to do in this individual case, if we consider the extent of the globe, the numbers of the human

race, and the comparative facility of execution contrasted with its importance. Had nothing been left for man to do, he would not be associated in the plans of the Creator; he would find an abundance of food, raiment, means of locomotion and circulation, ready to his hand, without any exertion on his part. Such, however, is not the case. Man has a function in the economy of the universe: he is not to remain a mere drone, an idle spectator; he must associate his efforts to the great work of Providence, whose intention evidently is, that certain results should be effected through human agency, notwithstanding the bounty with which Nature has provided for the wants of humanity. The anticipations of Columbus, then, were correct; but a greater exertion than that of mere exploration was required to accomplish the object of his speculation. If, however, he found a slight difficulty on the one hand, he discovered an immense source of riches on the other. So we augur of Fourier's *prevision:* if his speculation of arriving at peace, unity, morality, and real religion, be rather more difficult than he supposed, still it must be *possible,* by the means of moral training and continued exertions on the part of the benevolent, to render those speculations practicable. We may, perhaps, discover a source of production and riches in the new world of social organization which far exceeds the expectations of Fourier and his partisans. By sailing in unknown regions, we are sure to find more than we expect, if we direct ourselves according to the inspirations of sound reason and practical science, instead of going just where the wind of caprice may chance to blow us.

OF THE EXPEDIENCE OF EMANCIPATING OURSELVES FROM THE INFLUENCE OF PREJUDICE IN MATTERS OF PARAMOUNT IMPORTANCE.

It may, perhaps, be difficult to divest one's-self entirely of the prejudices which influence that particular class of society with which we are more or less directly connected by our respective interests and pursuits; and particularly if the opinions of those persons in whose judgment we have good reason to confide, happen to be influenced by misconception or imperfect knowledge, rather than by an illiberal and sceptical disposition; but, what has just now been observed concerning the errors and the prejudice of learned and influential persons, in refusing their assent to the most rational principles of recent discovery, is sufficient to prove that the opinion of no man, or body of men, is absolute proof of the irrationality or the impracticability of a new doctrine; and, therefore, we ought always to examine for ourselves, when we wish to have a decided opinion concerning any recent discovery of paramount importance, which has not been tested by practical application.

To preach this precept, however, is much more easy than to put it in practice, because few people have sufficient leisure or patience to study new theories; and, therefore, it would be vain to expect every man to examine for himself before he forms his opinions concerning the principles of association; but, if we cannot expect him

to acquire a sufficient knowledge of these principles to form a well-grounded opinion in their favour, we may reasonably presume to say, that, without having thoroughly examined for himself, no man ought to have any decided opinion against them, whatever may be the degree of learning or respectability arrayed against this new science.

Those who have neither leisure nor patience to study the theory of *spiritual* attraction and corporate combination, nor the advantage of hearing this doctrine verbally explained, ought not to have any decided opinion concerning it, but wait patiently until practical application has proved its value or its nullity; for, until this theory has been fairly put to the test by practice, it is impossible to prove that any objection made against it, however plausible in appearance, is totally free from the influence of error or prejudice.

We have seen that the opinions of learned and respectable people concerning new theories of exact science, have been almost always erroneous during the first generation after the discoveries were published; no wonder, then, that the theory of human attractions and repulsions has hitherto met with a similar fate: but the day of justice is beginning to dawn on this discovery; and, in all probability, those who have exposed themselves to ridicule by hasty conclusions and misrepresentations, will deeply regret their presumptuous animadversions. Public opinion will certainly stigmatize them with the most severe reprobation, as a penalty for the absurd gravity with which they substitute their own prejudiced opinions for the sound doctrines of superior science.

In order, then, to avoid the ridicule to which ill-founded objections necessarily expose us, we should emancipate ourselves at once from the influence of prejudice, and remain perfectly neutral, until fairly convinced, either *pro* or *con*, by studying social science, or observing it in practice.

But, to those who have leisure to study these principles, and neglect to do so, merely from prejudice and sceptical indifference, we may be allowed to say that there is no plausible excuse for such conduct, when we reflect on the folly of our ancestors in similar circumstances. Nor can we screen ourselves from reproach by pleading ignorance when once we have been duly informed; for that excuse involves us in a dilemma of most humiliating alternative: we should stand accused, either of being too drowsy and indolent to open our eyes and behold the rising sun; or, of having an intellectual sight too weak to bear the light of genius. Let us not, then, prefer carelessly sleeping in the midst of famine and its volcanic eruptions, breathing the air of pestilence and depravity, dissolution and death, when, by availing ourselves of the heavenly lumination, we may escape from danger, enter into a land of peace and plenty, health and activity, love, festivity, variety, and harmony; the rapturous scenery of a promised land spreads far beyond the limits of our bounded view, and the light of genius soaring in the distance, invites humanity to quit this vale of tears and take possession of its divine inheritance; the terrestrial paradise allotted to man as his real destiny.

It must not be supposed that we wish to excite blind credulity, because we disapprove the sceptical opinions of prejudice or indifference; on the contrary, our principal desire is to stimulate inquiry; the object of this publication is to furnish the *data* on which an opinion concerning these principles may be safely grounded. We firmly believe that those who have sufficient independence of mind to divest themselves of all erroneous preconceptions, and sufficient leisure to study this theory with care and attention, will be thoroughly convinced of its transcendent utility; to say nothing of its charms and the universality of its application: and, moreover, we believe that the history of all new discoveries proves abundantly that no authority, however respectable, can pretend to be sufficiently free from the influence of prejudice, to merit the confidence of public opinion in quashing and denouncing these principles: for, notwitstanding the fulminations of the Church of Rome, the most respectable authority of the fifteenth century; and the opposition of the most learned mathematicians during fifty years of a more advanced period; the discovery of America confounded the presumption of infallibility, and the genius of planetary attraction eclipsed half a century of stern mathematical science.

These facts prove the fallible nature of the first three adverse opinions stated at the end of the last chapter; and in order to preclude the fourth of those apparently reasonable objections, we will endeavour to prove the insufficiency of our actual policy, and political speculation, as well as the absolute necessity of discovering the natural principles of terrestrial happiness. This method will retard the direct exposition of our theory; but it is positively necessary to undermine the ramparts of prejudice, by giving a negative demonstration of the principles of universal attraction, before we enter into a regular exposition. We proceed, therefore, to examine the present state of political theories, and the inefficiency of their arbitrary principles.

CHAPTER IV.

OF THE INFANCY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE.

1. *Of the Opinions of Philosophers and Politicians concerning the Imperfections of Political Science and Social Organization.*

The co-existence of different and conflicting opinions amongst statesmen and philosophers concerning the social and political interests of society is a certain proof of the absence of a real and exact science of internal and external policy; but, on the other hand, the progress of civilization proves, that if this science has not yet arrived at that state of perfection which constitutes an exact science, it has at least progressed to a period of advancement which may be compared to the transition from infancy to manhood. And, as an infant seeks instruction from the experience of advanced age, so statesmen and philosophers seek wisdom from the experience of past generations, by studying the history of antiquity, in order to obtain a faint knowledge of experience which may serve as a

guide in the absence of true science. This method, however, is defective in many respects, and should not be followed exclusively. Humanity is yet in its infancy, and, therefore, the history of its early developement can afford but little instruction concerning a more mature state of social existence.

The paucity of scientific principles in politics, and the insufficiency of such imperfect ideas as may be derived from history, have been confessed and lamented by the most learned men of all ages. After having spent his whole life in study, Socrates confessed that "*all he knew was, that he knew nothing*," and his greatest hope was, "*that the light of science would one day descend upon earth to guide humanity.*"

Montesquieu, one of the most learned men of modern times, after searching with indefatigable perseverance to discover the fundamental principles of society, concludes by saying, "*Civilized (incoherent?) societies are afflicted with a languid malady which is caused by some secret poison preying on their vital institutions; nor is the present state of science sufficient to discover either the nature or the antidote of this secret poison.*"

The author of the "Voyages of Young Anacharsis," in speaking of science in general, thus expresses himself:—

"*These libraries, the pretended treasures of sublime knowledge, are nothing more than a humiliating chaos of contradiction and error.*"

And Condillac, after having studied all the different systems of philosophy and politics, arrives at this conclusion:—

"*In order to discover the hidden principles of science, we must consider our ideas as they originate naturally; we must remodel the present methods of inquiry, and forget all the confused ideas of ordinary learning.*"

If we consult the most able statesmen of our own country, we shall find them equally candid in confessing the imperfections of the present state of philosophical and political science.

Mr. Burke, who is deemed one of the highest authorities amongst statesmen, thus expresses himself in a letter to Dr. Robertson, concerning the present imperfect state of political science, and the probability of its rapid improvement.

Burke to Dr. Robertson, in 1777.

"The part (of the History of America) which I read with the greatest pleasure is the discussion on the manners and character of the inhabitants of that new world. I have always thought with you, that we possess at this time very great advantages towards the knowledge of human nature. We need no longer go to history to trace it in all its stages and periods. History, from its comparative youth, is but a poor instructor. When the Egyptians called the Greeks children in antiquities, we may well call them children; and so we may call all those nations which were able to trace the progress of society only within their own limits. But now the great map of mankind is unrolled at once, and there is no state or gradation of barbarism, and no mode of refinement, which we have not at the same moment under our view: the very different civility

of Europe and of China; the barbarism of Persia and of Abyssinia; the erratic manners of Tartary and of Arabia; the savage state of North America and of New Zealand. Indeed, you have made a noble use of the advantages you have had. You have employed philosophy to judge on manners, and from manners you have drawn new sources for philosophy. I only think that in one or two points you have hardly done justice to the savage character.

"There remains before you a great field. *Periculosæ plenum opus aleæ tractas, et incedis per ignes suppositos cineri doloso.* When even those ashes will be spread over the present fire, God knows. I am heartily sorry that we are now supplying you with that kind of dignity and concern, which is purchased to history at the expense of mankind. I had rather by far, that Dr. Robertson's pen were only employed in delineating the humble scenes of political economy, than the great events of a civil war. However, if our statesmen had read the book of human nature, instead of the Journals of the House of Commons, and history, instead of Acts of Parliament, we should not by the latter have furnished out so ample a page for the former. For my part, I have not been, nor am I, very forward in my speculations on this subject. All that I have ventured to make have hitherto proved fallacious. I confess, I thought the colonies, left to themselves, could not have made anything like the present resistance to the whole power of this country and its allies. I did not think it could have been done without the declared interference of the House of Bourbon. But I looked on it as very probable that France and Spain would before this time have taken a decided part. In both these conjectures I have judged amiss. * * * * *

"Adieu, Sir; continue to instruct the world; and whilst we carry on a poor unequal conflict with the passions and prejudices of our day, perhaps with no better weapons than other passions and prejudices of our own, convey wisdom at our expense to future generations."

These authorities show that, in all ages, the most intimate aspirations of reflecting minds have been tending to discover the true principles of social policy; and, notwithstanding the slowness of improvement and the long protracted disappointments of ages after ages, those who, like Burke, have been distinguished for superior knowledge and intelligence, have never despaired of the discovery of this science. Though many philosophers and philanthropists have indulged their imagination in Utopian inventions and impracticable systems, the true principles of social science show that these systems were not totally void of reason in their aim, notwithstanding the utter impossibility of obtaining social harmony by the means which they proposed.

In referring to Utopian systems, we may notice a very remarkable coincidence between the desire of the ancient alchymists to change the ordinary metals into gold, and that of Utopians in general, who wished to change the discords and sufferings of society into concord and happiness. The alchymists sought, and sometimes persuaded the public that they had found, the *philosopher's stone,* by

which they could turn common metals into gold; the authors of Utopian systems sought, and wished in some instances to persuade the public that they had discovered, the true principles of social science by which mankind might be made happy and virtuous. At length the wild notions of alchymy were transformed into the real science of chemistry, and the visionary notions of Utopian philosophers have been recently transformed into the real science of human attractions and repulsions, with the natural mechanism in which they may produce physical, moral, and intellectual enjoyment, instead of privation, immorality, ignorance, and discord.

But it is still more remarkable, that, at the time when true social science shows the possibility of attaining a higher and more rational degree of happiness than Utopians had ever imagined, one of the most learned and rational chemists expresses himself thus, concerning the possible existence of a *philosopher's stone*:—

"We have already observed that carbon and sulphur are *polymorphous*, and phosphorus appears to be subject to the same law. Might we be allowed to suppose that simple bodies are *isomerous?* This question, you see, is nearly allied to that of the transmutation of metals. If it were once resolved in the affirmative, there would be a chance of success in searching for the philosopher's stone." * *

After a number of examples tending to prove the probability of this supposition, he concludes thus:—

"These facts are curious and peculiarly interesting; and, if they afford no positive proof of the possibility of effecting the transmutation of metals, they, at least, prove that such a notion is not to be rejected as an absurdity clearly demonstrated by the present state of chemical science."—(*Dumas, Philosophie de la Chimie*, 318 and 320. *Lectures at the College of France in* 1836.)

In quoting this opinion of the learned chemist DUMAS, we have no idea of exciting a blind credulity concerning either the *philosopher's stone* or social harmony; on the contrary, we merely wish to neutralize existing prejudices against freedom of investigation. Every body will allow that chemistry has rendered great services to society, and yet this science owes all its discoveries to a sort of wild and visionary speculation amongst the alchymists; whence we infer, that, if the chemists have not found the philosopher's stone, they have found something better: *i. e.* a real and eminently useful science; and by strictly analogical reasoning we may presume from this known fact, that if Utopians did not find the magic law of social bliss, they have paved the way to the discovery of a real science of permanent advantage to humanity.

It is now clearly proved that the desires of Utopians were rational and just, though their theories were erroneous; and, according to Mr. Dumas, the science of chemistry does not despair of realizing the previsions of alchymy.

The philosopher's stone, however, is of much less importance than true social science; and, fortunately for humanity, the most interesting of the two has become a certainty, while the other remains yet problematical.

These ideas of the transformation of knowledge from crude and

confused notions into positive principles, naturally lead us to examine the difference between the certain and the uncertain sciences.

2. *Of the Difference between the Accurate and the Inaccurate Sciences.*

A science is deemed *accurate*, when its principles are in accordance with the laws of nature; *inaccurate*, when its principles are more or less arbitrary and uncertain. In fact, real science is neither more nor less than a true knowledge of the different branches of the laws of nature, and the proper method of applying this knowledge for the advantage of humanity. In the present state of human knowledge, there are but few branches of science which may be deemed perfectly accurate in all their degrees, but still the difference is sufficiently great to warrant a distinction of two general classes of science; the *accurate* and the *inaccurate*.

Those sciences, which in their general principles are sufficiently fixed and exact to belong to the first class, are, *mathematics, chemistry, music*, and their inferior branches of application, such as mechanics, optics, perspective, chemical compositions, vocal and instrumental music, &c. &c.

The principal branches belonging to the second class are, *politics, political economy, metaphysics*, and *moral philosophy*.

Besides these two distinct classes of science, there are others which may be classed in a mixed category, because some of their principles are constant and natural, while others are arbitrary and problematical. In this mixed class we may place *natural philosophy*, or *physics*, and those which are commonly termed natural sciences, such as *botany, natural history, comparative anatomy*, &c. &c.— indeed, chemistry itself might perhaps be more properly placed in this class than in that of the exact sciences.

As those sciences which are deemed exact do not claim our immediate attention, we shall confine our observations principally to the uncertain sciences; our chief object being to prove that social and political principles have now attained to the rank of an exact science, by the discovery of the natural laws of human sympathies and antipathies; as alchymy was formerly transformed into an exact science, by the discoveries of chemical affinities, or physical attractions and repulsions.

That the students of the uncertain sciences should have remained till now without being able to discover the natural laws which were the special objects of their respective researches, is no more astonishing than that the natural laws of planetary attraction should have remained unknown to astronomers up to the time of Newton.

And though the discovery of Newton concerning the laws of *material attraction* might have drawn the attention of philosophers to an inquiry into the laws of *spiritual attraction*, and from that to *universal attraction*, (*material, spiritual, neutral* and *mixed*,) or the theory of universal movement, still, it is not surprising that one hundred years should have elapsed between these two discoveries,

when we reflect that humanity remained more than five thousand years without inventing the simple mechanism of springs for carriages, and many other contrivances still more simple.

Up to the present time, those philosophers who have cultivated the uncertain sciences have never properly defined the nature of their pursuits, and they have always neglected the principal functions of their respective branches of inquiry :—

1. *The moralists* have neglected to analyse the causes of human depravity and the consequent evils of society ; and therefore, they have never been able to discover a remedy for these evils. In perfect ignorance of human nature, they have asserted the inherent depravity of human passions, and thence concluded in favour of permanent compression ; but they have not sufficiently observed that the very same passions may produce either good or bad effects according to the circumstances by which they are influenced.

2. *The politicians* have not sufficiently analysed the causes of conflicting interests in society, and the consequent irruptions of revolutionary violence ; and therefore they have not been able to discover the natural laws of combined interest, mutual guarantee, and collective responsibility.

3. *Political economists* have confined themselves chiefly to the statistics of what already existed in practice, without sufficiently speculating on new combinations of a more economical and advantageous nature. If, by chance, they have sometimes ventured on questions of a higher order, such as the *exuberance of population*, for instance, they have merely proved the fact, without discovering the principal cause or the *natural and effective remedy*. Neither Stewart, nor Wallis, nor Malthus, who have treated this question more particularly than other economists, have done any thing more than alarm the public by proving the extent and the danger of the evil ; but they have invariably lost themselves in a maze of incoherent speculation, concerning a natural and permanent remedy. In ignorance of nature's laws, they have imitated the crude conclusions of moralists, and advised a general system of thwarting natural desires. Their doctrines concerning population are purely atheistical ; for they suppose by implication that human desires were not created by an omniscient and moral Providence, and that "preventive checks" are necessary to neutralize the laws of nature.

4. *The metaphysicians* ought to have made a regular *analysis* and *synthesis* of human *attractions* and *repulsions*, *sympathies* and *antipathies*, *instincts* and *tastes*, *discords* and *inequalities*, *natural peculiarities*, &c. &c., which would have led to a thorough knowledge of human nature, and the terrestrial destiny of humanity ; but, instead of this, they have passed their time in quibbling about the philosophy of *sensation*, *perception*, *judgement*, and other ideological puerilities which nobody understands. They are now completely eclipsed by the phrenologists, who, notwithstanding the imperfections of their infant science, have rendered an immense service by instituting a natural and effectual though inverse method of psychological speculation.

5. *The naturalists*, instead of trying to discover the laws of *universal analogy* in the organic laws of nature, which would furnish a really natural and scientific classification of all the organized bodies in the *animal*, the *vegetable*, the *mineral*, and the *ethereal* kingdoms, have preferred following their own fragmentary notions; so that in botany, we have the arbitrary classifications and nomenclatures of *Linnæus*, *Jussieu*, and numerous others; in zoology, we have the arbitrary systems of *Cuvier*, *St. Hilaire*, *De Blainville*, &c. &c.; and so of the other branches of natural science. Even in the exact sciences there is nothing like unity of method. In the application of physical science to measure the various degrees of heat, there are several different systems: we have the *Centigrade* thermometer, besides those of *Reaumur*, *Fahrenheit*, *Delille*, and probably others. Reaumur makes 80°, Fahrenheit 212°, Delille 150°, and the Centigrade 100°, to represent the same degree of heat. This is certainly a deplorable state of anarchy and want of unity, in a case where confusion might so easily be avoided.

Fortunately, however, the discovery of the *universal laws of attraction* and *analogy* will furnish the means of transforming uncertain and confused speculations into positive and exact sciences. It would be superfluous to prove the uncertainty of arbitrary principles in science; we only mention them to call the reader's attention to the more natural method of moral and scientific speculation discovered by Fourier.

By the *analysis* of the universal laws of attraction and repulsion, Fourier discovered the cause of *universal movement*; and, by the *synthesis* of these universal CAUSES, he discovered the universal laws of EFFECT, which are in all cases exactly analogous to the causes which produce them. By this synthetic calculation he discovered the science of UNIVERSAL ANALOGY, which enables us to foresee, with more or less accuracy, what will be the result of certain natural developements in a given time of action. It is hardly necessary to say, that analogy is not the same as identical similarity; and that, in the general scales of analogy, there are infinite degrees of convergency towards identity, and divergency from it.

We shall not enter into the minute details of this science at present, nor shall we explain its chief elements, before we have fully developed the principles of combinative unity; but it may not be uninteresting to state here, that it furnishes a series of the most convincing proofs concerning the immortality of the soul.

By this science, also, we are enabled to compare the whole existence of humanity, to that of a single individual, and to distinguish the different phases of *infancy*, *puberty*, *maturity*, and *decline*, in the social and political existence of the one, as in the earthly existence of the other. And, as the importance of a single individual compared to that of humanity is but trifling in the scale of universal existence, so the developement of *humanitary* existence is infinitely more complex than that of a simple human being, though there is a perfect analogy between the two.

When humanity is sufficiently advanced in science, and has acquired the necessary powers of industry for creating wealth in abundance, human genius has then acquired sufficient strength, by time and exercise, to discover the laws of *spiritual* attraction, and their natural modes of equilibrium in regularly organized corporations of individuals, exercising in separate *groups* those functions for which they have natural aptitudes or inborn instincts; and, as a natural education would enable each individual to develope all innate faculties; as the theory of natural instincts proves that each individual is born with several varieties of taste and aptitude—some more, and some less; as it is a well known fact, that every person is happy and content when occupied in any favourite pursuit, if it does not last long enough to degenerate into monotony and fatigue; as each person, properly educated, may become dexterous in all the functions for which he or she have a natural and decided taste; as every individual, so educated, may belong to those corporations only, whose functions he prefers;—it follows, as a matter of course, that each individual may lead a life of continual pleasure, by alternately varying his or her pursuits in those particular branches of industry, science, and pleasure for which he or she have a natural taste. This general rule, like all others, is subject to exception; but the exception in the general functions of industry does not form more than one tenth part of the whole: so that, in a natural state of association, containing regularly organized series of functions, there would not be more than one tenth part of the functions of an absolutely disagreeable and repugnant nature; and even this would be diminished as much as possible by scientific and mechanical means.

When humanity is sufficiently advanced in science and industry, to enter into its real destiny, to purge and equilibrate the human passions by a proper education and continual variety of occupation, it is prepared to enter on a career of happiness which is the result of social harmony; and as an infant or youth has no idea of the pleasures and happiness of its new state of feeling after entering into adult life, so we may fairly suppose that we, the human race in general, during our political infancy and ignorance, have but an imperfect idea of a truly happy existence in refined civilization.

It may perhaps be objected, that, according to this supposition, those who have lived in misery during the first ages of the world, will have been more hardly dealt with by Providence, than those who will be born during the fortunate ages of humanity; but this objection shall be fully answered in another chapter, where it will be seen that God is perfectly just in all his ways, and that those who were born in former ages will have a full share in the future happiness of humanity upon earth.

As it would be premature to enter into details concerning the transcendental branches of theory, before the simple elements are rendered familiar, we conclude these observations by a short extract from the works of Fourier.

"When my discovery has been proved by practical application,

it is certain that the different forms of incoherent society, the *savage*, the *barbarous*, and the *civilized*, or competitive states, will all be absorbed by corporate combination, and attractive industry; and that humanity in general will, in a very short time, be elevated from its infant state of political ignorance, to an adolescent state of political superiority and social advantage,—to its destiny of terrestrial happiness, which will last infinitely longer than its infant state of misery and ignorance.

"I have laboured to prepare the public mind for this happy change, which will be equally beneficial to monarchs and their people, and, by combining the interests of all, cannot fail to absorb all party spirit arising from conflicting interests.

"This science shows how much we are interested in rousing ourselves from that sort of lethargy and resignation which is the result of despair, or a want of faith in Divine Providence; in throwing off the yoke of ignorant atheistical philosophy, which would have us believe that no regular science of society exists in principle, or can possibly be discovered, and that man will never be able to discover his future destiny.

"But, if the knowledge of future events be beyond the reach of human intellect, whence comes it, that the whole human race, in every age, have such an ardent desire to penetrate the secrets of nature and futurity? At the very mention of the word *destiny*, the most phlegmatic nature thrills in every nerve; so inherent in our nature is the desire to penetrate the future. Why has the Deity, who creates nothing in vain, implanted in the breast of man this passionate desire, if he does not intend it ever to be satisfied? But he did intend it to be satisfied when the proper time arrived; and that is now at hand. The means of foreseeing future events is now discovered, and the science of *universal analogy* will reveal to us the mysteries of nature, and open to our view the great book of eternal destiny.

"Atheistical philosophers, unable to penetrate these secrets, wish to make us believe that they are absolutely impenetrable; they attempt to frighten us with the high sounding words of '*impenetrable sanctuary*,' '*unfathomable mystery*,' '*inscrutable ways of Providence*,' &c.; but, if the secrets of nature are really impenetrable, how happens it that Newton could explain one of the principal branches of universal movement, foretell eclipses, &c.? If he was allowed to penetrate one of the sanctuaries, is it not probable that we may be as fortunate in penetrating others? If the object of our most passionate affection were to smile upon us in one instance, should we not be foolish to relinquish all hope of future favour? Why, then, should the learned despair of obtaining the smiles and favours of Nature at the very time she encourages their suit by partially satisfying their desires?

"The term, however, of our political infancy has arrived; we are on the eve of the great metamorphosis which seemed to announce itself by universal commotion. It is now that we may truly say, 'the present is pregnant with the future,' for the excess of suffering will bring about the crisis of a salutary change. If we reflect

on the continual ebullitions of political discontent, it will appear as if society was every where making an effort to throw off an oppressive and insupportable yoke: famine and revolution seem to threaten every part of the earth; party spirit and political factions grow more and more violent: society is become faithless, selfish, reserved, inoculated with vice, and familiar with all sorts of depravity, even to the unnatural extent of forming alliances with barbarians to persecute Christians. The public revenue has become the prey of stock-jobbing vampires: industry, from monopoly and excessive competition, has become a sort of curse upon the people, who are reduced to the agony of Tantalus, by suffering continual hunger and thirst in the midst of superabundant wealth created by their own industry.

"The spirit of mercantile anarchy and competition has extended the sphere of its crimes; in times of war, it carries the instruments of destruction to the two hemispheres; our ships only connect distant quarters of the globe, to inoculate the vices and depravity of civilization on those of savage and barbarous nations. The whole earth is become a vast chaos of vice and immorality, and civilization in its *incoherent* state becomes more and more odious as it approaches to its end."

These eloquent lamentations of indignant genius, show that Fourier's sense of morality was considerably higher than the standard of the age in which he lived and died, neglected and misunderstood.

From this general view of the principles of morality as an exact science, we may proceed to a comparison between them and the arbitrary principles of uncertain moral philosophy.

A slight Comparison between the Natural Principles of a truly progressive Policy, and the arbitrary Systems of Moralism, Economism, and Politicalism.

We have taken the liberty of saying *moralism, economism,* and *politicalism,* to distinguish the crude notions of these arbitrary and changeable sciences from *true morality, real economy,* and *sound politics.*

What is commonly termed *moral philosophy,* is really so much opposed to natural principles in the greater part of its precepts, and the precepts of one sect or system are often so much opposed to those of another, that we are at a loss to conceive how any of them could ever obtain an extensive influence over public opinion. Every philosophical sect has published a particular code of moral precepts, derived from its particular system of metaphysics; and every code of *moralism* has been as different from all others, as the arbitrary principles from which they were all respectively derived, differed from each other.

There is, however, one point in which they all agree: not being able to discover the natural method of equilibrating the human passions, they have all agreed to manufacture precepts for *depressing, repressing,* and *compressing* the desires of human nature. Not knowing how to saddle and bridle the fiery steed, so as to

guide him safely, render him eminently useful, and prevent him from injuring either himself or others, they have all agreed to break his spirit by flogging and curbing, and the only difference of opinion has been concerning the mode and extent of fettering and mutilating. Some have thought that the sensual impulses were most dangerous, and required the strongest fetters; others have been more afraid of the intellectual desires, and advised a general system of mental blindfolding; and notwithstanding the fruitless efforts of six thousand years struggling against the indomitable passions of human nature, always recurring in spite of compression, and with a violence proportioned to the degree of obstruction, they still continue to preach the necessity of tying down and fettering, and never once dream of the possibility of saddling and bridling and governing.

This sort of error, however, is common to all sciences in their confused, arbitrary, and uncertain state: and, as it is absolutely impossible to equilibrate the passions, thoroughly, in any other social mechanism than that of *regularly organized corporations*, with variety of occupation, it is not surprising that moral philosophy should have been a vain, imperfect science, so long as the true principles of *associative* harmony lay hid amongst the secrets of unexplored nature.

The *early* destiny of human passions is, to produce discord and suffering, until reason can discover their natural modes of *developement* and their *essential* destiny, in which they may produce moral harmony and real happiness.

In this respect, the *vibrations* or movements of the spiritual world are exactly analogous to those of the material world: if you take a rod of metal, or of any other substance, and, by grating or rasping, cause it to vibrate irregularly, it will render a discordant and disagreeable sound; but, if you cause the same material to vibrate in regular series of oscillations and undulations, it will render a melodious and agreeable sound: and yet it is the same substance requiring no cutting or clipping to make this difference. And so it is with human passions, which produce discord and violence, when thwarted and rasped by misery and injustice; or harmony and benevolence, when made to vibrate in regular series of functions, or pleasurable occupations. As the same piece of metal may, at any time, be made to produce either a disagreeable noise or a melodious sound, so the same passion may be made to produce either good or evil effects in society. When the bees find plenty of flowers and a rapturous occupation in extracting honey, they offer a perfect model of harmony; but, when there are no flowers to furnish them with honey and the agreeable occupation of extracting it, and when the fruit of their economy is exhausted, these little images of angelic harmony are at once transformed into evil spirits, whose infernal fury ceases only in mutual extermination. These facts are luminous when properly contrasted; but progression is a general law of nature, and a series of ages were necessary to prepare the human intellect for discovering the real destiny of humanity upon earth.

It is curious to observe the progress of reason during the infancy of humanity. In savage nations, where reason is not sufficiently developed to think of guiding or remodelling the mind, it exercises itself in various remodellings of the body; and, in more advanced stages of *incoherent* civilization, philosophers exercise their reason in remodelling the mind: neither one nor the other have sufficient faith in the Creator to suppose that he knew how to create man as he ought to be, both mentally and bodily; or sufficient intelligence to perceive that, if he did not know how to create human beings properly, it would be folly for man to suppose he could make himself better than God had made him. In Dr. Robertson's "History of America," there is a curious account of the savages remodelling their bodies, and we may every day behold the tatooed faces of the inhabitants of New Zealand, and other nations of uncivilized beings. The following extract concerning this odd propensity, is curious and interesting. "Vanity, however," says he, "which finds endless occupation for ingenuity and invention, in nations where dress has become a complex and intricate art, is circumscribed within so narrow bounds, and confined to so few articles among naked savages, that they are not satisfied with those simple decorations, and have a wonderful propensity to alter the natural form of their bodies, in order to render it, as they imagine, more perfect and beautiful. This practice was universal among the rudest of the American tribes. Their operations for that purpose begin as soon as an infant is born. By compressing the bones of the skull, while still soft and flexible, some flatten the crown of their heads; some squeeze them into the shape of a cone: others mould them, as much as possible, into a square figure; and they often endanger the lives of their posterity (*offspring?*) by their violent and absurd efforts to derange the plan of Nature, or to improve upon her designs. But in all their attempts either to adorn or to new model their persons, it seems to have been less the object of the Americans to please, or to appear beautiful, than to give an air of dignity and terror to their aspect. Their attention to dress had more reference to war than to gallantry."—(*Robertson's History of America*, 196.)

Thus we see, that, in the first stages of society the aberrations of reason tend to deform the body by mutilation and compression, and, in more advanced periods, the aberrations of philosophy tend to mutilate and compress the natural passions of the soul.

It is painful and humiliating to observe the two different degrees of aberration presented to our imagination by the history of the discovery and conquest of America. The following details concerning the absurd habits of *spiritual* compression practised by the conquerors of America, form a singular contrast with those of *material* compression practised amongst the conquered aborigines:—

"The Spaniards had hardly taken possession of America, when, with a most preposterous policy, they began to erect convents, where persons of both sexes were shut up, under a vow to defeat the purpose of Nature, and to counteract the first of her laws.

Influenced by a misguided piety, which ascribes transcendent merit to a state of celibacy, or allured by the prospect of that listless ease which in sultry climates is deemed supreme felicity, numbers crowd into those mansions of sloth and superstition, and are lost to society."—(*Dr. Robertson's History of America*, 421.)

The aberrations of religion are not less strange than those of deluded savages and blind moralists. The precepts of Christianity have often been so much connected with absurd rites and dogmas as to bring religion into disgrace and ridicule. One is at a loss to conceive how such gross absurdities as those described in the following account, could ever have been allowed to disgrace religion; and yet they were commonly practised in France from the 7th to the 11th century.

"That infallibility, in all its determinations, to which the Church of Rome pretends, has been attended with one unhappy consequence. As it is impossible to relinquish any opinion, or to alter any practice which has been established by authority that cannot err, all its institutions and ceremonies must be immutable and everlasting, and the Church must continue to observe in enlightened times, those rites which were introduced during the ages of darkness and credulity. What delighted and edified the latter, must disgust and shock the former. Many of the rites observed in the Romish Church appear manifestly to have been introduced by a superstition of the lowest and most illiberal species. Many of them were borrowed, with little variation, from the religious ceremonies established among the ancient heathens. Some were so ridiculous, that if every age did not furnish instances of the fascinating influence of superstition, as well as of the whimsical forms which it assumes, it must appear incredible that they should have been ever received or tolerated. In several churches of France they celebrated a festival in commemoration of the Virgin Mary's flight into Egypt. It was called the Feast of the Ass (*La Fête de l'Ane*). A young girl, richly dressed, with a child in her arms, was set upon an ass superbly caparisoned. The ass was led to the altar in solemn procession. High mass was said with great pomp. The ass was taught to kneel at proper places; a hymn, no less childish than impious, was sung in his praise; and, when the ceremony was ended, the priest, instead of the usual words with which he dismissed the people, brayed three times like an ass: and the people, instead of the usual response, 'We bless the Lord,' brayed three times in the same manner.—(*Du Cange, voc. Festum*, vol. iii. p. 424.) This ridiculous ceremony was not, like the Festival of Fools, and some other pageants of those ages, a mere farcical entertainment exhibited in a church, and mingled, as was then the custom, with an imitation of some religious rites; it was an act of devotion, performed by the ministers of religion, and by the authority of the Church. However, as this practice did not prevail universally in the Catholic Church, its absurdity contributed at last to abolish it."

If we leave the aberrations of moral philosophy to examine those of political economy, we shall find them hardly less surprising. In

analyzing the principles of production, economists have shown the advantages which may be derived from the *division of labour;* but they have devised no means of preventing this excellent principle from stupifying three fourths of the human race, by constantly confining the individual to one minute detail of a particular function. They have openly confessed their inability to reconcile the developement of human intellect with the important advantage of the division of labour: and yet, this is one of the most important and easy problems of social science.

By exercising various minute functions in several different branches of industry, the same individual may become as dexterous in each detail as it is possible to be; and by changing alternately from one function to another at certain intervals, his bodily and mental faculties would be healthfully exercised, and his brain would never become stultified by one only, simple, eternal idea and occupation. Indeed, all possible advantages, physical, moral, and intellectual, arise, as if by magic, from the simple but natural and necessary mechanism of regularly organized series of groups applied to each particular function of industry, and varying, at proper intervals, from one function to another.

As to the confused state of political science, it is so evident that it requires no analysis to render it palpable: every body is more or less apprehensive of revolutionary agitations and commotions: every body hopes for a miraculous delivery from public calamity and political dissolution. We shall, therefore, proceed to examine the various theories and expedients that have hitherto been proposed as remedies for social and political evils.

Of the various Systems of Reform and the general Presentiment of Change in the Condition of the Working Classes.

During the last century, the civilized nations of Europe have been struggling to deliver themselves from oppression, and the insecurity of transitory political institutions. The privileged classes of society have been constantly preoccupied in manœuvring to maintain their social advantages, and the unfortunate multitude have been as constantly agitated with the desire of emancipation from ignorance and oppression. The consequence has been, revolutionary commotion at home, and exterminating war abroad.

Nor have the confused lucubrations of philosophers and politicians contributed in a small degree to feed the flames of deluded passion. Voltaire, Rousseau, Helvetius and other philosophers of the last century, contributed to kindle the flame of the French Revolution, as blindly and as recklessly as the extravagance of the Nobility hurried on to national calamity, by furnishing combustibles for general conflagration. These philosophical and political *aberrations* have blasted Europe from one extremity to the other: millions of human beings, from all parts of Europe, have been hurried into an untimely grave, by the violence of war, and England has been doomed to expiate its folly, by languishing in the pool of Tantalus, under the enormous pressure of a debt of eight hundred

millions, constantly exposed to the dreadful crash of a national bankruptcy.

Such a lesson has been dearly bought, but little understood. Political factions are almost as blind now as they were in 1789, and philosophical aberrations are hardly less predominant and universal: and yet, the veriest child might see that empty rights and liberty bring no relief to poverty.

Fortunately, however, for humanity, the lesson has not been lost to all eternity. Some minds of more than ordinary penetration have perceived the errors of mere political speculation, and turned their attention to the constituent elements of industry and society: they have descended from the tottering summit, to examine the unsound base: they have been more or less successful in their labours; and, if they are not quite unanimous in their ideas of reconstruction, all admit the necessity of forming a solid foundation of social and individual happiness, before we proceed to crown society with political institutions. The summit and the base are, of course, intimately connected, and cannot be thoroughly or advantageously separated; but, so long as the foundation is insecure, it is absolute folly to attend exclusively to the imperfections of the summit. When once the ground-work is secure, it will be easy to adjust the proportions of the rest. Let us, then, examine the various systems of reform, and the degree of confidence which may be due to them respectively.

The principal systems propounded concerning social interests in the nineteenth century, in addition to that of Fourier, are those of Mr. Owen and St. Simon; both of which contain, in our opinion, some very sound principles, mixed up with the most repulsive doctrines.

The St. Simonians, under the plea of female liberty, would probably have brought about a most revolting spectacle of licentiousness and immorality, if they had succeeded in establishing their system of reformation. They had no sound principles concerning the organization of industry; nor had they any idea of respecting individual liberty, in their system of passive obedience to absolute authority, and pontifical despotism. The only useful part of their efforts consisted in eloquent appeals to the feelings of humanity in favour of the suffering multitude; and in sound critique concerning the evils of *conflicting* civilization: but, to abandon the privations of the present state, to place one's self under the yoke of a mystic tyranny, would be falling into one evil to escape from another. As their doctrines have been generally exploded, it would be tedious and superfluous to refute them in detail; we merely mention them for the sake of methodical investigation.

With respect to Mr. Owen's principles, they have never been very thoroughly explained, and he himself has told us, that he had not yet published the whole of his doctrine. There are, however, a great number of sound notions concerning domestic economy and productive industry, in the works which he has already published; but his doctrines on religion and community of property, are more than *unsatisfactory*, if, in reality, they are what they are generally understood to be. As we are not quite sure that he holds,

these opinions, we shall not attribute them to him; but, whether he professes them or not, we may discuss them. We are inclined to think, from what we known of his doctrines, that he has not given much attention to the true principles of religion; and that he is in the habit of confounding priestcraft and superstition with principles of real religion: he appears to have drawn negative conclusions concerning the *use* of religion, from a natural and truly religious horror of its *abuse*. This confusion has prevented many people from examining what may be really useful in his principles of economy, and may therefore be regretted; for whatever may be the particular doctrines which he maintains concerning religion, it must be confessed that he and his partisans reason well on many subjects.* In perusing a weekly paper, called the *New Moral World*, expressly devoted to Mr. Owen's system, we remark the following lines of admirable truth:—

"On examination, it is plain that all the faculties and desires belonging to humanity are alike valuable, and their union in a similar degree of excellence is necessary to constitute a perfect whole. Proportion and equilibrium are the principal elements of harmony, and in every thing harmony is essential. There is nothing in the beauties, the splendours, or the treasures of the universe, that does not owe its charm, its glory, and its usefulness to harmony. In the physical frame, harmony is health; in the mental faculties, wisdom; in the moral qualities, virtue. Harmony, in short, is perfection; and if we produce it not, we waste the materials of our happiness!"—(*New Moral World*, Feb. 4, 1838.)

These are sound views, and we can hardly suppose them to belong to people who have no religion.

With respect to community, it has been preached and practised partially without success, ever since the time of primitive Christianity, and probably before. Speculative *aberrations* on this subject have been almost as numerous as on other branches of philosophy and politics. In fact, this doctrine is so repugnant to the general feelings of *equity*, that it is hardly necessary to refute it. We shall quote the opinions of one or two persons of leading authority, and then leave the subject to the reader's reflection.

Dr. Robertson expresses himself thus, concerning the attempts at community, made by some of the first settlers in America who emigrated from Europe:—

"The laws of England were adopted as the basis of their jurisprudence, though with some diversity in the punishments inflicted upon crimes, borrowed from the Mosaic institutions. The executive power was vested in a governor and some assistants, who were elected annually, by the members of the legislative assembly. So far their institutions appear to be founded on the maxims of human prudence. But it was a favourite opinion with all the enthusiasts of that age, that the Scriptures contained a complete system, not only of spiritual instruction, but of civil wisdom and

* This was written three years ago in Paris, before we were fully acquainted with the extent of Mr. Owen's opposition to religion.

polity: and without attending to the peculiar circumstances or situation of the people whose history they recorded, they often deduced general rules for their own conduct from what happened among men in a very different state. Under the influence of this wild notion, the colonists of New Plymouth, in imitation of the primitive Christians, threw all their property into a common stock, and, like members of one family, carried on every work of industry by their joint labour for public behoof. But, however this resolution might evidence the sincerity of their faith, it retarded the progress of their colony. The same fatal effects flowed from this community of goods, and of labour, which had formerly been experienced in Virginia; and it soon became necessary to relinquish what was too refined to be capable of being accommodated to the affairs of men."—(*Robertson's America,* (509,) *Settlement of Colony at New Plymouth in* 1620.)

This is easily accounted for, because, "that which is every body's business, is nobody's business," as the common saying has it, and ignorant men are apt to neglect pursuits that appear to be as much for other people's profit as their own.

One of the most learned divines of the 13th century gives the following remarkable opinion on the same subject:—

"Community, carried to an excess that would extinguish the most natural and legitimate sentiments, forms the political basis of the republic of Plato; individual property and incoherence carried to the utmost excess of selfishness, would be the natural results of the political principles of Aristotle. Which of these doctrines is worthy of preference? The first, if we consider the primitive impulse of human nature; the second, if we consider the present state of human depravity. But Christianity cannot exclusively adopt either of these political doctrines; our mission is to regenerate man so as to restore him to his primitive state of perfection."—(*Henry de Gand, according to Francis Huet,* p. 182-4.)

Though Henry de Gand does not explain what he means by "*primitive perfection,*" it is clear that he supposes it possible to restore mankind to perfection; and that this perfection is neither "community carried to an excess of promiscuity;" nor "*incoherence* carried to an excess of narrow selfishness."

These opinions are founded on experience; but, besides the weight of experience, we shall have many other reasons to oppose to the doctrines of absolute community, when we treat of the natural faculties and instincts of mankind. It is evident, however, *à priori,* that those things only, which are comparatively as plentiful as *air* and *water,* can be deemed, with justice, the common property of all mankind; and that the right of individual property is a necessary stimulus to create that plenty which may neutralize the evils of scarcity. It is but fair, however, to state that Mr. Owen only advocates *community* as the *beau ideal* of human happiness, and that he deems it necessary to respect all vested rights until society be improved to that standard of social and individual perfection which he believes would naturally lead to an absolute community of property.

The various doctrines concerning social organization, and the avidity with which they are imbibed by a certain portion of the public, notwithstanding their erroneous principles, prove at least that there is a general presentiment of change floating in the minds of the people; nor is the continual agitation of political reformers less indicative of this general expectation: should popular commotion, however, precipitate reform before sound notions are generally diffused, we may apprehend much more evil than good from the change. For this reason, it may not be useless to dwell a moment on the probable dangers of erroneous theories: for, the *vehemence* of subversive doctrines is pregnant with the *violence* of revolutionary action.

Of the Danger of erroneous Theories and subversive Vehemence.

If we except the critical position of France a short time before the Revolution of 1789, it is probable that a more eventful crisis than that to which the British Empire is now rapidly approaching, never, in the whole history of humanity, threatened the existence of a civilized nation. When poor, deluded, half-starved human beings meet together by hundreds of thousands in different parts of the empire, to demand relief from their sufferings, by the vain and illusory means of Parliamentary Reform; and, when those in whom they confide are as ignorant as they concerning the real and effectual remedies of social disorders; the most alarming results may be apprehended from the struggles of such gigantic powers of action in darkness and delusion.

That these unfortunate beings, as well as their infatuated leaders, are really under the influence of political illusion, is perfectly evident from the resolutions which are every where passed at their general meetings. At the "*Great Metropolitan Demonstration of the Working Classes,*" held on Monday, the 17th of September, 1838, the following resolutions were passed; and similar resolutions have been, and continue to be, passed at these demonstrations in every populous and influential part of the kingdom:—

"Resolved, 1. That this meeting is of opinion that the true cause of all the corruptions and anomalies in legislation, *as well as the distress and difficulties of the commercial, manufacturing, trading and working classes,* is, that our representative system is based upon exclusive and unjust privileges; and, therefore, that the time has arrived for establishing that system on a foundation more in accordance with principles of justice, brotherly love, and the increased knowledge of the people.

"2. That the principles of representation, as defined by the 'People's Charter,' are just and reasonable, embracing, as it does, Universal Suffrage, No Property Qualifications, Annual Parliaments, Equal Representation, Payment of Members, and Vote by Ballot; which, in their practical operation, would, in the opinion of this meeting, be the means of returning just representatives to the Common House of Parliament—persons who, being responsible to, and being paid by, the people, would be more likely to promote the just interests of the nation than those who now constitute

that assembly. This meeting, therefore, solemnly adopt the 'People's Charter,' as a measure of justice *they are resolved, by all legal means, to endeavour to obtain.*"

When millions of individuals, in threatening aspect, hold themselves ready to act under the influence of such delusive theories as these, may we not ask ourselves in appalment,—

What is the pending fate of the British Empire?—of the young Queen?—of the deluded Aristocracy?—of funded property?—of commerce and industry?—of the lives and fortunes of individuals in all classes?

What could the representatives of the people do, supposing them chosen according to these notions? What criterion have we to judge of the science of statesmen, and members of parliament, supposing them honest and well-intentioned? Where is the science which they are taught? What are its principles? Of what avail are political rights to a starving people? To what extent would it be possible to lessen the burden of taxation? and by what means? By national bankruptcy? But, then, what would become of those whose existence depends on funded property?

And, if the people do not wish their representatives to proceed to extremes of injustice to fundholders, what other means have they of effectually lightening the burden of taxation? What would be the amount of real advantage which might be derived from the mere abolition of unjust privileges? It would be trifling, indeed, however satisfactory to the feelings of justice.

That even the honest representatives of the people could do nothing more than lighten the burden of taxation, and that but to a very trifling extent, is clear from the uniform tenor of their plans and their doctrines. They have not the slightest idea of guaranteeing the people against the crimes and frauds of commercial anarchy. Indeed, it will be clearly seen, when we treat especially on that branch of social science, which relates to political guaranteeism and universal insurance against fraud and monopoly, that the most elementary notions of this science are unknown to the statesmen of all parties, Whig, Radical, and Tory.

If, in this general and deplorable state of political delusion, those theories of socialism which prevail in England should be found more or less impracticable, so as to confirm political parties in their present illusions, rather than divert their attention from political to social questions, what may we not apprehend from the errors of these theories, and their practical failure at such an awful crisis. Would not such failures confirm the multitude in their errors concerning political reformation, and make them still more determinate in their designs of revolutionary change? And, if once a revolutionary movement is begun, who can tell where it may end? What have we to prove that it may not be as bloody and as terrible as that of France in 1789? Nothing. On the contrary; every thing forebodes a similar catastrophe.

Of what all-absorbing interest, then, are the true principles of social science, and their diffusion at such a critical juncture of circumstances as the present?

That the best system of social organization should become generally diffused and duly canvassed before political parties proceed to those extremes which are likely to produce general subversion, is, in our opinion, greatly to be desired.

Our apprehensions may be easily conceived, by a little reflection on the present state of political agitation. We may readily imagine the course in which the tide of popular rage would flow, after progressing from one disappointment to another, throughout an aggravating series of delusive measures: and that no permanent benefit could arise from the deceptive measures of mere democratic, or aristocratic policy, is our firm conviction.

When once the people were in possession of all the political rights which they demand, their first difficulty would be to choose honest and enlightened statesmen; and if we grant that it may not be difficult for the people to discern honest from intriguing candidates, we are not the less embarrassed to know how they are to judge of capacity. What is the science necessary for a statesman? and what is the test to prove that such or such candidates are possessed of that science?

If we judge from the legislative measures of the past, and the actual difficulties which are the results of these measures, we can hardly be disposed to admit that a vast erudition in the history of ancient states, in addition to a powerful talent for making speeches, are sufficient to constitute the science that is necessary to confer happiness on the people and prosperity on the nation; for, if such were really the case, the talents and the efforts of Pitt, Fox, Sheridan, Burke, Canning, Brougham, Peel, and the whole host of our celebrated statesmen, would certainly have prevented the present miserable and destitute state of the British people, if they could not entirely prevent the abuse of political power. And, if these statesmen have not been able to prevent the increasing miseries of the people, or avert the calamities threatened to the rich, by the sufferings of the poor deluded and destitute multitude, what are we to expect from present or future statesmen whose science may probably be neither superior to nor different from that of former politicians? Of what trifling import must be their honesty, if their science be not superior? The most enlightened honesty, under the influence of the present confused state of political science, cannot do more than effect the correction of abuse, and a less iniquitous distribution of privilege and wealth: and admitting the possibility of these operations, how far would they contribute to the welfare of the multitude? Certainly not very far: few indeed would be the advantages derived from such fragmentary operations, and fearfully inadequate to the wants of the people, and the peace of the empire. Where, then, are we to look for effectual relief and real improvement? Where, indeed? that's the question!

If we may judge of political nostrums from the measures proposed by the favourites of the people, the cause of freedom is indeed hopeless. Nor are the most accredited statesmen of the day better prepared to meet the difficulties of this alarming state of things.

What systems of guarantee do they propose against—

The excess of population?

The increasing miseries of the poor?

The danger of life and property from revolutionary violence?

The oppression of all classes by fraud and bankruptcy?

The evils of external war?

The ruinous and deleterious influence of individual competition and the adulteration of alimentary substances?

The increasing immorality of the inferior classes?

The selfishness of individuals, and the general distrust of all classes?

For the solution of all these problems, statesmen rely on the ingenuity of political economists; and the most esteemed professors of this uncertain science, confess their inability to do more than analyze the evils of society: their most generally approved maxim is, "to let things take their own course" (and a pretty course they are taking!), because they despair of making them better, and they fear they might make them worse by imprudently interfering without a proper knowledge of the remedy.

Their prudence is certainly praiseworthy; but is it not unreasonable to suppose that things will remedy themselves without being exposed to the most violent reactions of diseased nature, and the probable chance of dissolution, or at best, a feeble and precarious convalescence?

When Malthus published his alarming truths concerning the excess of population, the statesmen were obliged to stifle his voice, because they knew not how to remedy the evil. But did they try to find out the means of discovering a remedy? did they adopt a new method of investigation in order to obtain a real knowledge of social science? did they suspect the efficacy of repressive legislation? did they foresee the dangers of political contention?

Did it ever occur to them, that a mere knowledge of the history of past events was not sufficient to guide them in the pursuit of social and political amelioration? And yet, a moment's thought may suffice to convince us that the science necessary for a statesman is not to be gleaned solely from the history of past events. If we study the history of all the different forms of social organization that have existed upon earth, in ancient or modern times, we shall find that there is not one of them adapted to the present state of social wants.

But, to make this conclusion more evident, let us examine the general and distinguishing features of the different sorts of social organization transmitted to us in history.

In order to simplify this examination, we may confine ourselves to the following classification, and neglect those forms of society which may be deemed mixtures of several of these typical and distinct forms.

1. The golden age.
2. The savage or wandering tribes.
3. The patriarchal or familial government, with domestic slavery and pastoral industry.

4. Barbarism, with absolute slavery, limited industry, and large standing armies.

5. *Incoherent* civilization, with political liberty and unbounded industry.

Of the first ages we have nothing but vague traditions, concerning Eden, Paradise, and primitive happiness, from which, according to the Hebrew Scriptures, man was precipitated on account of original sin. This is but vaguely understood; but we shall soon have an occasion of explaining in a natural manner, the allegory of original sin, as it is given in Scripture. In addition to our own remarks on this subject, we would recommend the perusal of O'Brien's PRIZE ESSAY, concerning the Round Towers of Ireland, and other monuments of antiquity. It is the most instructive and interesting work we ever read on that subject. But as few facts are positively known concerning the primitive state, we have but little to learn from that source: and if we examine the second, or the savage state, we shall find perhaps few advantages for either poor or rich in such a form of social organization. There are, however, in such a state, certain advantages that the suffering poor of civilized and barbarous nations might prefer to their present miserable condition.

In a savage state, the poorest individual is perfectly free: and he has a right—

1. To gather fruit wherever he finds it.
2. To feed his cattle wherever he likes.
3. To fish and to fowl wherever he chooses.
4. To hunt animals whenever he thinks proper, and feed on the fruits of his own industry.
5. He is perfectly careless about the future, and has merely to provide for his present wants.
6. He can form internal leagues with any of his fellow wanderers, in order to rob and plunder other hordes of savages or neighbouring societies.

As far as personal condition is concerned, these privileges are certainly not inferior to those of the unfortunate poor of civilized society; but, then, the moral condition is abject indeed, and without remedy. Savage hordes inflict the most excruciating tortures on their prisoners of war; they make little or no progress in social amelioration, and the whole of the female sex is reduced to such a state of slavery, that many a mother attempts to strangle her female offspring, when she is not prevented by those who surround her. She is induced to adopt this unnatural course, in order to save her female infant from the horrors that are attendant on the degraded and slavish condition of her sex amongst the savage hordes.

The only lesson, then, to be learned from the study of the advantages and the disadvantages of a savage and uncultivated state of society, is, that in a well regulated state, the poorest of the poor should enjoy material, or worldly advantages, equal, at least, to the natural rights and advantages of a savage life: for, if they do not, their sufferings will be the more poignant as they advance in intellectual improvement: their minds will become more active and

agitated, more restless and revolutionary, and the state will be constantly threatened with violent dissolution. What are we to think, then, of Lord Brougham and those statesmen who labour to give the people learning and political privileges, at a time when they can devise no remedy for the increasing poverty and the excessive swarmings of the labouring classes? and what are we to think of a state of civilization, in which *nine tenths* of the population would prefer the carelessness and the personal ease of a savage life, to their destitute and careworn condition of ill requited industry? and that nine tenths of the Irish population would prefer the wandering and free condition of savages to the miserable and languishing condition in which they now suffer, there can hardly be a doubt. Indeed, we may venture to suppose that the great majority of the English population would prefer the wild freedom of uncultivated society to the insupportable slavery and the precarious existence of uncertain labour.

If we pass from the examination of savage hordes to that of patriarchal tribes, we shall still be perplexed to find any real advantages that might be useful and beneficial to civilized society. We find, on the contrary, domestic slavery, and exterminating feuds, even amongst the most ancient patriarchs. If we refer to the more advanced periods in which patriarchal government has been established without direct slavery, as amongst the clans of Scotland and Ireland, what do we find but continual war and carnage, little or no industry, exterminating hatred, excessive poverty, ignorance, and superstition. The only sorry advantage to which patriarchal government can lay the shadow of a claim, is a sort of wild and miserable independence, which, by constantly engendering war, forms a serious check to excessive population: but it would be puerile to prefer the miseries of clanship, or family feuds, to those of extensive but ill-organized industry.

If we find nothing useful or applicable in patriarhcal forms of government, we can hardly expect to find any thing better in the social organization of barbarism or brutal despotism, in which no man can say his life is his own; and where the predominant features are ignorance, slavery, superstition and immorality.

The only practical information, then, to be derived from history, concerning society, is to be gleaned from the annals of modern civilized nations; and by analyzing the history of all these, we shall find nothing but a series of different degrees of *poverty, fraud, oppression, war, famine, pestilence, direct* and *indirect slavery, individual selfishness, general distrust;* and a constant winding in a delusive circle of imaginary improvement, without any prospect of an approaching issue from the dangers of *want, disheartening care, atheism, immorality,* and *despair.*

If it were possible to glean any positive knowledge of social progression, from the history of civilized states, England and France, the two most civilized nations that ever existed upon earth, would furnish us with ample materials. But what do we learn from this study?—We learn that, notwithstanding the prodigious improvements in the various arts and sciences, the unbounded powers of

mechanism, and the accumulation of wealth by means of general industry, the diffusion of useful knowledge amongst the industrious classes, and many other improvements of modern date,—notwithstanding all these real advantages, nine tenths of the British population are languishing in a state of physical privation and moral degradation. And, if we turn to France, what do we find?—that twenty-two millions of inhabitants live on less than fourpence a day for each individual; that the whole production and income of the nation, if equally divided among the thirty-three millions of inhabitants, would not afford sixpence for the daily expense of each individual: board, lodging, clothing, fire; all the physical, moral, and intellectual wants of nature, would be reduced to the necessity of disputing the preference of satisfaction from the scanty supply of sixpence daily. When once we are perfectly convinced of the truth of these facts, what are we to think of statesmen who waste their time in frivolous discussions concerning universal suffrage, political liberty, the sovereign power of the *starving* people, the pure intentions and the practical superiority of Whigs, Radicals, and Tories? What are we to expect from their everlasting orations in favour of theocracy, aristocracy, and democracy, when history proves that all these particular forms of government have been tried separately and conjointly from time immemorial, without ever being proof against social misery and political dissolution?

But if no positive knowledge is to be derived from the mere study of history, a very serious warning of the dangers to which civilized nations are exposed, may be found in the annals of the most flourishing empires of antiquity. We may ask ourselves in terror, what is become of the once mighty Rome, of Carthage, Athens, Babylon, and even of the modern proud and lofty Spain? The history of antiquity abounds in pictures of the most enchanting colours; of riches, pleasures, mildness of climate; perfection of industry, agriculture, manufactures, art, science, splendour, magnificence, politeness, refinement, and all the rapturous advantages of an advanced state of civilization: but what now remains of the once luxurious dominions of Semiramis? Alas! the dreary "*desert of Babylon.*" When the inquisitive traveller visits the classic regions of his early dreams, he is suddenly and painfully divorced from long cherished illusions; in mental agony and almost involuntarily he exclaims,—"What is it that has caused this deadly change? Where is the once proud Athens? where, the mighty Rome? the wealth of Carthage, where? of Babylon, the luxuries?"—Yes; where indeed? Victims of their own proud ignorance, buried they lie in their own deep ruins!

No positive science of the organic principles of social life can be gleaned from the fragmentary remains, the imperfect pictures, of social organizations which have perished through ignorance. The study of history is analogous to the study of anatomy; and as the mere skeleton of an infant would not be sufficient to instruct us in the physiological principles of life and health in mature age, so the fragmentary pictures of antique society are not sufficient to instruct us in the perfect physiology of social existence. Elegantly turned

phrases and classic eloquence, teeming with the choicest imagery of literature, only serve to charm the imagination and intoxicate reflection. When the beggarly reality of former ages is clothed in the glittering robes of literary art, and the musical sounds of *riches, luxury, innocence, morality,* and *earthly paradise,* lull the senses into an illusive confidence, as we gaze on the pictures of fallen empires, we become blind to the defects of their hideous conformation, and instead of learning to despise their real depravity, we are induced to admire their fabulous simplicity. Instead of painting the miseries of universal slavery, poets and historians have portrayed the gaudy scenes of courts and luxury: instead of endeavouring to instruct, they strive only to please: instead of analyzing and exposing the real seats of disease, the morbid humours which poisoned the vital parts of social existence, and finally terminated in political dissolution, they disguise the emaciated forms, the canker-eaten features of reality, and palm upon posterity the painted mask in lieu of a real portrait. This license of art has deprived us of the means of really learning to appreciate the physiology of antiquity. The very fact of whole nations having passed away without leaving a trace proves that nothing could be learned from them concerning a healthy constitution, and the deceptive art of literature has hidden from our view the principal defects of imperfect organization. But, supposing the history of humanity to be perfect, all that we could possibly learn from it would be a knowledge of the imperfections of barbarism and *incoherent* civilization; for, it is well known that no perfectly refined state of society ever yet existed on this globe. It does not follow, however, that no improvement can ever be made on the present state of social organization, any more than the actual existence of a savage state proves the impossibility of civilization.

A little serious reflection on these facts, will enable us to understand that something more than historical erudition is necessary to constitute a real science of society; but, supposing statesmen in general to be possessed of this science, and that, by a proper attention to what they know of the real interests of society, all social evils might be remedied, we may then examine the second question:—

2. *What is the Test to prove that Parliamentary Candidates are possessed of that Science which is generally deemed Efficient?*

There exists a strange neglect of the ordinary and most necessary precautions to secure a common guarantee as far as regards the science and the legislative fitness of parliamentary candidates. The simple fact of possessing property to a given amount is deemed sufficient, because men of property generally receive a college education, and are personally interested in the preservation of public order and prosperity. It is not even required that they should know any thing at all, if they possess the property qualification: but if a man wishes to exercise an inferior function in society, such as that of a physician, or a barrister, or a professor of any secondary branch of science, he must previously undergo a series of exa-

minations before a committee of the most learned men in the nation, in order to prove himself qualified to exercise the profession to which he aspires. The physician and the divine are compelled to prove their scientific qualifications, before they are allowed to administer remedies to the physical and moral sufferings of *individuals*, but statesmen are not compelled to give any proof of fitness to administer remedies to the social diseases of a *whole nation*. This is a most striking anomaly; and yet, strange as it is, we hear little or no complaint against it; the Liberals only ask for the right of choosing members of parliament, without requiring any real guarantee concerning the science and morality of candidates for legislation. If they could but obtain *honest* parliaments, and equal political rights for the three kingdoms, they would think that perfect liberty was secured. The real source of social evil is not perceived by any party, either Radical or Conservative. The mere rights of legislation are the subject of contest, while the principal object of legislative science is buried in the deepest ignorance. Property and privilege are the snares of political intrigue, while the true interests of all parties, the organization of industry, is either totally overlooked, or treated as a question of mere individual concern. Instead of discovering the means of uniting the interests of all parties, statesmen of every colour are absorbed in snatching at shadows; the Liberals are as obstinate as the Conservatives in pursuing chimeras and neglecting their own and the public interests. It is easy to foresee the utmost result of what is commonly understood by a liberal policy. If the movement party were in office to-morrow, they would not know how to better the condition of the people, or protect the rights of property; and if the people, still suffering from poverty and privation, were to ask for measures of real utility, and threaten to turn their new governors adrift, in case of disappointment, their newly elected guardians of public rights would, no doubt, be highly incensed at such presumption on the part of the ignorant mob. To dare to feel discontent with the measures that were deemed fully adequate to public prosperity, by an honest House of Representatives, and seditiously refuse to be satisfied with constitutional starvation, would startle the prudent money-makers, and reduce them to the disagreeable necessity of maintaining peace in the midst of famine by means of an enormous constabulary force. And in that case,—

What would be the fate of England?

Can politicians give us any information on that question?

If these rapid and fragmentary considerations are sufficient to make us doubt the existence of a real science of politics amongst statesmen, or the possibility of securing such persons as are best qualified for legislation, by a true knowledge of society and progressive principles, may we not ask ourselves, in dismay—

What is the probable fate of the British empire?

For, a social revolution, a civil war between those who possess *every thing* and those who possess *nothing*, would most certainly bring about political dissolution, in spite of all our learned and wily statesmen. And in that case,—

What would be the fate of our young and interesting Queen?
The English, Irish, and Scotch nobility?
The unfortunate fundholders?
The commercial interests?

What would be the fate of our boasted civilization and superiority?

High sounding words, great promises, and persuasive declamation, may serve to excite the passions of a deluded people, and thereby obtain political ascendancy, but those who wish to acquire a real knowledge of social science cannot put their trust in flimsy declamation, or mere historical erudition: nor can any statesman of common sense so far deceive himself as to suppose that political rights alone can satisfy a starving population, or that even a great diminution of taxes could effectually relieve the distress of a whole nation. What, then, are we to think of those who merely strive for political ascendancy in order to confer political rights *on*, or to withhold them *from*, the people? Or, what is it that deludes the people so far as to suppose that political rights would raise the price of labour and do away with vexatious taxation? How would it be possible for the poor to benefit by mere *political* change, unless it were at the expense of the rich? and in that case, how would it be possible to prevent a civil war? and if civil war is the only possible result of a *political* change in which the people would really derive even a temporary advantage, how can we think of advocating so dangerous an experiment for the mere *temporary* benefit of the poor, by the *permanent* ruin of the rich.

These hasty remarks are more than enough to prove to unprejudiced minds, that the most fatal consequences may be apprehended from the predominance of erroneous theories in politics, and therefore it may not be uninteresting to inquire into the causes of political illusion.

Of the Incoherent State of Science in general, and the consequent Divergency of Public Opinion.

When we consider the present incoherent state of science and scientific institutions, it is easy to conceive the cause of contrary opinions concerning political interests.

Even such a thing as a general and correct classification of the various scientific pursuits, and their respective correlativeness, does not exist; for the abortive attempts at classification, made by Bacon, D'Alembert, and more recently by Ampère, hardly merit notice. Every where, and in every thing, incoherence is predominant. The idea of universal harmony, and the necessity of adapting each particular branch of science to one general principle of unity, are neglected as vague ideas or vain aspirations.

It must, however, be admitted, that so long as science remains in its present fragmentary state, it may be no easy matter to discover a true principle of general *co-ordination*, and that much con-

fusion might arise from the admission of arbitrary systems, such as those which are current in Germany; but in the absence of a perfect system of *classification*, would it not be wise to institute two distinct bodies of scientific men—one to profess science as it is now known, and one to devote all their time to making new discoveries in each particular branch, instead of leaving chance to govern absolutely with respect to progression and discovery?

If a complete classification of science and scientific research could not be made at once, *a partial programme*, at least, of such discoveries as are most imminent, might be sketched out, and rewards offered to those persons who might succeed in any branch of discovery.

If each particular class of science had established this method, and drawn out particular lists of such discoveries as were most wanting in their respective departments, the political economists would have found that the most urgent discovery in politics, was that of association, or harmonic combination; for, as man is destined to live in society, the advantages and disadvantages of particular forms of social organization must necessarily be the principal cause of social prosperity or adversity. As man is a helpless being when alone, and all-powerful in association, the welfare of society, we repeat, must necessarily depend on the degree of excellence in the mode of uniting private interests so as to produce political unity and power. But a very slight analysis proves that, in the present state of things, private interests, instead of being generally united, are, on the contrary, very often in direct opposition; and, in as much as private interests are opposed to each other, political power is necessarily frail and insecure.

What can have been the cause of so much confusion and contradiction amongst political economists and politicians in general? is it negligence or indifference, or want of genius, or want of method? or all these defects combined?

A very little thought is sufficient to show that the power of nations is intimately connected, in fact, absolutely based upon, the wealth of nations, and the wealth of nations is created by their industry. Whence it follows that the industry of nations is the primary subject of study for economists.

When this question is properly stated, it is evident that there are but two fundamentally different modes of organizing the pursuits of industry:—1. An incoherent arrangement of separate families, pursuing their own individual interests alone, and independently of all others, according to the present prevailing system; 2. An associative organization of different families operating in large numbers and pursuing various branches of industry, according to one general plan of individual and collective interest. (We may here observe, that there are as many different varieties of associative combination, as there are of *incoherent* aggregation; so that the apprehensions of depressive monotony are totally unfounded. When we say, *one general system*, then, of association, we must not be misunderstood to mean, one absolute and inflexible form of society.)

If we ask which of these principles approaches nearest to perfec-

tion, there can be no doubt of its being that of large associations; for, as every thing in nature is organized on the most economical principles, and, as *societary* combination is infinitely more economical than incoherence, it follows, as a necessary consequence, that the natural principles of excellence in society, are those of association; and hence, the chief task of political economy was the discovery of the natural and harmonic laws of combination. As a farther proof of association being the natural form of society, we have actual demonstration of incoherence being its *unnatural form:* in the present state, we see the interests of each class diametrically opposed to that of all others, and the interests of individuals of the same profession, are equally conflicting. The interest of lawyers is, that disputes and contentions should arise between those who have money to pay for lawsuits; no matter whether they be strangers to each other or members of the same family: the interest of medical men is, that illness may be every where prevalent, so as to produce numerous patients: military men are constrained to wish for war, that their chances of advancement may be in proportion to the number of their comrades slain in the field: architects, masons, and carpenters, are interested in the ravages of fire, burning down cities, &c., to furnish employment in reconstruction. Besides these conflicting interests of different classes, individuals of the same profession are interested in each other's ruin: each lawyer, doctor, merchant, and shopkeeper, wishes to have all the business of his competitors, that he may secure an independency for himself in the midst of the general uncertainty.

In fact, the present state of incoherent civilization presents a most contemptible scene of conflicting mechanism, in which the interests of each caste are contrary to those of every other; but it will be impossible to have a thorough notion of the imperfections of this state of things before we are well acquainted with the advantages of a better, in which the interest of a whole nation is identified with the immediate interest of every individual, both rich and poor.

If the private interests of different castes, and those of individuals in every profession, are allowed to remain opposed to each other, how can we expect unity or concord in political opinions? each class necessarily strives to gain political ascendancy, privilege, and advantage, at the expense of all others? and so long as the interests of individuals are opposed to those of society, it would be folly to expect large bodies of men to prefer the public interest to their own private welfare.

This divergency of public opinion is the necessary result of jarring interests, and jarring interests are the inevitable result of *incoherent* civilization: the absence of social science is the cause of incoherence, and thence the cause of fragmentary science, divergency of opinion, conflicting interests, and social misery.

But, in the absence of a complete social science, politicians might have discovered a general system of guarantee, and mutual insurance, in which each order of separate interests would be directly interested in the general welfare of every other; in which

direct fraud would be almost impossible, and by which the greatest possible amount of advantage in a state of unconnected individual interest might be secured to all: in fact, a system in which each particular corporation would be *insured* against absolute ruin and misery, by paying a small premium to a general fund for mutual protection. This system would form an intermediate step between incoherence and association. It is merely a general application, on a political scale, of the principles already applied to private companies for insuring life, property, &c. It would, however, be somewhat more complex, on account of being a political as well as a civil institution. We shall enter into the details of this mode of combining individual interests, when we treat particularly on political guaranteeism; but we may state at present, that this system is but of secondary importance compared to the superior degrees of association, because it merely guarantees us against fraud and injustice, without realizing a superior organization of industry; whereas domestic association would enable us at once to produce more abundantly, consume more economically, and guarantee both individual and public interests against fraud and injustice.

This universal system of guarantee would place every branch of industry in similar conditions of justice and equity, as those which now regulate the system of coining the metallic currency. Formerly, the public were continually exposed to fraud by the adulteration of coin by monarchs and by schemers; at present they are only exposed to the fraud of petty coiners of base metals, who are easily detected. It is astonishing that politicians should so long have neglected to observe the principle of general guarantee contained in the regulations for coining, which were discovered and applied by chance in a few branches of administration, such as the Mint, and the Post-office.

To enter into a minute examination, however, of all the effects of incoherence, and all the causes of divergency in political and scientific opinions, would occupy more time than we can now devote to that part of our subject; nor is it necessary to dwell very particularly on them here, as we shall frequently recur to them hereafter: suffice it to say, that incoherence in society is the inevitable result of incoherence in science; and a fragmentary and confused state of general science is inevitable, so long as the integral principles of attraction which govern the universe, both materially and spiritually, remain unknown or only partially discovered. When once human genius has discovered that *human attractions and repulsions are exactly in proportion to the essential destiny of humanity upon earth*, it is then known what form of society will admit of the harmony of the passions, and what is the cause of subversion and the necessity of compressive doctrines, during the period of *incoherent* civilization. The law of human attractions, being in proportion to the destiny of humanity, is exactly analogous to the law of material attraction in the solar system, where the destiny of each planet is exactly in proportion to its particular powers of attraction and repulsion, combined with

its particular distance from the sun, and the respective positions of other planets; the *accidental* destiny of humanity is a subversive and incoherent state of society until it can discover the laws of harmony and its natural destiny upon earth; the same as a comet is destined to follow an irregular course until it can find a proper position in the solar system. It is evident that truth, justice, candour, and harmony would be agreeable to every body, if we knew how to make them agree with the interests and pleasures of each individual; and that, so long as the pursuits of interest and of pleasure are incompatible with truth and justice, there will be no immediate hope of harmony. Social science, then, consists not only in uniting all private interests with each other, and with the general interests of society, but also in rendering the practice of falsehood, injustice, hypocrisy, and immorality, absolutely and directly injurious to those who practise them, and *vice versâ*. This task is much less difficult than people may at first imagine; for when once the *Phalanx* of industrial corporations is organized for the various pursuits of happiness, all other advantages become, not only easy, but absolutely inevitable: indeed, one of the general *theorems* of the science of attraction is, that THE ORGANIZATION OF REGULAR SERIES NECESSARILY GENERATES HARMONY; OR, THAT THE LAWS OF SERIES ARE THE BASIS OF CONCORD. The solar system is an harmonic series of planets; the most delightful music is an harmonic series of simple notes; and, as the most exquisite music, or the most infernal noise, may be produced by the same band of instruments, according as the notes are combined in harmonic series, or jumbled together in horrid disorder,—so the human instincts and passions combined in regular series may produce exquisite harmony; but, if allowed to act *incoherently*, they will produce a real hell upon earth, as they have done hitherto, and will ever continue to do, so long as they are left to act without unity of purpose. The moral doctrines of compressing the passions, that they may not produce such violent discord, are, as Fourier says, exactly analogous to a theory of harmonizing musical instruments, by exhorting the bass instruments to weaken their tones, others to soften their notes, and the rest to stifle their sounds, in order to render the discordant confusion less insupportable, while every different instrument was at liberty to play different notes, without any regard to time, melody, or unity. As such a theory of harmonizing musical instruments would be evidently ineffectual, so it is clearly proved to us by an experience of several thousand years, that compressing and moderating the passions is absolutely inadequate to the task of harmonizing them, while they are free to act as caprice and jarring interests may impel them. Nor would there be any lack of freedom in a general system of unity, obliging the same passions to act in unison with each other, as in the case of a band of musicians, because those who did not like the social music of one corporation could easily take a part in another; and besides that, they might vary from one to another, for the purpose of avoiding monotony and fatigue.

No wonder that philosophers and politicians should be divided

in their opinions concerning civil and political institutions of an incoherent nature; for, as incoherency in every degree is contrary to the natural laws of harmony, every institution that is adapted to such a state as incoherent civilization, must necessarily be more or less defective; and, therefore, to disagree about the preference which may be given to either, is just as if we were to dispute about which was the least disagreeable noise amongst a great variety of discordant sounds. If this were once clearly and generally understood, we should no longer quarrel about political regulations that are contrary to the interests of certain classes; we should all agree to substitute harmonic institutions; and the only emulation would be, who should organize the most perfect corporations, who should compose the most rapturous harmony.

So long as institutions are inharmonic, we may rest assured they will produce divergency of opinion; nor is it easy to know which of the political parties of the present day is most discordant in its pretensions. One thing, however, is certain; as no sort of discordant noise can ever produce harmony, so no sort of *incoherent* political reform can ever produce peace or happiness.

Let us, then, briefly examine what degree of convergency in public opinion may be expected from a correct social and political science. The contrast may be interesting and instructive.

AN INCIDENTAL DIGRESSION.

Before we discuss the advantages of a correct political science, it may not be useless to anticipate an objection which is very generally made concerning the innate depravity of human nature, and the impossibility of rendering man just and virtuous.

Without entering into a long disquisition on the various doctrines concerning original sin, we may adduce the authority of Scripture and of celebrated divines concerning the possibility of regeneration; and, without entering into a labyrinth of erudition to discover the literal meaning of certain scriptural allegories, we may state that our notion of original sin is, that the disobedience of God's commands, and the introduction of injustice amongst men, was the original sin of humanity upon earth: and, as all the most learned divines admit the possibility of regeneration, so do we. Indeed, if the possibility of regeneration were not admitted, where would be the utility of preaching morality and religion? How could souls be saved, if they could not be first regenerated? Our conviction then is, that favourable circumstances in which the practice of truth and justice would be conducive to worldly interests, and *vice versâ*, would be eminently efficient in seconding moral and religious instruction for the great work of regeneration.

In a preceding paragraph we quoted the opinion of Henry of Ghent, surnamed "*the solemn Doctor*" (of Divinity). In speaking of the political doctrines of Plato and Aristotle, he says, "But Christianity cannot adopt either of these doctrines: our mission is to regenerate man so as to restore him to his primitive state of perfection."

And if Christ died on the cross, was it not to atone for our sins,

facilitate regeneration, and open the gates of heaven to humanity? And when he said, "*Seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened to you,*" are we to disbelieve him, and suppose regeneration impossible? Certainly not.

But to be as explicit as possible in consistence with brevity, we will quote a private letter of one of our friends, which contains a very remarkable analogy between the infancy of an individual and that of humanity. By the infancy of humanity we understand its political infancy during arbitrary civilization, and the absence of true social and political science.

"What can be more striking than the analogy between the infancy of an individual immediately after birth in this world, and that of humanity during the primitive ages of its existence? The infant is born helpless, without either experience or intelligence: it finds in the breast of its mother a suitable aliment already prepared, and, in her maternal affection, that fostering care which is necessary to its welfare. Without these precautions of Nature, the infant would merely be born to experience a few hours' life in the cradle of death. Such, we may presume to have been the primitive existence of humanity, and this presumption is strengthened by the various profane traditions concerning Paradise, Eden, the Golden Age, &c., in which our first parents enjoyed in abundance all the fruits of luxuriant nature in reward for the simple efforts of gathering them. And, moreover, if Nature had not abundantly provided every thing necessary to the preservation of human life, previous to the creation of man on the globe, how would it have been possible for our first parents to live, prosper and multiply, placed, as they must have been, defenceless and without experience in an unknown world? But the sacred traditions confirm our natural conceptions on this subject; for they tell us, that all the physical wants of man were abundantly provided for him on his first appearance on this earth, and that his earliest steps in acquiring experience were under the immediate guidance of the Creator."

"Without entering into any discussion concerning the first disobedience, &c. (which might lead to endless controversy), we may follow out the natural analogy between the birth and progress of individual existence and that of humanity. When the infant has accomplished the first period of its existence, and the milk of its mother is no longer sufficient for the support of its growing strength, the mechanical means of assimilating a stronger food become necessary, the travail of dentition commences, and a certain degree of suffering is the natural concomitant; and thus the second period of human infancy is beset with affliction.

"So it is with the infancy of humanity. When men had multiplied upon the earth to an extent that rendered its spontaneous productions insufficient for their physical wants; scarcity, privation, and discord must have afflicted them during their ignorance of industry and the means of cultivating natural productions. The invention of these means to secure a sufficiency of nourishment, may be compared to the cutting of teeth to enable the infant to assimilate other substances when the milk of its mother is no longer

adequate to the function of nutrition. The second period, then, of infancy in the individual career, and in that of humanity, is marked by the generation of more powerful means of obtaining nutrition when the spontaneous aliment of the maternal breast no longer exists; and, in both cases, this generation is painful and protracted."

This is a natural mode of accounting for the fall of man into misery and sin; nor does it in any way contradict scriptural tradition; and our most intimate conviction is, that the natural mode of returning to truth, innocence, and harmony, will be in exact accordance with what is predicted in the Scriptures concerning the millennium, or second coming of Christ. Those who may think that this account is not in strict accordance with the letter of holy writ, should remember, that it is the spirit, and not the letter only, which we must attend to in allegorical writings. A moment's thought will suffice to show that the analogy in this case is perfectly *natural*, and consequently in strict accordance with the *spirit* of truth. The disobedience of men consisted in the unjust practice of robbing, and depriving each other of natural fruits, instead of cultivating and multiplying the means of subsistence—that was one way of eating of the forbidden fruit; indeed, it appears more natural to understand the allegory of "forbidden fruit" to mean the apple or fruit belonging to another person, according to a just distribution, than to suppose that God created an apple, or fruit of any sort, that was not meant for the use of man. According to our interpretation, the fruit was not absolutely forbidden to all mankind; but the injustice of robbing each other of a just share of the fruits of nature was forbidden to all the human race. (It is well known, that all oriental scholars understand the word *Adam* to mean the whole human race of the primitive ages, as well as the first man created on the globe: but to those who are particularly curious in this matter, we again recommend O'Brien's work on the Round Towers of Ireland, and the Monuments of Antiquity. The allegory of the forbidden fruit is there explained scientifically.)

We take it for granted, then, that it is possible to regenerate humanity, and we now proceed to examine the advantages of a correct political science.

Of the Advantages of Correct Political Science, and the consequent Convergency of Public Opinion.

The advantages of a real science, and the disadvantages of arbitrary systems, are admitted by every body: and therefore our present task is not so much to prove the utility of a correct political science, and its application to society, as it is to strengthen in the reader's mind an impartial opinion concerning the discovery of this science. This can only be done in a vague and general manner, insomuch as we have not yet entered into the details of our subject; but, on the faith of what has already been said concerning the general principles and results in a single case of combinative organization, we may take a hasty glance at the *political connexion* of these individual associations. The natural contrast between

association and incoherence will serve to elucidate our proposition:—

1. By paying proper attention to cleanliness, wholesome food, good air, &c. &c., each corporate body would preserve the health of its individual members, and these precautions would be strengthened by paying medical men in proportion to the health of the members, instead of paying them in proportion to the amount of sickness.

2. Instead of paying poor-rates to able-bodied people in idleness, they could advance money for general loans, enabling the poor to form industrious companies, in order to render waste lands fit for cultivation, and build habitations or *Phalansteries* upon them. When once they had built their habitation, and rendered the waste lands fit for cultivation, they could easily pay the interest of the money advanced for materials and nourishment during the preparatory operations.

This system would not only diminish the burden of poor-rates, but it would also partially provide for the exuberance of population, for which there is no earthly provision at present. Each association would then have to support its aged and infirm members; and the number of these would be greatly diminished by sanitary regulations and healthy occupation.

3. By procuring useful employment for all the able-bodied poor of each establishment, added to the regulations just now mentioned for providing new colonies, it is clear that indigence might be thoroughly eradicated, and its consequent crimes prevented.

4. Each corporation buying and selling on a wholesale scale, would want but few retail dealers, and therefore the greater part of the present swarm of traders would return to productive and useful industry; and, as competition would be confined to large and enlightened bodies, having to maintain their credit and an honourable character, fraud, adulteration, and bankruptcy would be rendered almost impossible. The property of the whole phalanx would be a guarantee against bankruptcy; and, as each corporation would exchange its superfluities for those of other individual societies, it is evident that they would be mutually injuring themselves by adulterating their respective productions.

5. Each society would prefer those branches of industry for which climate, soil, mineral productions, and other local advantages gave them a natural superiority, and hence the mutual advantages of exchange on terms of equity.

6. A whole province, or even a whole nation, of these individual combinations, might form a federal society of *insurance*, to guarantee each other respectively against the ravages of *fire, frost, hail, rain*, or any other general calamity; so that if a *Phalanstery* was burnt down, or if a whole county was ravaged by storm, the loss would be reduced to a trifle for each, when supported by all.

7. The advantages of general education and superior science being common in each locality, would be incalculable, in appreciating all the local resources, and the best means of turning them to account.

8. The interests of the rich and the poor would be united in the combined action of property and industry, so that it would be impossible to separate the two; and hence the difficulty of one class legislating for themselves alone, or obtaining unjust privileges.

9. All the taxes, direct and indirect, might be reduced to one general direct tax; and by paying quarterly or half yearly all the taxes of each association, a useless and expensive legion of tax-gatherers might be disbanded, and occupied in productive or useful pursuits.

10. The amount of taxation might be considerably diminished in consequence of prisons, police establishments, and other expensive institutions of *incoherent* civilization, being reduced to one tenth of their present extent; and perhaps even less than that.

11. University education and the higher branches of science might be conducted on better principles, both of science and economy, under the immediate control of government, than they now are, under the influence of superannuated creeds, charters, and interested prejudices. Instead of wasting money and time on idlers who have no taste for learning, as it very often happens at present, those youths only, who had manifested particular vocations for transcendent science, would be sent by their respective localities to study at universities.

12. The commerce between different nations might be carried on by governments, who would know exactly what were the just proportions of exportation and importation suited to each nation; thus avoiding the endless miscalculations of ignorant individuals, and prevent the unjust privileges and monopolies of private companies, as well as the disastrous failures resulting from over-speculation and excessive competition.

13. By this means, also, custom-houses might be abolished, to facilitate the mutual intercourse of nations. Nor would there be any inconvenience in this measure, because each nation, province, and locality would produce in superabundance those things only for which it had a natural advantage, requiring no other protection than that of its natural superiority; and, as the expenses of government would be greatly diminished by the wholesale measures of economy to which we allude, there would be no reason for regretting the revenue of customs, duties, &c.

14. War would probably be abolished between civilized nations; as it is quite clear that everybody loses and nobody gains by war on civilized policy. As for barbarous nations, they would soon be constrained to imitate or adopt the natural system of society, which in half a century would render them as learned and polite as the most civilized nations.

15. Instead of destructive armies and navies, we might have navies of commerce, and armies of industry; the one usefully occupied by sea, and the other by land. The armies of industry might be employed in building ships, cutting canals, making railways, erecting public monuments, &c.: instead of being drilled to use destructive arms, they might be taught to wield the instruments of production.

16. Nations might be united together in empires, as provinces are in nations; unity of method might be adopted all over the earth for such things as are of universal importance; one universal language might be adopted and taught every where, besides the native languages of each respective locality. In fact, endless advantages of individual and general interest would be the natural consequence of correct science and its application in truth and justice.

It is clear that these conditions would unite all the interests of society, and thence it is not less evident that they would produce concord and convergency of public opinion.

We are aware that such magnificent and prodigious results as these will excite the doubts of those who consider themselves reasonable, positive, and practical people—of those who are commonly called *business-like* men: but it must be remembered that these social and political results can only be obtained by corporate combination: and that, so far from pretending to produce wonderful political effects in the present state of *incoherent* society, we might predict with certainty much more calamitous results than they—the positive people—are aware of. If the principles of spiritual attraction explain to us the results of harmonic combination, they also explain to us the effects of general incoherence and jarring interests: and if the picture of the one is truly magnificent, that of the other is gloomy and dread. It is the ignorance of pending danger which lulls the thoughtless multitude in delusive security; but those who see the dark spot in the political horizon, are fully apprehensive of an approaching storm. It must also be remembered that the difference is great between passing at once in review all these advantages and the necessary slowness in which they would be realized little by little; but however slow the transformation may be, it will be steady, foreseen, and sure: nothing can effectually prevent the power of science from making its way, though prejudice may for a time retard its progress. The most interesting subject of inquiry, then, at present, is—Are the natural principles of corporate combination discovered, or are they not?

It may be interesting, however, to examine the causes of political retrogradation as well as those of progression; for though humanity is sure to progress on some point or other of the globe, still it is proved to us by experience, that civilized nations may die a political death, just as an individual may be carried off before his time by fever or pestilence, or by any other mortal disease. When we say civilized nations, it is understood that we allude to *incoherent* civilization, such as that which now exists in the most advanced countries of Europe, and formerly in Italy and Greece; for, when the whole globe is really civilized, or rather harmonized by corporate combination, there can be no instance of political dissolution: the only political change that can happen, will be variation in the scale of political importance and ascendancy.

If a revolution were to bring about a dissolution of the British Empire, it is clear, that those who are the most prejudiced against reform in any shape, would be the greatest sufferers by such a

dissolution: we mean those who have the heaviest stake in property and vested interests. The people who have nothing but their knowledge and their labour, would merely be exposed to temporary suffering; but property of every sort, and the advantages of credit and position, would be entirely wrecked. Let us hope, however, that a catastrophe which would involve the lives and fortunes of so many thousands, may be prevented by those who are most exposed to risk; and who, by being better able to judge of the danger, would be most guilty in the event, and therefore justify the dreadful fate which their indifferent scepticism had drawn upon them: and, in order to render the possible event of such a catastrophe less imperceptible to the eyes of the indifferent, let us take a hasty view of those mighty empires whose ruins now attest their fallen glory; whose history records an empty name; whose crimes against humanity condemned them to destruction; and in whose fate we read the future doom of ignorant and reckless tyranny.

Chapter V.

OF THE FATE OF EMPIRES, AND THE CAUSES OF POLITICAL DISSOLUTION.

The fate of empires, and the causes of political dissolution, are subjects of vast extent, stretching far beyond the limits of a single paper; but a slight review of history may enable us to discern the chief seats of disease in each constitution, without dissecting the infinite details of social and political organization. Those who are familiar with history may easily follow out the mortiferous ramifications, when the real seat and power of a dissolving principle are clearly discovered, and those who have not that advantage, may easily verify facts by reading history attentively.

Of Political Existence, and the Duration of Civilized Nationality.

It is almost universally believed that nations are subject to decline as well as individuals, and it must be admitted that this opinion is not without foundation in experience; but, it may be interesting to inquire, what is the natural duration of political existence, and whether or not, civilized and uncivilized nations are subject to *premature* dissolution, as well as individuals.

The political existence of a nation may be compared to the terrestrial existence of a human being, and the analogy is certainly very striking, but it is not without some degree of divergency or absolute difference. There is also a high degree of analogy between the earthy career of humanity and that of an individual, where a nation is considered merely as a member of the great body, and compared to a part only of the human organization. In this view of the case, a nation forms but one member of the general existence of humanity, and its disease or dissolution may affect other nations, as the amputation or the mortification of a limb may affect the health and strength of an individual: but, according to the first mode of comparison, a nation may disappear by premature dissolution, like an individual by premature death, without

materially affecting the rest of mankind. The first mode of comparison must be more or less imperfect, because the premature fate of an empire is a much more important event in the career of humanity, than the premature fate of an individual; in both cases however, the analogy is evident.

Though nations may pass away, and supplant each other in rapid succession, during the *incoherent* periods of political existence, it does not follow, as a matter of course, that they should be subject to similar vicissitudes when human genius has discovered the natural laws of political concord. As the laws of peace and harmony may be compared to those of a healthy constitution, so those of war and discord may be compared to a state of disease; and, as individuals of consumptive organization may die at any age between infancy and puberty, so nations of corrupt constitution may decline and pass away before they arrive at maturity. And, as infants or adults of healthy frame may be sent out of this world by any fatal accident, so nations of considerable strength and vitality may be disorganized by war, famine, pestilence, and other general calamities.

Whence we infer that nations, practically organized according to the natural laws of justice, truth, and morality, may exist during the whole career of humanity upon earth, the same as every organ and every member of the human body may continue sound and vigorous during the whole life of an individual.

From this view of the case, it follows, that all the civilized nations of antiquity have been prematurely dissolved; and though some of them may have been strangled by external violence and war, still they were all more or less defectively organized, and, therefore, more or less exposed to an untimely fate from internal corruption and depravity, as well as from external violence and misfortunes.

Nor are the civilized nations of modern Europe less subject to disease than those of antiquity were, though a superior power of creating wealth affords them greater strength of resistance against the corroding influence of moral and sensual depravity: if they are less exposed to dissolution from external war and violence, they are far from being secure against excessive population and internal revolution. Before we close this chapter, we shall see that corroding ramifications exist to an alarming extent in the British Empire; and that, unless proper means be resorted to in time for neutralizing them, political existence will become more and more precarious as we progress in general incoherence. It will, however, be soon enough to discuss the diagnostics of political disease in modern states, when we have observed those of former ages.

As we proceed in the analysis of antiquity, it will be seen that nations may be compared to individuals in a moral and scientific point of view, as well as in their material constitutions and existence They may be deemed more or less virtuous, ingenious, industrious, and worthy of admiration, or depraved, rapacious, destructive, criminal, and execrable, according to their respective degrees of influence in retarding or advancing the happiness of mankind.

Of Ancient Civilization.

For the sake of rapidity, we shall quote a series of facts, and remark upon them as they occur. With respect to antiquarian controversy, concerning the errors of History, we have only to say, that, for our present purpose, it is quite indifferent whether Nimrod was or was not the founder of the first government amongst men; if he were not, somebody else was; and the history of succeeding generations is sufficiently accurate for us to draw general conclusions.—The same remark is applicable to all the facts which we shall quote.

The first Empire of Assyria, 2233 years before the Christian Era.—"Nimrod, the great hunter, son of Cuth, and grandson of Ham, is said to be the first who organized a regular government amongst men. He established his dominion in the plains of Chaldea, not far from the famous tower of Babel; and there he laid the foundation of Babylon. Soon after this event, Ashur, of the race of Sem, built a city on the banks of the river Tigris, and called it Nineveh. This city became the capital of Assyria, and the rival of Babylon."

"It is probable that the Empire of Assyria was soon conquered by the Elamites or Persians; for Belus, the most ancient monarch of Assyria mentioned in history, received the honours of divinity for having rescued the Empire from their yoke. His son, Ninus, was a fortunate conqueror, and he joined Babylonia, Persia, Media, and Bactriana, to his Empire. In the last of these military expeditions he married Semiramis, a princess of superior genius and unbounded ambition. After his death she succeeded him on the throne; and, after having conquered all Asia, she made Babylon the capital of her Empire. Her successors continued to reign more than 1200 years, according to some historians, but not more than 600 according to others. The last of her descendants, Sardanapalus, an effeminate and voluptuous monarch, was reduced to the melancholy fate of being burnt alive in his palace, to escape from the fury of his revolted subjects: and thus was dissolved the first great Empire of Assyria."

It would not be difficult to multiply similar quotations from the history of the most ancient nations, the principal features of which are war and conquest. But we refer to historical works for all detailed information. The two distinctions of rank and condition were those of *warriors* and *slaves*. The chief occupation of the former was conquest and plunder; that of the latter domestic industry. And as war was the only "honourable" occupation, it absorbed all the powers of intellect and science, leaving productive industry to ignorance and slavery. These remarks will be more confirmed as we proceed in reviewing ancient civilization.

"Nabuchadnezzar the second, aided by Cyaxares, King of the Medes, destroyed the Empire of Nineveh, and formed the second Empire of Assyria, 555 years before the Christian era. One of his successors, Balthazar, was conquered by Cyrus, who added these dominions to those of the Medes, and thus was founded the great Persian Monarchy."

Here we find the same spirit of war and conquest predominant; and the second Empire of Assyria was dissolved in the same manner as the first.

"The Jews, according to their historians, were the only people who adhered to the true religion. The Assyrians, the Medes, and almost all the Oriental nations, professed Sabaïsm, or the worship of fire and stars; a custom which originated amongst the Chaldeans. The priests of Babylon having made the first discoveries of science, and more particularly of astronomy, they represented the various phenomena of the heavens by certain symbolic figures which were deified by the people. The Egyptians borrowed the sciences and the worship of the Chaldeans; and the Greeks at a later period introduced the superstitions of Egypt, and embellished them by fabulous additions. During the first periods of civilization, the whole human race, except a handful of Jews, were under the influence of idolatry. The few discoveries of science which gleamed on those ferocious ages, were made by priests, and they kept them secret to preserve their immediate influence over the ignorant multitude. It would be useless to discuss the extent of their discoveries, so much magnified and extolled by historians; for, whatever was the extent of their learning, they kept the multitude in darkness, and made no general application of science to useful pursuits. In fact, it is clear, that their chief practical knowledge consisted in cunning deceptions, such as the arts of necromancy. Whatever the amount of science might be amongst the Ancients, it is evident that violence and deception were almost the only fruits it bore."

In the history of less remote periods, we find similar pictures.

"Darius I. failed in his expeditions against the Scythians, several of his provinces revolted, and his numerous army was dispersed by the Greeks at Marathon. His son Xerxes was still more unfortunate. While a million of his soldiers were impeded in their progress by a few Spartans at the Thermopylæ, Egypt revolted and freed itself from the Persian yoke. Despised by foreign nations, and detested by his own subjects, he was assassinated by one of his officers. His brother Artaxerxes, finding the kingdom ravaged by pestilence and civil war, made peace with the Greeks. Artaxerxes died, and left three children, Xerxes II. Sogdian and Ochus. Sogdian killed his brother Xerxes, and was himself murdered by Ochus, who left two sons, Artaxerxes and Cyrus: these two made war on each other, and Artaxerxes having conquered his brother, remained sole possessor of the diadem. The natural son of Artaxerxes was assassinated by the Eunuch Bagoas to make room for Arses, who in his turn was murdered also. At length the throne was occupied by Darius Codoman, who was conquered by Alexander the Great. After three great battles Darius lost his life and the largest Empire in the world."

"Such were the revolutions of the great Persian monarchy, which, after an existence of two hundred and six years, became a province of Macedonia."

Here again, we have the same predominant features, war,

assassination, conquest, and plunder. The great Persian Monarchy, after having enslaved all the nations of Asia, was itself conquered, dissolved, and despoiled by Alexander the Great. Nor does ancient history furnish any other information of moment, concerning civilization. The arts of industry are hardly mentioned, and the little that is said of their progress relates to sensual refinement and regal luxury. The policy, then, of barbarian chiefs, was to concentrate all the wealth of the nation in their own hands; to leave wealth of any sort in the possession of the unarmed slaves, would have been a sure temptation to neighbouring cut-throats pompously styling themselves warriors. If we revert to other pages of ancient history, we find the same policy of cunning and brutality.

"In order to gain possession of Pelusium, a fortified town on the frontiers of Egypt, Cambyses, son of Cyrus the Great, placed at the head of his army a number of cats and dogs, and other animals, worshipped by the Egyptians; and this stratagem succeeded, because the Egyptians, in fear of killing their deities, did not dare to oppose his army. He easily conquered Egypt, put the King and all the nobility to death, treated the people ignominiously, and reduced them to the most abject state of slavery. In pursuing his conquests in Africa, he lost an army of fifty thousand men, who were engulphed in seas of burning sand." (529 years before Christ.)

It is not necessary to make any comment on this passage, further than to remark that it is not exceptional, and that every page of ancient history is analogous to this.

"Cheops and Chephrem built the Pyramids in Egypt, and reduced the people to misery and slavery, by excessive taxation." At this period "the nation was divided into two classes—masters and slaves: the King and the priests or nobles formed one, and the whole mass of the people the other."

This passage shows that if any advance had been made in knowledge, it was in favour of tyrants, priests, and warriors alone, and to the disadvantage of the people in general. By referring to the history of Greece, we may trace the effects of a similar policy with a certain degree of progress in art and science, but without any general system of amelioration.

GREECE. — "While the kingdoms of Athens, Thebes, and Argos, were increasing in numbers and in power (a few centuries after their first establishment), some influential individuals founded those of Arcadia, Lacedemon, Corinth, Sycion, Thessaly, and Epirus. Athens and Lacedemon soon acquired considerable preponderance amongst these small States; which, in their early attempts at settlement, were infested by monsters and banditti."

"The heroes of Greece, after having rid their country of both, formed themselves into bands of pirates, under the name of Argonautes; they passed the sea to gain possession of the treasures of a certain King of Colchis; and, about the same time, a troop of adventurers issued from the confines of Asia Minor, and conquered the country called Pelasgia or Peloponnesus"

If we turn to the pages which describe the internal Constitution of Athens and Sparta, we read as follows:—

"The inhabitants of Athens were classed in three great divisions; *Citizens, Slaves,* and *Foreigners.*

"Tisamenes, the King of Sparta, was dethroned by Aristodomenes, the Chief of the Heraclidæ; and the conquered people refusing to pay the tribute imposed upon them, were reduced to the most degraded state of slavery. Their masters were forbidden either to give them liberty at home, or sell them as slaves in any other country. To complete their degradation, all the slaves of the State and the prisoners of war were branded with the generic appellation of *Helotæ.* Not only were they obliged to drudge in all the laborious occupations of servility, but a badge of infamy was attached to their dress, as a permanent livery of bondage and contempt. These degraded beings were often obliged to drink to excess, as a means of refining the manners of freeborn Spartans, by the disgusting sights of beastly intoxication. Once in every year they were exposed to the infamy of flagellation, that they might feel and remember the absolute inferiority of their condition."

These were ordinary feats amongst the ancient Greeks, and particularly amongst the Spartans, whom we are taught to revere in early youth. What must we think of modern education, when such ferocious barbarians as these are held in admiration by those who educate the minds of statesmen? There must be something radically wrong in the principles of a moral science which leads to an erroneous appreciation of historical facts.

Nor was the civilization of other countries superior to that of Greece.

"227 years before the Christian era, the inhabitants of Syracuse called to their aid Pyrrhus, King of Epirus, who seized all Sicily except Lilybæum."

"Disciplined bands of Campanians, formerly in the pay of Agathocles, ravaged a great part of Sicily, took possession of Messana, and massacred the inhabitants. About the same time the Carthaginians sent an army of one hundred thousand men into Sicily, disarming and despoiling every city which fell into their hands. This atrocious conduct, however, did not pass with impunity, for shortly after, Carthage, and a great part of Africa, were desolated, and almost the whole of their army destroyed by a plague. This calamity was rendered more dreadful by the horrors of war. For when they thought themselves secure in Sicily and masters of Syracuse, Agathocles led his army from Sicily to Africa, terrifying the inhabitants into a panic of superstition. In order to appease their angry gods, and avert the dangers of total destruction, they immolated two hundred children of the most noble families, and three hundred persons willingly sacrificed themselves at the same altars."

The Carthaginians were as rapacious and ferocious as they were ignorant and superstitious; they despised all intellectual acquirements, and were constantly absorbed in commercial speculations and plundering expeditions.

Such were the characteristics of the celebrated rivals of Roman ambition.

"Rome, until then but little known amongst nations, was beginning her bloody mission of conquest under the false pretence of humbling inhuman tyrants. At this early period she seemed to envy the possessions of Alexander, and make preparations for seizing them on the first opportunity. Nor was she long held in suspense respecting the success of her spoliating designs, and Macedonia itself, the hereditary kingdom of Alexander, finally became a Roman province."

It would be useless to multiply quotations in proof of Roman duplicity in her career of conquest and spoliating policy. The mere transcription of a few heads of chapters may suffice to draw the reader's attention to the principal features of antiquity, and enable us to make pertinent remarks on ancient civilization.

1. "History of the Kingdom of Syria, from the time of its formation after the death of Alexander, to the time when it was reduced to the state of a Roman province." (312 to 85 B. C.)

2. "History of the principal States formed by dismembering the Syrian Empire, Pergama, Bythinia, Paphlagonia, Cappadocia, Armenia, Bactriana, Juda, &c. &c."

3. "History of Greece, from the death of Alexander until it became a Roman province."

4. "History of Egypt, from the death of Alexander until it became a Roman province under Augustus Cæsar."

Thus we see, that war and conquest were the chief causes of dissolution amongst the ancient nations of the earth. The Empires of Assyria were subdued by the Persians; who in their turn were plundered and enslaved by Alexander the Great. The vast Empire of Syria formed by the successors of Alexander, was first dissolved into a number of small states rendered tributary to Rome. These petty dukedoms were, afterwards, reduced to the rank and condition of Roman provinces, subject to the spoliating tyranny of lawless Prætors. At this period, all the industrious nations of the earth were either plundered and enslaved by Rome, or reduced to extreme indigence, by perpetual war and agitation.

Nor was it difficult to impoverish poor, ignorant and uncultivated tribes. Common vegetables, fruit, corn, oil, and wine, were almost their only productions, and these were often as inferior in quality, as they were limited in quantity. In consequence of universal depredations, famine and pestilence are stamped on every page of ancient history; ignorant slavery was the chief instrument of production; but little attention was bestowed on agriculture, and science was involved in the wiles of superstition. Instruments of war, and objects of luxury, alone were in demand; the tide of inventive genius necessarily flowed in the channels of destructive power and pompous tyranny.

The wants of the multitude were ranked with those of animals, and deemed unworthy of attention from philosophy. Even Aristotle, the great sage of Greece, presumed that slavery was unavoidable, because, forsooth, his sagacity could neither devise nor foresee an

adequate remedy. According to him, virtue was fit only for the favoured few, and depraved ignorance was the ultimate destiny of humanity. In the first book of Aristotle's Politics, we find the following remarkable words:—"The science of the master consists in knowing how to make use of his slave. He is the master, not because he is the owner of the *man*, but in so much only as he makes use of his property. The slave is a part of the wealth of the family."—Xenophon suggests the propriety of seizing all slaves as public property, and letting them out on daily hire to those who offer the highest salaries. "This measure," says he, "would augment the public revenue, and in order to prevent the slaves from escaping with impunity, they might be seared on the forehead with the stamp of Athens." These two propositions contain the essence of ancient philanthropy, and their ideas on political economy. It is evident, that when ancient philosophers speak of the *people*, they allude to *free citizens* only, for whom the great and enslaved mass laboured incessantly as animals. These champions of liberty betray the most severe jealousy when a question is mooted concerning the manumission of a slave, as if the interests of the state were endangered by allowing an individual to pass from a dependent to an independent condition. The most humble citizen had at least one slave, as a domestic drudge. In ordinary families several were occupied in bruising corn by hand, and baking bread; in cooking and in making clothes. Thousands were occupied in those manufacturing establishments for which Athens was renowned in antiquity; but generally they were condemned to the most laborious occupations; and to judge of how nearly their condition was reduced to that of animals, we have only to know that they were regularly sent to the river to drink with the horses.

These facts are sufficient to show the helpless state of industry, and the wretchedness of the great mass of the people. Free citizens thought of nothing but pleasure, intrigue, and war.

And modern philosophy admires the political aberrations of antique speculation, and the *virtue* of spoliating tribes, and sophisticated tyrants, is held up as a pattern for modern emulation! It is high time to turn the tide of investigation, and quit the barren shores of false morality. By remaining under the influence of a superstitious veneration for antiquated philosophy, we are liable to mistake the illusions of our imagination for sound judgment and rational appreciation.

While the pursuits of destruction were so preponderous, and those of production so helplessly inadequate, it is not surprising that nations should decline and disappear like frail consumptive mortals: it would indeed be astonishing if so much weakness of constitution were able to withstand such formidable elements of dissolution.

The more we reflect on former ages, the less may we marvel at the slowness of advancement in civilization. So long as industry was confined to helpless ignorance, constantly exposed to the havoc of exterminating war, and forced to wade through ever swelling streams of human blood, the wonder is not, that it pro-

gressed so slowly, but that it was able to progress at all. While the whole earth was subject to the infernal spirit of spoliation, the premature fate of Empires was a necessary consequence, and as inevitable as the premature fate of individuals in the field of battle. These facts read to us an awful lesson, which proves that in proportion to the preponderance of injustice in modern states may we expect the possible event of untimely political dissolution.

From what we know of ancient history, the fall of Greece may be deemed the greatest affliction that ever desolated humanity before it was scourged by the barbarous career of Rome; for notwithstanding the depravity of their morals, and the infamy of slavery which stained their social organization, the Greeks were probably the most ingenious and industrious people of antiquity. We are more indebted to them than to any other nation, for useful knowledge in art, science, and industry; they were, perhaps, however, more remarkable for improvements upon Oriental inventions, than for national discoveries. If we are to judge of the tree by its fruits, Alexander the Great, who destroyed the healthy constitution of progressive freedom in Greece, was really the greatest monster that ever sullied the fame of humanity, before the existence of cormorant Rome.

But let us observe the fate of that iniquitous Empire.

Roman Civilization.

To have a general idea of Roman civilization, we need but glance at a few heads of chapters in history as we did with regard to ancient civilization, and remark upon them as we proceed.

753 years before the birth of Christ.—

"The two brothers Remus and Romulus were chiefs of banditti living by plunder. Their reputation for courage and force gave them great ascendancy over their freebooting companions, and their liberality drew all the robbers of the country under their standard. Slaves who deserted their masters were received with open arms, and under their banners found protection and independence. By this policy their numbers increased daily, and Romulus conceived the idea of forming them into a settled and stationary body. He was opposed in his designs by his brother Remus, whom he killed with his own hands, in order to silence opposition. Soon afterwards, he and his followers built a quadrangular wall or fortification round the Palatine hill, where they usually resorted; and there they fixed themselves as the central rendezvous of their freebooting expeditions." Such was the origin of the proud and mighty Rome.

"As few women would consent to marry these lawless banditti, they organized a regular expedition to carry away the daughters of the Sabini and other people in the neighbouring countries. Violent wars ensued, in which the Romans were generally successful, and thereby rose to greater power.

"For some time after its commencement, Rome contained but three thousand inhabitants, but, 509 years before the Christian era it had become the predominant power in Latium.

"Numa Pompilius introduced the arts of peace, and established a regular form of religion: but after his death, war became again the sole occupation of the Romans.

"*Tullus Hostilius* made war on the Albani, the Fidenates and the Sabini.

"*Ancus Martius*, on the Latini, the Fidenates, and the Veïans.

"*Tarquin the Ancient*, on the Latini, the Sabini, the Veïans, and the Etruscans.

"*Servius Tullius*, on the twelve nations of Etruria.

"*Tarquin the Superb*, on the Volsci, the Sabini, the Gabiani, and the Ardeates."

These facts prove that the founders of Rome were freebooters, and during the first two hundred and fifty years, the ruling passion of their successors was conquest and plunder.

280 years before Christ.—"The war between the Romans and the Samnites appeared to be closed when the Tarentines joined the league, and called to their aid against the Romans, Pyrrhus, the King of Epirus. This prince, who had studied the art of war under Alexander the Great, flattered himself that he should be able to imitate in the West, the prodigious conquests of Alexander in the East. At first, he gained two victories over the Romans at Heraclea and Asculum, but he was defeated at Beneventum, by Curius Dentatus."

The Romans are celebrated for their heroic virtue at this period, because they were frugal, and austere; it is said that Fabricius refused to poison Pyrrhus, and that Curius Dentatus was in the habit of eating vegetables with a wooden spoon. But if a Roman general was obliged to eat peas with a wooden spoon, we may fairly infer that the arts of industry were not sufficiently developed to furnish more elegant utensils to common people: and if Curius Dentatus refused to receive a bribe from the ambassadors or messengers of the Samnites, and thereby merited the admiration of his contemporaries, is it not a proof that such conduct was not common, and that corruptness was more prevalent than virtue? for, if such examples had been common, they would not have been very remarkable, and historians would probably have left them unnoticed.

"The time which elapsed between the close of the Samnite, and the commencement of the Punic wars, was the brightest period of Roman history. During that period the Romans were as virtuous as they were courageous; but, after the defeat of Antioch and the pillage of Corinth, the rich spoils of the East introduced luxury amongst them. They no longer sought power and influence from patriotic motives, but merely to satisfy their insatiable thirst for pillage and emolument."

It is not easy to understand what the historian means by *patriotic motives* in a people who were constantly occupied in robbing their neighbours. According to this definition, the word patriotism means collective selfishness, and all plundering bodies are patriots.

"Rome owed every thing to conquest; even the introduction of

the arts and sciences. Their first writers and their first artists were slaves whose talents they despised and neglected."

149 years before Christ.—"Fifty years after the second Punic war, Rome sent her deputies to Carthage to decide a question of dispute between Massinissa, King of Numidia, and the Republic of Carthage. The deputies were astonished to find the Republic in a flourishing condition, and when they returned to Rome, Cato gave an exaggerated description of their riches and their power, and concluded by advising war, in order to reduce the one and despoil them of the other. *Delenda Carthago* became the general cry at Rome, and war was immediately declared.

"The Roman general laid siege to Carthage, and soon reduced it to the last extremity of famine. A great number of the inhabitants dispatched each other, that they might not survive the ruin of their country. The city was destroyed (146), and the whole country was reduced to the enslaved condition of a Roman province.

"After the destruction of Carthage, the Roman general, Scipio the younger, was sent to Spain to punish the revolted inhabitants of Numantia. By refusing battle, he reduced them to despair; and, as they were on the eve of perishing by famine and pestilence, they killed each other, and reduced the city to ashes, leaving him a melancholy triumph over ruins and dead bodies.

"The possessions of Rome in the island of Sicily were cultivated by an immense number of slaves, whose masters treated them with inhuman rigour. At length, one of the slaves named Eunus excited the others to revolt. After having committed great ravages and successively defeated four Roman Prætors, they were finally reduced to submission; but the fire of sedition was only subdued for a time, to break out more violently afterwards.

"The slaves in different parts of Asia followed this example of revolt, and placed at their head a certain Aristonicus, who, after having cut to pieces a Roman army, was himself defeated, conducted a prisoner to Rome, and strangled in prison. The other cities of Asia which imitated Pergama in the revolt against the Roman yoke, were reduced to submission by one of those crimes familiar to the Romans; who, in this case poisoned all the sources which furnished water to the cities. The kingdom of Attalus was plundered and reduced to the state of a Roman province. The spoils were divided amongst the people of Rome, by Tiberius Gracchus; who, in accordance with the agrarian law he had just then revived, divided the lands and the slaves of the conquered provinces, in equal portions among the Roman citizens."

105 *years before Christ.*—"A prodigious multitude of barbarians, Cimbri and Teutons, invaded the Roman territories, and in their first battle, killed 80,000 Romans; but afterwards they were opposed by Marius, who defeated them and killed 200,000 in the field of battle, besides taking 90,000 prisoners. Three years later, the Cimbri formed another army and penetrated into Italy, but they were again defeated, and 140,000 of them slain.

"While Rome was thrown into a state of consternation by the sudden irruptions of these barbarians, the slaves of Sicily made another general revolt, and, under the command of Thrypho and Achenio, they withstood the shock of two Roman armies, but were afterwards cut to pieces by the consul Aquelius."

These quotations are not exceptions to the general tenor of Roman history, every page of which attests that Rome was enriched by the spoils of other nations, and that its grandeur was supported by the most cruel and inhuman policy. Every luxury it enjoyed was stained by human blood and human suffering: and this was the boasted civilization of Rome. It owed its greatness to a ravenous voracity, and, like a monster, it destroyed itself, leaving its enormous carcass as a prey to the vultures of the North.

The internal dissensions which divided the patricians and the plebeians of Rome whenever their pursuits of conquest allowed them time for dispute, were no longer caused by the jealousy of caste, when every citizen became eligible to the highest offices of state; but the seeds of discord were not less formidable. There were still two parties; that of the rich and influential, who adjudged to themselves all the spoils which victory brought to Rome; and that of the poor, who, after having braved the perils of war, returned to their homes in poverty and contempt. The rich could carry every thing as they wished; their treasures enabled them to corrupt the judges, arm troops of slaves and form numerous partisans: the poor composed a fickle multitude of discontented and suffering citizens, easily allured by any dangerous enterprise, which promised them relief.

"Tiberius Gracchus courted the favour of the people, and was elected to the important function of Tribune. The first act of his authority was to demand the revival of the agrarian law: his colleague, seduced by the rich, refused his assent, and was discharged from office by the people. The law was adopted, but its execution was impeded by the rich. Tiberius Gracchus became odious to the senate; and when he offered himself as candidate a second time, they secretly armed their partisans, and, accusing him of aspiring to the dictatorship, caused him to be massacred, with more than three hundred of his followers.

"While other tribunes were endeavouring to maintain the rights of the people, Caius Gracchus was preparing to revenge the death of his brother. He was not so persuasively eloquent as Tiberius, but he was more vehement. He was elected Tribune, and became the idol of the people, as his brother had been before him. He became so powerful that the senators did not dare to oppose him openly: they tried to ruin his credit with the people by proposing measures of reform still more liberal than his, and by this stratagem they prevented his re-election: but no sooner was he deprived of office, than they repealed all the laws which he had made. A civil war openly broke out. The consul armed his partisans, and Caius united all his friends in order to oppose force to violence. A general massacre ensued, and

the consul put a price on the head of the second Gracchus, which was soon brought to him. The ferocious Opimus weighed the head and gave the assassin the promised reward of seventeen pounds and a half weight of gold.

"But the blood of Caius Gracchus generated Marius, the most terrible scourge of the Roman senators.

"Marius was named general of the army of the East. When Sylla heard of the nomination he returned to Rome at the head of six legions, massacred the partisans of his rival, and threatened to burn the city if Marius were elected. He revived the party of the senate and reinstated its authority, to the detriment of the people. He declared the partisans of Marius enemies to their country, and set a price upon the heads of the most influential.

"After a short time, Cinna demanded the recall of Marius from exile. The senate flew to arms, and Rome was again inundated with the blood of its citizens. Cinna was defeated, but escaped, and joined the army in Campania. He recalled Marius, and they led the whole discontented population of Italy to Rome, besieged the city and put to the sword all who were suspected of belonging to the opposite party.

"Marius died, and Cinna was murdered by his own soldiers, but there were still fifteen generals and two hundred thousand soldiers of the party remaining. Sylla, followed by his victorious legions in Asia, marched against Rome, and his fellow citizens of the opposite party. He met a large army conducted by the adopted son of Marius, and cut them to pieces at Sacriportum, near Prænestum. The inhabitants of all the towns which had declared in favour of Marius, were put to the sword, and six thousand soldiers who voluntarily rendered themselves to the mercy of Sylla, were massacred in Rome under the eyes of the Senate. Regular lists of proscription were drawn out, containing the names of forty senators and sixteen hundred of the equestrian order. The following day forty more senators were added to the list, besides a great number of wealthy citizens."

These were the fruits of Roman civilization, or rather barbarism, about 80 years before the birth of Christ; and from this period the Romans continued more or less frequently to massacre each other in disputing their prey, the spoils of conquered nations.

"Soon afterwards Pompey returned to Italy with all the ostentation of an eastern conqueror. The Romans dreaded his approach; they knew his power and his influence among his troops, and they feared the return of another tyrannical Sylla. Pompey, however, banished their fears, by disbanding his army; the conqueror of Asia entered Rome like a private citizen. This modest and prudent behaviour gained him more friends and adherents than the most unbounded power, aided with profusion and liberality. He was honoured with a triumph, and the Romans, during three successive days, gazed with astonishment on the spoils which their conquests had ravished in the East; they were in raptures at the sight of the different captives and treasures which preceded the conqueror's chariot. But it was not this alone which gratified

the ambition and flattered the pride of the Romans: the advantages of their conquests were more lasting than an empty show, when 20,000 talents (about 2,000,000*l.* sterling,) were brought into the public treasury, and the revenues of the republic were raised from 50 to 85 millions of drachmæ; Pompey became more powerful, more flattered, and more envied.

"When he was sent to pacify Spain (73 years before the Christian era), the Romans had to contend with a formidable enemy hitherto despised. The infernal delight which they took in scenes of blood, had considerably increased the number of gladiators. One of these gladiators, a Thracian captive, named Spartacus, raised the standard of revolt, and urged his fellow sufferers to butcher the Romans instead of themselves. He and seventy of his companions were soon joined by great numbers of fugitive slaves from all parts of Italy. Spartacus soon found himself at the head of one hundred and twenty thousand men. He carried on the war during three years, defeated several Roman generals, and almost destroyed their armies. At length he was overpowered by Crassus in a general engagement, and he, and forty thousand of his followers, were slain in the field.

"At this period, the whole of Italy, and the islands which lie near its coast; the northern coast of Africa, Spain, a great part of ancient Gaul, (Germany, Switzerland, France, Belgium, and Holland,) Greece, Syria, and almost all the parts of Asia then known, were reduced to the condition of Roman provinces. Besides the heavy imposts which the conquered provinces were obliged to pay to the Republic, the Roman generals and soldiers never returned from these unfortunate countries without being loaded with plunder; and to complete their ruin, the Roman governors stripped them of all that was left after the Republic and her soldiers had levied their tribute. In course of time, almost all the riches of the earth were brought to Rome, where they served to excite the vilest passions of avarice and discord.

"Such was the state of the Republic when Cicero was elected Consul (63 years before the Christian era). If his genius and his probity were not able to save Rome from destruction by the repeated shocks of conflicting factions, he was, at least, instrumental in retarding its ruin. He was particularly fortunate in discovering the conspiracy of Catiline.

"Catiline was a man of desperate fortune. He belonged to an illustrious family, but had squandered his patrimony in vice and dissipation. Accustomed to crime under the dictatorship of Sylla, he formed a conspiracy in which all the most abandoned and corrupt characters of note were implicated, and their number was then very considerable. Their object was to destroy the Senate, and make themselves masters of the Republic and its resources: to abolish all debts, seize the property of those who were not in the secret, and murder all who opposed their designs. Those veterans who had dissipated the plunder distributed by Sylla, were eager to bring about new revolutions, in order to repair their ruined fortunes at the expense of others. They were all organized

in regular troops under the command of Mallius in Etruria, and the day was fixed for setting fire to Rome and plundering it during the general disorder and massacre of the victims; but Cicero discovered the whole machination and revealed it to the Senate. Those leaders who were seized in Rome, were immediately put to death, and the others fell in the field of battle."

Julius Cæsar was supposed to be in the secret of the conspiracy, but he was not directly implicated. He afterwards excited a civil war, in which hundreds of thousands perished, and he became sole master of the fortunes of Rome; but his domination did not last long: he was assassinated in the Senate by those who abhorred all forms of tyranny, but that which is commonly termed a Republic: *i. e.* an oligarchy, or *polytyrannical* despotism, to the exclusion of *monotyrannical* dictatorship.

By the murder of Julius Cæsar the civil war was rekindled, and millions of citizens perished before Rome was reduced to an absolute state of abjection under Augustus Cæsar.

If we may believe historians, Julius Cæsar, before he turned his arms against his countrymen, reduced 800 cities in Gaul and Britain; he defeated three millions of soldiers, of which one million were slain in the field, and one million taken prisoners and sold as slaves at Rome. What an imp of hell he must have been!! In apotheosis he certainly deserves the rank of an infernal deity.

After the complete subjugation of the numerous factions in Rome under Augustus, the earth seemed, for a time, doomed to submit to the yoke of oppression; but, during this the deepest gloom that ever obscured the career of humanity, the star of redeeming light rose steadily in the East, and announced to the drooping world the birth of a Saviour. Fourteen years before the death of Augustus, Jesus the Messiah was born in Judea. His mission was to redeem mankind, destroy slavery, and inculcate the reign of peace upon earth, justice, and good will amongst men. He was persecuted by the spirit of injustice, and, at the age of 33 years, he was crucified as a malefactor; but the spirit of truth which he breathed upon earth was destined to conquer the spirit of evil. The light of divine justice was shed upon mankind to dispel the darkness of error. The reign of truth, morality, and harmony, was promised to man upon earth, and heavenly assurance was given to him that he had only "*to seek the kingdom of justice, and he should certainly find it.*"

Great have been the sufferings of privation and fatigue during the perilous voyage of discovery, and in every step the earth has been stained with blood: but, at last, the day has dawned on the benighted race of man, and the land of promise is now within our view.

Contrasted with the history of Roman tyranny, the birth of Christ is a heavenly consolation; and the history of his doctrine affords additional proof of their barbarity.

"The cruel death of Jesus on the Cross, so far from terrifying his humble followers, gave them new strength to continue their mission. They compared the precepts and the example of their divine

master to the prevailing doctrines and actions of the age: on the one hand, corruption, oppression, selfishness; on the other, purity, indulgence, affection. They were confirmed in their opinions, and, from that moment, they acknowledged no law but that of Christ. They congregated together, and formed but one heart, one soul; but the ardent charity which caused them to unite so closely, soon caused them to disperse. They resolved to regenerate mankind, by preaching the doctrines of faith, hope, and charity; to conquer the world from the reign of injustice and idolatry; and in that holy war they vowed to shed no blood but their own.

"At 17 years of age Nero was proclaimed Emperor of Rome; and when he was only 19, he caused his brother Britannicus to be poisoned. Shortly afterwards he put to death his mother, his wife, and his minister (Agrippina, Octavia, and Burrhus). He was also suspected of having set fire to Rome, which was consumed in many parts; but to clear himself, he accused the Christians of the crime; and the consequent martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul was the signal of persecution against the disciples of Christ.

"After having caused Seneca, Lucan, and other illustrious citizens to be put to death, he gave himself up to effeminacy, went to Greece with an army of dancers and flute players; entered the arena of public games, and gained 1800 crowns of laurel. During his absence, the imperial crown was offered by the legions of Gaul and Lusitania to Galba, the governor of Spain; and notwithstanding the opposition of Virginius Rufus, the clamours of the Pretorian guards decided the contest in his favour. The Senate sent ambassadors to Galba, and condemned Nero to the ignominious death of a traitor. After much hesitation, Nero resolved to die, and commanded his secretary to stab him.

"Galba, at 70 years of age, became Emperor of Rome. He made himself many enemies by his justice, and but few friends by his virtue. He adopted Piso Licinius as his successor; but Otho, who had helped to raise him to the throne in the hopes of being chosen his successor, urged the Pretorian guards to insurrection, and Galba was murdered, as well as his adopted son. The throne was then offered to Otho. The legions of Germany revolted, and proposed their general Vitellius to the empire. The two armies fought; and Otho was defeated. He committed suicide in consequence, and many of his followers did the same. Vitellius reigned three months in the midst of cruelty and licentiousness. The legions of the East were jealous of the power of the other Roman armies, and resolved, in their turn, to create an Emperor. They offered the throne of the world to Vespasian, who was then commissioned to punish the revolted Jews of Jerusalem (69 years after the birth of Christ). He had hardly made up his mind to accept the offer, when one of his lieutenant-generals, Antonius Primus, had already entered Italy, defeated the partisans of Vitellius, put the tyrant to death, and subjected Rome.

"Vespasian, and after him his son Titus, reigned a few years, and re-established order. The justice and benevolence of Titus consoled his people under the heavy afflictions of earthquakes, pesti-

lence, and famine, which desolated Italy during his reign. At this period Herculaneum and Pompeii were destroyed by the irruptions of Vesuvius.

"Soon afterwards, in the reign of Domitian the crest-fallen Rome was obliged to pay tribute to barbarians. Decebalus, the King of the Daci, made the Romans smart for a while under the lash with which they had scourged humanity during centuries of carnage and plunder.

"Domitian was a cruel and narrow-minded prince, who persecuted the Christians. In his reign St. John was banished to the island of Patmos, where he wrote the Apocalypse; St. Andrew and St. Denis suffered martyrdom in Greece.

"This Emperor drew out a list of proscriptions, which contained the name of his wife: she learned the fact, and joined the intended victims, who agreed to deliver Rome from the tyrant.

"He reigned fourteen years, and was the last of the Emperors commonly called the twelve Cæsars."

From this period the Roman Empire continued to decline more or less rapidly, until the innumerable swarms of barbarians from the North completed its ruin. A few quotations may suffice to show the state of declining Rome.

"Pestilence, famine, rebellion, and internal war with barbarians, desolated Italy during the reign of Marcus Aurelius. Nothing less than his great talents and excellent qualities could have prevented the dissolution of the empire. The Parthians, the Egyptians, the Armenians, revolted during his reign; but his most formidable enemies were the Marcomans, a people of Germany, who would have destroyed the Roman army, had it not been saved by a Christian legion.

"The only ambition of his son and successor, Commodus, was to battle with lions and vanquish the strongest gladiators. He died by poison, and was succeeded by Pertinax, who was murdered by the Pretorian guards. After the death of Pertinax, these janissaries publicly offered the throne to the highest bidder. Didius Julianus had the misfortune to obtain it. He was soon beheaded; and after a short contest between several pretenders, Septimus Severus remained sole master of Rome. He put to death all those who had opposed him, and then marched against the Parthians. In proceeding towards the Euphrates, he reduced several cities, put all the men to the sword, and sold more than one hundred thousand women as slaves. He died and left the empire to his two sons Caracalla and Geta. He was hardly buried when Caracalla murdered his brother in the arms of his mother, who was wounded in the struggle. He reserved the same fate for all those who opposed him; but he was himself murdered by Macrin, who succeeded him. Macrin was killed at the end of fourteen months' reign, and was succeeded by the young Heliogabalus, whose chief exploit was that of making his own grandmother a senator of Rome."

About the year 360, there were not less than thirty pretenders to the empire, according to some historians; nineteen, according to others.

Towards the end of the fourth century, Theodosius divided the empire in two parts: the Eastern and the Western Empires; both of which were soon overrun by myriads of barbarians from the North. The Huns, the Allans, the Goths, Burgundians, Vandals, Swedes, Lombards, Franks, Saracens, Normans, and Turks successively or simultaneously overwhelmed every part of the empire, and particularly the Western division, where they renewed the horrible scenes of carnage which had already drenched the earth with blood. During the first centuries of the middle ages, these barbarians spread darkness and desolation over Europe, demolishing every trace of learning and of art, as if they had been sent by Providence to raze the monuments of slavery and iniquity from the face of the earth; to destroy by fire and sword a race of vipers whose crimes had polluted humanity; whose only study was destruction; whose power was derived from oppression; and whose time was come to pay the dreadful debt of those who revel in iniquity.

This appreciation of the Romans and their civilization, is certainly not more severe than their policy deserves, if we respect the cause of truth, though when compared to other iniquitous nations they may appear less culpable in the eyes of impartial criticism. But our object here, is not indulgence for minor degrees of depravity, or the redeeming qualities of science; the distinction of the true principles of civilization, is our present aim; and therefore the principles of absolute truth must be attended to, whatever may be our desire to excuse ignorance. We may, however, contend, that as a nation, the Romans had few redeeming qualities: whatever we may admire in the inheritance of Rome, are the legacies of individual genius, and not of national institutions. A few monuments and military roads form the only exceptions to this sweeping condemnation.

Roman civilization may be resumed in one word: *universal spoliation.* However we may adorn the expression with the glittering epithets of *courage, bravery, freedom, conquest,* &c., the reality still remains the same: their noble *principles* were nothing more than what is commonly understood by "*honour among thieves,*" and their *practice* was neither more nor less than "*your purse or your life:*" and as for their private habits of morality and temperance, we have only to read history to see that they were sober and temperate so long only as they could not be otherwise, because their ignorant ferocity reduced them to the necessity of living on common vegetables, and want of skill in industry obliged them to use wooden spoons and other rustic utensils: but when they had enriched themselves by more extensive depredations, they became absolutely swinish in gluttony, and overbearing in pride and ostentation. Even in the time of Cicero, when the principles of liberty are supposed to have shone forth in all their splendour, there was no attempt made to abolish slavery. Those who called themselves the people, were a privileged mass of predatory ruffians. Their pretended principles of equality merely related to an equal division of the spoils of conquest, as every page of their history attests.

We have only to read Cicero's orations against Rullus, in order to understand their ideas of equality. "This Rullus was a tribune of the people, and he had proposed an agrarian law, the purpose of which was to create a decemvirate, or ten commissioners, with absolute power for five years *over all the lands conquered by the republic, in order to divide them among the citizens*," that is to say, among the needy freemen, but not the mass of the population who were the slaves of freemen.

In Monsieur Blanqui's *History of Political Economy* we find the following graphic sketch of Roman civilization.

"The people lived crowded together in small fetid cells, exposed to the most hideous maladies, and cruel privations. Their scanty clothing almost entirely composed of woollen cloths, and but seldom renewed, exposed them to a permanent epidemic disease, which could only be kept down by the universal custom of daily bathing.

"In the midst of the greatest magnificence of Roman power, we find but an abject populace of slaves and artisans, labouring to satisfy the luxury of unproductive citizens. The arts and sciences were cultivated by indigent slaves, and even the medical art was not an exception to this rule. Commerce was in its infancy, unless we call commerce the mere exchange of gold for the natural productions of the people who had been robbed of their money. No Roman city was famous for its manufactures: nor had they any seaport equal to those of the present day. And yet they had numerous large towns and extraordinary wealth; but their opulence was not to be compared to ours: the lowest of the middling classes in modern civilization, enjoy more real comforts than the great senators of Rome did formerly. All Roman grandeur was external and theatrical: they multiplied monuments of ostentation, and paid but little attention to those of utility. In the immediate vicinity of these great monuments the people were packed up in unhealthy dwellings; and their food contrasted sorrily with the richness of their utensils.

"The entire legislation of Rome, from the most lauded period of their republic to the final dissolution of the empire, was merely a reproduction of the incorrigible prejudices of the people against productive industry. They had recourse to agrarian law whenever they were severely attacked by poverty. The *lex Terrentia* ordained that each citizen should receive five bushels of corn monthly. The *lex Sempronia* fixed a *maximum* price for corn, and the *lex Clodia* ordained a gratuitous distribution. Sometimes laws were passed to enable debtors to free themselves by paying one third of their debts. The vain attempts at an equal distribution of land were successively made by the *leges Cassia, Licinia, Flaminia, Sempronia, Cornelia, Servilia, Flavia, Julia,* &c.

"While these laws paralysed industry by protecting and encouraging idleness, the strictest regulations were made to keep each class distinct from the others. Augustus condemned the senator Ovinius to death, for derogating from his dignity by conducting a manufacturing establishment. With such institutions

as these, it is easy to understand why industry never flourished in the Roman Empire.

"Notwithstanding the numerous precautions taken to avoid famine, its ravages were frequent both in the capital and in the provinces. The art of governing was reduced to the mere expedient of providing daily food for idle and half starved people. The number of ameliorations in commerce, is counted by the number of famines which suggested them. Under Augustus, a famine was the cause of establishing a fleet and public granaries: another under Tiberius, gave rise to a premium for the importation of corn: under Claudius, a famine caused them to repair the seaport of *Ostia*; another under Nero, gave birth to numerous privileges and advantages in favour of corn factors: under Antoninus Pius, a famine caused the port of *Terra-cina* to be repaired, and a lighthouse to be erected: another under Marcus Aurelius caused a seven years' provision to be made. During the administration of Commodus, a famine led to a dreadful massacre. This was all that Rome did for commerce. No regular system was thought of: they lived from day to day inventing mere palliative expedients.

"Even wool, which was almost the only material of which clothing, curtains, bed-clothes, &c. were made, never was the object of any particular regard on the part of statesmen. Industry never was an object of that attention which might lead us to suppose that they understood its importance. Each country furnished its quota of tribute: Arabia, its perfumes; Africa, its corn; Spain, its honey and wax; Gaul, its oils, wines, and metals; Greece, its objects of art and luxury; the borders of the Black Sea furnished them with skins and hides. Rome consumed all, and paid for it with the gold of tributary nations. When foreign contributions became insufficient, taxes were levied on industry at home. This was several times the case under Alexander Severus. As the Emperors increased the number of lawyers, they became more addicted to taxing laborious professions. The most shameful expedients were devised by jurisconsults, one of whom suggested the system of adulterating coin. Constantine, their greatest patron, persecuted in the most barbarous manner all those who lived by productive industry. The system of tithing was carried to such an excess of arbitrary fixation, that no person could know positively how much of his harvest could really be called his own."

These facts alone prove that we have been too long in the habit of admiring the predatory Romans, instead of holding them in utter detestation, and execrating their memory as a nation. It is not because Horace, and Virgil, and Tacitus were Romans, that we admire them; but because they were men of genius: and as such they belonged to humanity, and not alone to guilty Rome.

A nation is worthy of praise in so much only as it contributes to the discovery of useful institutions, and the creative power of industry; and is to be pitied in so much only, as it may have been the innocent victim of external violence. The claims of Rome on the first of these points are few indeed; and on the second, they are those of a highwayman who murdered his neighbours to seize

their property, and suffered capital punishment to atone for his crimes. Though the hangman were himself a criminal, the fate of his victim would not be less just; and though the barbarians who destroyed the Roman Empire were themselves freebooting cut-throats, still the fate of piratical Rome was not less merited. But that we may not appear to indulge in vain declamation, let us examine the principal defects of their habits and institutions.

As a civilized nation, whose political existence lasted more than a thousand years, we have a right to expect discoveries from them which would be really useful to humanity; but, instead of that, what do we find?

I. What did they do for Science?

In Mathematics we are not aware that they made any discoveries of importance, or knew any thing more than what they had borrowed from the Greeks.

In Physical and Natural Science their knowledge was very limited, and generally drawn from the same source.

In Philosophy they were the humble servants and dull imitators of the Greeks.

II. What did they do for Art?

In Painting, their skill was very limited.

In Music, they imitated, and probably never equalled the Greeks.

In Sculpture, they never equalled them.

In Poetry, they were not superior.

In Eloquence, they were inferior.

III. Where did they excel in the Applications of Art and Science?

Their Theatre was inferior to that of Greece; and their public sports were much more brutal.

Their Architecture was not superior.

Though their monuments were built on a more imposing scale, still they were inferior as works of Art: for, when they attempted to modify the general principles of Grecian architecture, they were so ignorant of the rules of taste, that they disfigured the models which they altered. In their hands, the Doric style lost its strength and its grandeur; the Ionic much of its grace and elegance; the Corinthian its variety. The simple Grecian cornice became heavy from being overloaded with a multiplicity of unmeaning mouldings, which confused the agreeable contrasts of light and shade so expressively diversified in the Grecian monuments.

The prince of the Roman architects, Vitruvius, has so horribly disfigured the admirable Attic base, that it may be truly termed a monstrous caricature: indeed, ignorance and bad taste characterize almost all their modifications of Grecian Art.

Their Military Roads are the work of laborious slavery and spoliating policy.

Their Aqueducts are stupendous monuments of ignorance.

If they had understood the physical laws of the elements, they might have procured water without such gigantic efforts of human labour.

If they had made useful discoveries in Mechanical Science, they might have been less solicitous of making difficult and distant conquests, to rob others of that which they did not know how to produce in abundance themselves.

We do not know of their having done any thing to improve the various branches of Manufacture: on the contrary, we believe they knew nothing on this subject, but what they learned from other nations. Indeed, they always preferred wholesale robbery to honest industry.

If we consider their immense power, the attempts which they made to improve Agriculture were insignificant.

And if we may judge from the writings of the Latin authors, the great body of the ordinary citizens, and all their millions of slaves, lived principally on dried peas, boiled corn, and common vegetables: a simple cake of bread made with butter, is spoken of as a great dainty, even in the time of Augustus. Juvenal's account of the luxuries of the senators, and particularly of the Emperor Domitian, only tends to confirm our opinion by proving them to be exceptions; and it is well known that fine linen was a thing unknown to Rome: flannel shirts and woollen sheets, windows without glass, and cars without springs, were the most refined comforts of Roman Emperors. Though the word *fine-linen* may be frequently found in the writings of the Ancients, we have every reason to believe that a sort of common sackcloth, such as that in which Egyptian mummies are enveloped, was their finest specimen of linen cloth; and this opinion is confirmed by the known prevalence of woollen clothing amongst the Romans.

In Navigation, they were not superior to other nations of those ages; their commerce was confined chiefly amongst themselves; from other nations they took all and returned nothing.

In fact, almost all the luxuries of Rome were the productions of other countries. The Romans were neither artists, nor mechanics, nor merchants, nor agriculturists, nor men of science, nor philosophers in a superior degree; but they were *quibblers, tyrants,* and *robbers* on a most transcendent scale.

IV. Their Religion was nothing but Idolatry and Superstition;

And even that they borrowed from more imaginative nations. When the Christian doctrine was proclaimed, they persecuted its followers in the most inhuman manner during four centuries. The Temple, which they dedicated to the worship of the predatory Jupiter (*Jovi Prædatori*) is a luminous illustration of their fundamental principles of Religion.

V. Their Social Organization was based on the most Absolute and Abject Domestic Slavery.

Paternal authority amongst them was barbarous in the highest degree. Even in the early ages of boasted Roman virtue, the lives of women, children, and slaves were at the mercy of conjugal, paternal, and lordly despotism. Manlius Torquatus condemned his own child to death for merely engaging with the enemy with-

out the express command of his military superior; and Junius Brutus inflicted capital punishment on his two sons, because they differed from him in opinion concerning the rights of a dethroned monarch.

One of the twelve laws of their celebrated table, gave to creditors the power of enslaving, and even of killing their insolvent debtors, whatever might have been the cause of insolvency.

These are all purely barbarian customs, and their political institutions were not less barbarous.

VI. What were the Advantages of their Internal Government?

The Patricians were constantly at war with the Plebeians, whenever external conquests did not occupy them both and absorb their internal rancour. Whatever the poorer caste obtained by intimidation, was repealed on the first opportunity by their adversaries. Tribunes were massacred, whenever they proposed laws favourable to the people, and prejudicial to the aristocracy. (That is to say, favourable to *poor freemen;* for nobody ever thought of emancipating the great mass of the productive population from the bonds of personal slavery and degradation.) Every victorious faction put its antagonists to death, and confiscated their property. Neither life nor fortune could be deemed secure during any considerable length of time, if the people were not occupied in external war. The Government was always either mono-tyrannical or poly-tyrannical; it never was, properly speaking, constitutional or liberal. Notwithstanding the enormity of their spoils, the people were constantly crying out for *panem et circenses,* food and entertainment: in fact, their only safeguard was external depredation. And, in speaking of the *Roman people,* it must always be borne in mind, that a privileged mob of paupers, called citizens and soldiers, were called the people; but the real people, that is to say, nine-tenths of the whole population, were slaves, and the personal property of the privileged castes.

VII. What was their External Policy?

Conquest and spoliation: bloodshed and oppression.

If they introduced any useful art into a subdued country, it was merely to enable their slaves to yield more profit. They neglected the arts of general utility, and introduced such only as gratified their own sensuality. They invented absolutely nothing but the art of despoiling nations of the fruits of their labour. And though they may have generalized Grecian science, they neither discovered nor improved any thing of importance. Their parochial administration was merely a regular system of tithing and ransoming the people whom they enslaved. Indeed, we are not aware that they improved any science, or art, or social, or political, or religious institution of the Greeks, and, therefore, we may truly say, that they were a useless nation; nay more, they were a positive curse to humanity. Their civilization was internally corrupt and externally destructive. Instead of imitating them we should hold them in abhorrence.

They retarded the progress of mankind during two thousand years, either directly by actual destructivity, or indirectly by the influence of their institutions on following ages of servile ignorance. If they had been a moral and an intellectual people, they would have progressed from barbarism to *incoherent* civilization; but they were a mere brutalizing mass, and, as sensual monsters, they were swept from the ranks of influential nations.

The Greeks are, perhaps, the only people of antiquity who are entitled to a high degree of admiration for real services rendered to posterity in the discoveries of art, and science, and industrial resources. Nor can modern civilization boast of much useful genius before the fifteenth century, if we except the efforts of religion in dissolving the dread bonds of slavery. Notwithstanding the moral depravity of the Greeks, they were infinitely more ingenious and industrious than any other nation; and they were certainly not more immoral than other nations, who were deprived of the light of Christianity. It may, perhaps, be said that they borrowed many of their arts and sciences from the Egyptians; but then it must be remembered that they improved these so admirably, that they became almost entirely different; and, besides improving upon Egyptian art and science, they made many useful discoveries themselves, and established a much higher degree of political excellence in their constitution; and, above all, a progressive degree of political freedom. When we compare the splendid improvements which, during a frail existence, the little nations of Greeks made in the arts which they received from the Egyptians, to the monstrous caricature of Grecian civilization in the hands of the cruel and clumsy Rome, we may compare the political existence of the one to the graceful and accomplished personation of Apollo, and that of the other, to the cannibal and monster Cyclops: and, as Apollo is said to have destroyed the Cyclops, so the taste and learning of the elegant and manly Greece eclipses, by its brilliancy, the dull pretensions of the awkward giant, Rome.

That the Romans had a very strong bond of unity which saved them from dissolution during hundreds of years, is undeniable; but that bond of *internal unity* was based on the iniquitous principle of *external spoliation*, and in so much as they relaxed that principle in favour of peace and justice abroad, by so much were they exposed to civil war between conflicting interests at home. Drawn swords were their only resource; notwithstanding the blundering conceit of their orators, military force was the supreme law. If the patricians were sometimes amused with the vain-glorious ingenuity of sophists; if they tolerated for a while the assumed superiority of metaphysical illusion, and the boasting exclamations of a Cicero, "*cedant arma togæ; concedat laurea linguæ*," they rudely turned the *toga* to the "*right about*," whenever it suited their material interest or their obstinate caprice. We may here remark that Cicero was completely ignorant of the science of subduing a barbarous policy; and we shall have occasion to remark elsewhere that Burke and other celebrated modern statesmen were

ignorant of the science of neutralising the subversive policy of incoherent civilization.

In execrating the principles on which the political existence of Rome was based, we do not pretend that private citizens were more cruel than those of other barbarous nations: our object is to prove that their political constitution was more unjust, iniquitous, and barbarous, than that of any other people; and that their political career was more disastrous than useful to humanity. This appreciation may perhaps appear excessively severe, but those who think we are too general and absolute in our sweeping condemnation, can easily indulge themselves in forging arguments in favour of this by-gone Roman civilization: *i. e.* military Barbarism: our task is to expose the roots of evil in society, and the proper methods of eradication. After having acquired a competent knowledge of the nature of social evils, we shall be in a fair way for understanding the principles of a progressive policy.

Much might be said concerning the depravity of Rome, and the inhuman criminality of its political career, but we have already said more against this idol of classical prejudice than prudence and discretion might perhaps suggest, and therefore we refrain from the disgusting operation of probing deeply into the corrupt details of military policy, reserving our remarks on the general defects of *incoherency* in all ages, until we have briefly analyzed those of higher degrees and modern date.

MODERN CIVILIZATION.

In reading the history of the dark ages which cast their shadows over Europe during the agonizing periods of declining Rome, we are painfully affected by the multiplied pictures of human affliction. Though mankind was delivered from the lacerating fangs of cormorant Rome, it was still in the clutches of innumerable vultures, not less ravenous and destructive; but to dwell on this period of desolation would be painfully tedious, and, therefore, we shall hurry over it as rapidly as possible; simply quoting a few of the principal pages of history, and leaving the reader to draw his own conclusions. When we arrive at the dawn of modern industry and discovery, we may dwell with pleasure on the prospects of humanity.

By the aid of their military science the Romans were able to repel the barbarians of the North, and prevent them from spreading beyond the limits of the Danube; but, when the enterprising spirit of their generals and the obstinate courage of their soldiers began to decline under the enervating influence of refined depravity, when military power was at the disposal of monied influence and grovelling ambition, and when what had formerly been deemed glorious patriotism was supplanted by the meaner motives of mere personal gratification; while, in fact, depravity and corruption became so general as to threaten the empire with rapid decline from depopulation, the simple, though uncultivated, manners of the northern barbarians augmented their numbers to a most formidable

extent. During the first four centuries of the Christian era they harassed the Romans by repeated irruptions; but it required a general and overwhelming influx to complete their ruin. The signal of that universal commotion, which effected the final destruction of Rome, was given by an innumerable horde of savages, who probably ignored the Roman name.

The borders of the Caspian Sea were inhabited by barbarians of Scythian origin, who were called Huns; and at the end of the fourth century these people, in quest of plunder, crossed the mountains of the Caucasus which separated them from the Allans, whom they drove before them as they proceeded. The Allans fell back upon the North of Europe, and the Huns followed them. The shock of these invasions displaced the Goths, the Sueves, and the Vandals, who fell, with all their weight, on the Roman Empire. The feeble resistance of Rome encouraged these barbarians to look upon it as an easy prey, which they resolved to seize.

During the fifth and sixth centuries they ravaged the Roman Empire in all parts, and seemed to take a satanic delight in contemplating their work of ruin and destruction. At length, they began to impede each other in their progress, and dispute the possession of the spoils they had respectively acquired; and, in order to defend their booty from their hungry brethren, who came later into the field, they confined themselves to certain limits of territory, and thus established the feudal foundations of modern states.

The policy of the Eastern Empire was to avoid as much as possible the scourge of these barbarians, by drawing them on towards the West. Italy was inundated by innumerable tribes of Vandals, Sueves, and Allans, from which it was partially delivered by Stilicho in a celebrated battle near Florence; but, while Stilicho was preparing to march against Constantine, (a soldier who was proclaimed Emperor by the legions of Brittany,) he was assassinated by order of the Emperor Honorius, who was as much afraid of his success as his defeat. From that time the barbarians were hardly resisted. In 408, Alaric, King of the Visigoths, or Western Goths, laid siege to Rome, and delivered that city and all the southern parts of Italy to the rapacity of his followers.

The Romans had already abandoned Brittany; the Goths and the Sueves had divided Spain amongst themselves; the Burgundians, Allans, Goths, and Francs were disputing about the division of Gaul, when Italy fell under the yoke of the Herules, Rugians, Goths, and other barbarians. This great revolution, which finally destroyed the Western Empire of Rome, took place 507 years after the battle of Actium.

From this period the invaders made war on each other to extend the limits of their respective conquests. During these wars, Pepin the Short, chief minister of Childeric III., usurped the throne of his master and Pope Stephen II., who required his protection against the aggressions of the Lombards, confirmed the usurpation, by going personally to crown Pepin King of the Francs. In acknowledgment for this service, Pepin marched against the enemies of the church; defeated Astolphus, King of the Lombards, and

founded the temporal power of the Pope, by giving him the exarchat, or government of Ravenna.

Pepin left his kingdom to his two sons, Charles and Carloman, the latter of whom died (in 768), and Charles became sole master of France. He is known in history by the distinguished epithet of Charlemagne, or Carolus Magnus. He was a wily politician, and a brave soldier. In order to occupy his turbulent chiefs, he conducted them into distant regions; and, as the pretext of their conquest was the diffusion of Christianity, they were fanatical in their aggressions, and put to death all those who refused to receive the new doctrines.

This compulsory mode of converting heathens was hardly in unison with the spirit of Christianity, but it was perhaps a less execrable principle of despotism than that which blackens the memory of the Romans. Besides, the bonds of direct slavery were every where slackened by this religious zeal. Spoliation and conquest, however, were still the leading pursuits of the lords of the earth. During the anarchy of the middle ages, *might* was the most secure of rights, and kingdoms were often founded and dissolved in very short periods of time. The history of Europe, at this period, is chequered with numerous registers of infant states and untimely dissolutions, owing to the restless spirit of conquest which animated the various tribes of barbarians. Nor was the Eastern Empire and its new capital, Constantinople, entirely free from change and revolution.

The fall of the Western monarchy, the effeminacy of the Greek emperors, the decline of the Persian Empire, the universal corruption of morals, the shocks of contrary opinions concerning religion, which caused many feverish minds to establish new sects—every thing, in fact, seemed to forebode a revolution in the East as well as in the West. This was perhaps hastened by Mahomet, a man who possessed an exalted imagination and an instinctive thirst for dominion over his fellow beings.

Mahomet was born at Mecca, in the latter part of the sixth century. He was left an orphan without fortune, and became a travelling merchant. He studied the sciences taught by the Christians and the Jews who were dispersed in various parts of Syria, and distinguished himself in one of those wars which often occur between different tribes of Arabs. He afterwards married a rich widow, and became distinguished for his science as well as his riches and his bravery. He gave himself out as a prophet sent by God to re-establish the ancient religion of the Patriarchs, and added, that he was favoured by frequent revelations from the angel Gabriel. His near relations were his first disciples, but he was persecuted by his tribe. He escaped to Medina, where the inhabitants embraced his doctrines. This event forms the original era of the Mussulmans' creed. It is termed the *Hegyra*, or the era of the flight.

The eloquence of Mahomet, and, perhaps, more than that, the promise of plunder, soon obtained numerous proselytes to his doctrine. By the aid of his warfaring partisans, he successively

defeated all those who opposed his influence and his doctrines, and in a very short time he conquered the whole of Arabia, and penetrated into the Grecian territories. He had become sufficiently powerful to command princes to adopt his creed; but at the age of 61, and in the zenith of his career, he was destroyed by poison.

After his death, his partisans hesitated in the choice of a successor; at length, however, Abubeker, one of his fathers-in-law, was preferred to Ali, his son-in-law. Abubeker, the first caliph or vicar, published the Coran or sacred book of the Mussulman, containing his precepts and the revelations received from the angel Gabriel. The principal dogmas are similar to, and probably borrowed from, the Jewish and Christian religion: unity of the Deity, belief in angels and in the prophets, of whom Mahomet is the chief; the immortality of the soul, and the resurrection of the body: predestination, or the inevitable fatality of all human actions: prayer and fasting are recommended, and polygamy is permitted. By the doctrines of fatality, he induced his followers to be reckless of life and fate, and excited their imagination by promising a future life of voluptuous pleasure.

The zeal of his successors increased the enthusiasm of his partisans, whose pretensions extended to the conquest of the whole world. Syria was invaded by order of Abubeker, and conquered from the Greeks by Kaled, under the vicarage of Omar, the third caliph. Amrou, another general of Omar, conquered Palestine, invaded Alexandria, destroyed its libraries, and reduced Egypt under the vicarage of Othman: and while Abdallah, at the head of 40,000 men, advancing towards Africa, defeated a large army of Greeks, commanded by the Prefect Gregory, near Tripoli; Zaid, another Arabian chief, reduced Persia under the Mahometan yoke, and annihilated the dynasty of the Sassanides (665). After the death of Othman, who was murdered, Ali was elected caliph by the chiefs of Islamism. Under his reign, Moaviah revolted, and gave him battle; but not being able to conquer in the field, he stimulated a fanatic to assassinate him. He then usurped the title of head of the faithful, and made it hereditary in his own family; and hence arose a schism in the Church, divided into the sects of Ali and Omar. Moaviah sent his son Yesid against Constantinople, which was six times in danger, but the Greeks repelled the enemy, and saved their capital (year 680). After the death of Moaviah, the Mussulman Empire was, for some time, in a state of anarchy, but, at length, order was restored, and Africa was converted to Islamism.

If we take a view of the world as it appears in the year 800, or the days of Charlemagne, the period when modern history is generally understood to begin, we shall find that those parts of it which had hitherto fallen under the notice of the historians we are acquainted with, were generally shared among three principal empires: Mahometans, Christians, and Saracens.

The dominions of the Saracens comprehended Asia and Africa, from the Ganges to the Atlantic: Spain was also a part of their empire. The western parts of the Roman Empire were subject to Charlemagne. Greece, Asia Minor, and the provinces adjoining

Italy, were the possessions of the reduced Eastern Empire of Rome under Greek emperors.

It is hardly necessary to observe that the doctrines of Mahomet were finally professed in the dominions of the Saracens, and those of Christianity in the Eastern and Western Empires; but we may observe that Islamism is spiritually and materially, or doctrinally and geographically, placed between the extreme East and the extreme West of the globe, participating in the doctrines of both Christianity and Heathenism; and this fact may furnish matter for reflection with regard to universal Providence. War and bloodshed was not less frequent among the Christians than among the Mahometans, and, on the death of Charlemagne, the Empire, being divided among his children, fell into a state of anarchy. The British Isles, divided into many states, whether under the Saxon Heptarchy, or the ancient princes, were peculiarly subject to intestine divisions. The heptarchy being dissolved in 827, England was reduced under one head in King Egbert. In this infant state of the European powers, the contests of neighbouring states were incessant and calamitous. The depredations made on them by the Danes and Normans were wide and destructive, and the bickerings between the powerful barons and their sovereigns frequent and bloody.

Perhaps a more calamitous period than this is not to be met with in history. Mahomet had broken down the altars of idolatry, abolished their sacrifices, and taught the people to believe in the unity of a Supreme Being; but he had set himself up as a greater prophet than the meek and lowly Jesus, preached persecution and conquest to his deluded followers, and was in himself a dreadful example of violence.

When continual divisions, both in the Christian and the Mahometan world, seemed to threaten the destruction of the whole human race, a new contest arose, which resolved the different contending powers into two grand parties. Palestine was held in veneration by the Christian world: they called this territory the Holy Land, and their struggles for the possession of it were deemed Holy Wars.

The Caliph Omar, successor of Mahomet, had formerly invaded this country, and taken it from the Eastern Empire; and the Christian powers combined to retake it from the Saracens. On this occasion, multitudes of adventurers from the several kingdoms of Europe flocked together to partake in the holy expedition, or crusade. They attacked the Saracens with impetuous fury, and were opposed with similar spirit. In these conflicts myriads were slain, and few of those who left Europe ever returned to their native countries; but the enthusiasm of those ages was not easily subdued; and one crusade after another was undertaken with zeal. Jerusalem, which had been rebuilt by the Emperor Adrian, was successively in the hands of the different parties, till the Christians were finally driven out. But, while the Saracens and Europeans were consuming their strength in the small province of Palestine, the more Eastern nations of Asia seemed threatened with total annihilation.

About the time that John was king of England (13th century), the Tartars, of whom we have yet heard little, began, under Jenghis Khan, and afterwards under Hulaku and Timur Beck, or Tamerlane, successively to make the most destructive havoc of the human race. Jenghis Khan, perhaps the greatest and most bloody conqueror that ever lived, had been a prince of one of the small states of Eastern Tartary, and was deprived of his inheritance at the age of thirteen; but he recovered it at the age of forty. He reduced the rebels, and began his cruelties by throwing their seventy chiefs into as many caldrons of boiling water. Nothing now stands before him; he conquers the neighbouring princes; subdues and kills the Great Khan himself, to whom his own and other states had been subordinate. He extends his conquests over the nations of Asia, from remote Tartary and the confines of China, to Russia on the West, and southwards to the Persian shores. His design, at first, seems to be the total extermination of the people he subdues, and to repeople their countries, with his Mogul Tartars; accordingly, with fell and fixed resolve, he employs his army, after a victory, in beheading 100,000 prisoners at once. He and his followers were Deists. It was a long time before they heard of such a thing as a temple, or any particular place dedicated to worship; and when it was first mentioned to Jenghis Khan, he is said to have treated the notion with ridicule and contempt. Well would it have been if the conqueror in these speculative refinements had given up to the worship that is performed in the temple of the heart; but from the dreadful resolution of the sovereign in favour of his Deity, and the contempt he showed for the manners of the vanquished, there seems reason to believe that his massacres, as well as those of Mahomet, were, in fact, persecutions on account of a different religious profession. His destruction of the human race is not to be paralleled in the annals of any other nation. To give an account of the numbers slain during his six years' reign, will appear almost useless when it is considered how incapable we generally are of forming adequate conceptions of things we have never seen. We may easily form clear ideas concerning thousands of people; but fourteen millions four hundred and seventy thousand, the number supposed to have been killed by the destructive Jenghis Khan, seems too prodigious for conception.

After the death of this destroyer of the human race, the Tartars continued to extend their conquests, until, under Hulaku, they put an end to the empire of the Saracens, by taking their city Bagdat, and then became masters of almost all Asia.

The family of Jenghis Khan had become extinct, and the empire was divided in many small states, continually at war with each other,—when one of the princes, Timur Beck, or Tamerlane, in the fourteenth century, copying the example of Jenghis, reduced them under his own dominion: spread his conquests over Asia, and even took and pillaged the city of Moscow in Russia.

The commotion of the Tartars in the East, had driven from their confines the inhabitants of Turkestan; and while the rest of the world were fiercely destroying each other, these vagrant Turks

seem to have been acquiring possessions and power. Renowned for their courage and impetuosity in war, they were at first employed only as mercenary troops in the armies of contending powers; but this did not suit them long: they soon commenced conquering for themselves, and reduced the Saracens, their former masters, as well as the Persians, under their own dominion. On the other side of the Hellespont, they were formed into a nation with Persia, having Bythinia for their capital, under their leader, Othman, one of the greatest warriors and politicians of the age; and hence they were called Ottomans.

In his western excursions, Tamerlane found this people besieging the remains of the Eastern Roman Empire, then pent up in the city of Constantinople.

If the profession of Christianity could not screen the Europeans from wars and wranglings among themselves, the doctrines of Mahomet were far from preventing his followers from destroying each other, among whom were now the Persians, Turks, and Tartars, as well as the Saracens and Arabians.

Timur attacked the Ottomans with his usual ardour, cut their army to pieces, and carried away captive their Sultan Bajazet, bound in an iron cage. The empire of the Tartars, however, soon after the death of the conqueror became again divided into a number of states, while the Turks, recruiting their strength, renewed the attack on the Greeks or Eastern Roman Empire, in the year 1452, subdued them, took the city of Constantinople, and there fixed the seat of their government. In the beginning of the sixteenth century, their dominions included Greece, Asia Minor, Palestine, Syria, with Africa from the Red Sea along the Mediterranean to the Atlantic Ocean. Thus fell, about the middle of the 15th century, the last feeble remains of the once great and imperial Rome; and the empire which had heretofore made the nations of the earth to tremble, bowed at the feet of the vagabond and overbearing Turks.

It is not surprising that civilization should have made so little progress during these ages of destruction, in which humanity, in quest of useful discoveries, had constantly to wade through streams of human blood. And if we turn from these dreadful scenes of carnage in Europe, Asia and Africa, to see what progress civilization is making in the newly discovered hemisphere of America, we shall not find a less melancholy scene of madness and destruction.

The fanatical tenets of pseudo-Christians induced them to consider those nations who were not of their profession, as a neglected race whom they might subdue and enslave, in order to convert them. On the discovery of America, millions of human beings were put to the sword by civilized Europeans, who hunted them down like wild beasts, and threw their bodies to the hungry dogs. It was familiar to the early adventurers, during their barbarous expeditions of conquest, to speak of giving or lending the carcase of an Indian till more could be obtained; and by a cruelty still more oppressive, and from the same insatiable thirst for gold which had produced their immediate slaughter, the wretched Indians were exterminated

in still greater numbers: they were made to work mines, and fell victims to privation, fatigue, and the deleterious vapours underground. Their delicate frames, heretofore easily supplied with food from the kindly soil which they inhabited, soon sunk, never more to rise, under the hardships to which they were reduced by their inhuman conquerors. The springs of life were thus sapped by unrelenting tyranny, and population was checked to a degree which rendered the country waste and desolate, until the insatiable thirst for gold defeated its own purpose. But, it was not to be cut short in its diabolical career, so long as there remained on earth a human being to enslave. To supply the place of the exterminated Indians, the unfortunate inhabitants of Africa were torn from their native shores, and reduced to slavery in foreign climes. The destructive torch of avarice was kindled amongst the African chiefs, who were induced to make war on each other, that they might capture their brethren and sell them as slaves. Towns were burnt, and millions were slain in war, in order to obtain prisoners for sale. Parents, children, husbands, wives, friends, and companions, were torn from each other, branded like beasts of the field, whipped and driven to labour without hope of rest or reward; and all this to pamper the luxury of exterminating demons, who call themselves Christians, and who, forsooth, under the pretext of religion, add insult to oppression, by feigning solicitude for the fate of those unfortunate souls in the next world, which they torture so cruelly and unrelentingly in this.

But it would be useless to multiply beyond measure the examples of conquest, spoliation and injustice in modern history, to show the powerful influence of iniquity in retarding the progress of useful discoveries; what we have said already with regard to the inventions of science, is enough to show that nearly all the real advantages of modern civilization, over that of ancient Greece, have been acquired to humanity within the last three centuries. Those who are familiar with history, will easily appreciate the difficulties with which the spirit of industry, peace, freedom, and improvement has been beset in its progress of acquiring power and influence during this period; and the resistance which tyrannical barons and feudal institutions constantly opposed to the commons who fought the battle of freedom and industry, with admirable intrepidity, until the policy of fusion recently united the commercial and the feudal aristocracies, in one league of privileged oppression. (This fusion seems at present to be incomplete, but it will not be long in peril from the Free Trade agitation and the Corn monopoly.) The oceans of blood which deluged Europe during the French Revolution, are still swelling in our imagination, and the threatening attitudes of starving liberty in the populous regions of industry, are ominous signs of future calamity. If the influence of external war is less to be feared in modern states, the vehemence of revolutionary agitation is more terrible than ever in its periodic ebullitions, and the dangers of anarchy are imminent in all the states of Europe; in Great Britain we fear they are insuperable. A civil war, a national bankruptcy, and the necessity

of defending India against the powerful legions of Russia, are almost inevitable calamities which threaten ruin to England, and which, we fear, she will neither be able to avert nor overcome. Nothing less, we are convinced, than the miraculous intervention of associative combination, can save the civilized portion of humanity from the pending dangers of conflicting interests, and the consequent sacrifice of human life. But, as those who are not accustomed to reflect on the progress already made by modern civilization, are apt to think that every thing is impossible which they do not at once conceive, we will take a general glance at the origin of modern improvements, as this method, we hope, may serve to familiarize the mind with the ideas of continual progress, and the necessity of advancing, until happiness can be obtained for all the human race; or, at least, until physical want and undue privilege become mere words in the annals of humanity.

When the rude northern warriors had poured forth like a deluge from their native wilds, and taken possession of the more cultivated territories of the South of Europe, in addition to the northern parts of the continent of Africa, the change of their affairs arising from their new acquisitions, necessarily modified their former regulations. Heretofore, a nation or tribe could wander about as inclination or the prospects of chase might direct, but now it became necessary to settle. Every individual was occupied by the concerns of his family, and only appeared in public affairs when the exigencies of state and the call of his chief required his presence.

Formerly, valour and cunning were the only objects of public esteem and confidence; but now, other distinctions besides those of personal abilities, mark out the individual for respect and adulation. Property stamps the title of lord upon a few, and its absence marks out the rest of mankind to do them homage.

Amongst the Goths, tracts of their new possessions were allotted to those chiefs who had distinguished themselves in the conquest, and these were called proper or real possessions; the rest was reserved for common use, and was termed fief land: it was committed to the charge of the sovereign chief, for public administration and disposal. This was parcelled out in different portions at different times, and granted as fees during the pleasure of the sovereign, on condition of furnishing him with a certain military force, whenever the exigencies of state required it. The great feudal possessors disposed of these districts in smaller grants to their vassals or dependents, on similar conditions; and, while cordiality and mutual confidence reigned between the sovereigns and their vassals, the great barons, and between these and their minor vassals, the feudal system was a powerful federation for the practice of war; but it was fraught with the seeds of intestine division, which afterwards broke out with great violence, and rendered Europe one continued scene of calamity and desolation. The feudal lords soon extorted from the sovereign a confirmation for life of those lands which had been entrusted to them during the pleasure of royalty; and, not contented with this extension of

privilege, they succeeded in having them converted into hereditary possessions, subject only to fees and military dues to the crown.

Private wars became frequent among the great barons, and they summoned their vassals to their respective standards, without consulting the interests of the crown; strong castles and fortified habitations were every where erected to protect them from the attacks of their neigbours, and each prince or baron became a petty sovereign, almost independent of his superior lord. In the tenth century, it was customary for these barons to ransom all the people who passed near their castles, by establishing a regular toll for passing on the highway; not because they kept them in repair, for they did no such thing, but because they thought proper to adopt this mode of spoliating travellers. Each feudal chief led his own followers to the field of battle, in time of war; and, in time of peace, administered justice within his own district, and according to arbitrary laws of his own framing. A few imperfect, traditionary, and local customs served to guide the barons in their dispensations of justice. Disputed points were often referred to the decision of a combat between plantiffs and defendants; and culprits, in order to prove their innocence or confirm their guilt, were obliged to plunge their arms in boiling water, to lift red-hot irons with the naked hand, walk blindfolded and barefooted over burning ploughshares, or keep the arm extended without any support for a full hour before a crucifix. These dreadful experiments were called appeals to heaven, and entered upon with great formality of devotion. Whoever escaped unhurt, or proved victorious, was pronounced to be acquitted by the judgment of God. This was called the *ordeal*, which, with the judicial combat, prevailed in the courts of Europe from the ninth to the fifteenth century.

The Christian religion, though generally professed, was not able to prevent these calamitous proceedings. The nobles, or barons, superior to all restraint, harassed each other with perpetual wars, oppressed their vassals, and often humbled or insulted their sovereign. And, yet with all their power and state, these mighty barons could neither read nor write: so little remained of literature in Europe, that, when a grant was to be confirmed by charter, they had recourse to clerks or learned men (so termed because they could read and write) to negotiate this important business; and, as a proof of sincerity in the stipulation, the baron or the sovereign solemnly bound himself to fulfil the engagement by marking the sign of the cross, where his name was subscribed by the clerk. This custom is observed by the illiterate at the present day, and hence subscribing an article is termed signing.

Those vestiges of ancient literature which escaped the first fury of the ignorant Goths were exposed, during this period, to a second chance of destruction. The Saracens having obtained possession of Egypt, and deprived the Europeans of the papyrus, (which served as paper before the modern inventions of paper-making,) and the scarcity of parchment in those times, caused many ancient writings to be erased in order to furnish sheets for new composi-

tion. We may here observe, that the art of paper-making is an invention of the fourteenth century.

It was in the dreary times of the middle ages that the crusades commenced, which were instrumental in changing the manners and the institutions of Europe. Before this period, the newly established nations of Europe had but little intercourse with each other, but they were then brought together in a holy league against the infidels in Palestine. Unrestrained by general laws, and unacquainted with commerce, the people had been harassed with intestine broils, which prevented refinement and softness of manners from gaining admission amongst them; but this fortuitous event had an immense influence on the destiny of Europe. Impelled by a religious zeal, all the nations of Europe, and individuals of every class, were engaged in the conquest of Palestine. Not only the turbulent barons with their martial followers, allured by the boldness of a romantic enterprise, but men in the more humble and pacific stations of life, ecclesiastics of every order, and even women and children, engaged with emulation in an undertaking which was deemed sacred and meritorious. Six millions of persons assumed the cross, the distinguishing badge of the zealous adventurers; and the endless disputes which had stained the different parts of Europe with blood, were now absorbed in one common cause.

The first efforts of valour, animated by enthusiasm, were irresistible; Syria, Palestine, and part of Asia Minor were wrested from the Mahometans, and the banner of the cross was displayed on Mount Sion.

While we reflect with concern on the mistaken zeal of the adventurers, who, from a partial regard for a particular spot of ground, could devote the lives of thousands to the sword, and, perhaps, implant in the minds of the Mussulmans an indelible prejudice against the most holy and peaceful religion, we may, perhaps, feel affection and respect for the religious deference of the first leader of these expeditions. Godfrey of Bouillon, a young and valorous prince, at the head of the numerous armies of Europe, having taken possession of Jerusalem, in the midst of youth and military splendour, and the profusion of honours heaped on him by his adherents, declared "that he would not wear a diadem in that city where his Saviour had been crowned with thorns."

When the crusades had united the different nations of Europe in one common cause, their mutual intercourse naturally circulated in the western part of the continent, what was found remaining of art and magnificence in the East. The first rendezvous of the crusaders was commonly in Italy, where Venice, Genoa, Pisa, and other cities began to apply themselves to commerce, and made some advances towards wealth and refinement. The adventurers embarked at these places, and, landing in Dalmatia, pursued their route by land to Constantinople. This magnificent city flourished greatly in commerce: it was then the only mart in Europe for the commodities of the East Indies, and curious manufactures were carried on in its precincts. Again, Italy copied Greece, and disse-

minated its arts over the rest of Europe, when the Eastern Empire was reduced under the dominion of the Turks.

When the attention of Europe was turned to the recovery of the Holy Land out of the hands of the infidels, it would have been accounted flagrantly impious to raise commotions at home; and that was the cause of a general peace in Europe, which served to foster the rising genius of art and manufacture. The turbulent barons were engaged in these remote enterprises, and many of them sold their patrimonial estates, in order to obtain the means of undertaking their expensive expeditions of crusade. These were acquired by successful industry, which became rich when it was no longer impoverished and impeded by civil war. The sovereigns were also enabled to regain their power during the absence of the powerful barons, and by making common cause with commercial and industrious cities, they succeeded in reducing the jurisdiction of the nobility. The kings, during this period, granted charters of freedom to cities, and formed them into corporations, with the privilege of a decisive voice in enacting laws. The manumission of husbandmen from the debasement of personal slavery, was a later refinement in the manners and institutions of Europe, and which, though almost universally obtained in the most civilized nations of the present day, is not yet adopted in the northern parts of Europe: in Russia and other northern nations, the husbandman is still a slave. The humane spirit of Christianity, and the rising power of peaceful industry, struggled hard with the manners of feudal despotism, in order to introduce the practice of manumission. The formalities of liberating slaves were executed with great solemnity in places of worship, and were considered highly meritorious and acceptable to heaven. At this period, the Roman Catholic Church was the great benefactor of humanity. The arts and sciences were cultivated by its ministers, and the poor were more or less protected from the violence of feudal injustice. That style of architecture, which is commonly termed Gothic, was either introduced into Europe, and improved under the auspices of the Church, or entirely invented by religious inspiration. In fact, almost all the advantages of modern civilization are indebted to religion for protection at this period, which may be deemed the first dawning of freedom and science upon industry.

In the feudal times the numbers of slaves in all the nations of Europe were prodigious. They composed the greatest part of the people, and their condition was extremely mortifying and oppressive. Distinguished from freemen by a peculiar dress, and obliged to shave their heads, they were every moment reminded of their inferior condition. The life of a slave was deemed of so little value, that a very trifling compensation atoned for taking it away. On very slight suspicion they were put to the rack. Before the regular establishment of royal courts, their masters had absolute power over their persons, and could punish them with death, without the intervention of the law. Themselves and their offspring were equally at the disposal of their masters, who could sell them like cattle or any other property: and many of these customs pre-

vailed until a very recent date. Indeed, they still prevail in Russia; and the descendants of slavery in England and the refined nations of the Continent, look down with haughty contempt on their unfortunate brethren of the North, instead of aiding them to obtain freedom.

When the Northern barbarians embraced the profession of Christianity, they held the priests in the same veneration as they had formerly held the Druids in their forests. What little remained of the laws and the learning of the Romans was in the possession of ecclesiastics, who formed a regular system of jurisprudence, which, in contradistinction to the proceedings of the civil courts, was called the Canon Law. The arbitrary decisions of the martial tribunals of the barons, from which there was no appeal, contrasted with the mild equity of the proceedings in ecclesiastical courts, established in orderly gradation, permitting appeal from one to another, until a cause was determined by that authority held to be supreme in the Church. It was this contrast which first intimated to the people the difference between arbitrary and regular laws.

The sovereigns aimed at regular national codes, and established ambulatory royal tribunals, encouraging appeal from the arbitrary courts of barons, which, by degrees, sunk into contempt, while the royal courts were held at fixed places, and stated seasons. Statutes were enacted for abolishing the practice of private wars; by degrees, the judicial combat and trial by ordeal were laid aside; and by the regularity of their proceedings, and the comparative equity of their decisions, the royal courts became the objects of public confidence.

Towards the middle of the twelfth century, a copy of Justinian's pandects was accidentally discovered in Italy. Men of letters studied the new science with eagerness, and were rewarded for their labours with the honours which had heretofore been considered due to military valour only. In a few years, professors of civil law were appointed to teach publicly in most of the countries of Europe. The dignity of knighthood (then deemed a distinction superior to royalty, and which monarchs were proud to receive at the hands of their private gentlemen of superior years and reputatation,) was alike conferred on the warrior and on the man of science.

Though the discovery of the Roman pandects, and the institution of a science of legislation based thereon, are generally deemed fortunate events in modern civilization, our opinion is, that they were the very reverse, and that they only served to enslave the minds of legislators to the superannuated codes of a depraved people, instead of allowing modern genius to progress naturally in legislative developement, proportionate to its progress in science and industry. This system of adopting or imitating laws which had been made for other periods, and social institutions of a different nature, only prevented common sense from inventing laws and regulations exactly in character with the new social condition of freedom and industry. The genius of modern society, under

the benign influence of Christian principles, is diametrically opposed to the social condition of slavery and piracy which were common under the beclouded influence of Pagan mythology and Polytheism. But, notwithstanding this evil influence, society continued to progress, and we have every reason to hope that superannuated barbarian codes will soon be totally consigned to oblivion.

It was in those days that "benefit of clergy" was instituted. The book was handed to the convicted felon to read before the Court. If he performed this, the clerk pronounced aloud, "*Legit ut clericus,*" (he reads well, or like a clergyman,) and the criminal was acquitted. This was certainly an abusive privilege, but it served as a powerful stimulus to study, in order to obtain the privilege or benefit of clergy.

When the power of domineering nobles was not reduced under the influence of laws, their respective castles were regarded as seats of generous hospitality, or dreaded as dens of violence and oppression, as the respective dispositions of the owners were deemed mild or ferocious. In those days, the knights turned out in succour of distress. It is well known that the various orders of knighthood were first established on different points between Europe and the Holy Land, for the purpose of protecting pilgrims from the treachery of pirates; and, that after the crusades, they continued their institutions under different forms, for the generous defence of unprotected innocence. The same spirit of enterprise which had prompted some to take up arms in defence of the oppressed pilgrims in Palestine, incited others to declare themselves the patrons and avengers of injured innocence at home; and, when the Mahometans had prevailed in the contests for Jerusalem, and driven the Christians out of Asia, the knights of Palestine became *errant:* they wandered about in quest of opportunities for asserting the rights of the feeble and oppressed, orphans, widows, ecclesiastics, and all those who could not bear arms in their own defence. Their romantic and hazardous enterprises were considered valiant and pious, and obtained universal respect for their heroes. The tables of lords and sovereigns were open to the adventurous knights, who also won the company and esteem of the women. Valour, humanity, courtesy, justice, and honour were the characteristic qualities of chivalry, and their influence on the progress of civilization was more powerful and beneficial than we are apt to suppose, notwithstanding the extravagance of sentimental enthusiasm. Knighthood was conferred on the brave and the virtuous, with great solemnity, in places of public worship, by the hands of kings, who were then deemed the fountains of honour. Kings rewarded heroes with their countenance, and adorned their shields with new achievements. By these armorial bearings families were distinguished. Devices, emblematic of the qualities of the hero, or expressive of his feats, began to be multiplied; but heraldry has since degenerated into a system for flattering pride, and marking out unmerited distinctions among privileged classes of society.

Few marks of learning adorn the Gothic escutcheon; it exhibits

no great show of geometrical lines, or emblems of science. Chivalry, in which valour, gallantry, and religion were so strangely blended together, was better acquainted with crosses, croslets, shells, ribbons, fillets, locks of hair, and other little presents of their ladies, with animals of chase, and instruments of war, than with matters of science. A monkish figure, with a book, or some childish device, seems to be the grandest monument they were able to erect, in the system of heraldry, to the honour of learning. Their ancestors used to wear the skins of animals round their shoulders, and adorn their helmets with them; hence the crest, and the furs or drapery hanging round the escutcheon. The supporter of the shield was the hero who bore it on his arm in the field: he might be strong, like a bull, and the family of his wife as fierce as lions, and equally concerned with himself, to support the escutcheon unstained. This system of honour was evidently based on what the phrenologist would call the predominance of the animal faculties. Heralds have fixed two supporters to the shield; sometimes beasts or birds, and sometimes human figures. The feudal soldiers used to fall on in battle with a shout of some sentence, and hence the motto in coats of arms.

When the Europeans had become so far changed in their manners as to be capable of relishing improvements in science and letters, the languages of the ancients were studied with avidity. Schools were erected in cathedrals and monasteries, and the learned were rewarded with lucrative employment, and academic honours in colleges and courts. In places of worship the Latin tongue was generally used. The modern languages of Europe were yet rude and uncultivated. The works of the learned were written in Latin, which was the language of science all over Europe. In those days, genius, unclogged with erudition, was shut out from the temple of science; pedantry was mistaken for wit, and a memory loaded with arbitrary rules, for a mind fraught with valuable information.

It was in the fourteenth century that the nations of Europe applied themselves to the cultivation of their own languages, and the study of mathematical and physical sciences. They soon made improvements in science, and pursued their inquiries far beyond the conceptions of the philosophers of Greece and Rome Chemistry, commenced by the Arabians, laid open many of the minute works of the creation; the invention of gunpowder quite altered the tactics of war, and rendered it, in many cases, less destructive; but, besides lessening the work of destruction, it was of positive utility in facilitating the laborious works of the mine. The fifteenth century was also remarkable for the discoveries of printing with moveable type, and engraving on copper. During this period, commerce underwent considerable revolutions. When Constantinople, the general mart of Europe, had fallen into the hands of the Turks, the trade and manufactures of the Greeks devolved upon their neighbours, the Italians and the Lombards; who, in addition to the Jews, settled in different countries, and carried on the commerce of the world. The rich productions of India were brought to the ports of Egypt, and thence they were taken and distributed

over Europe, principally by the Lombards. Those people who inhabit the shores of the Baltic and the coasts of the Northern seas, distinguished themselves early as enterprising maritime nations. Their depredations at different periods, under the names of Danes and Normans, have been severely felt in Great Britain, but they at length became benefactors to humanity, by their superior activity in commercial enterprise.

About the middle of the thirteenth century, the spirit of commerce awoke in the North. To defend themselves against the pirates who infested their seas, the cities of Lubeck and Hamburgh entered into a league of mutual defence, and in a short time eighty of the most considerable cities, scattered through those vast countries stretching from the coast of the Baltic to Cologne on the Rhine, acceded to the confederacy. This was called the *Hanseatic League*, and the cities which formed it were called *Hanse Towns*.

This confederacy of commercial towns became so formidable, that its alliance was courted, and its enmity dreaded, by the greatest monarchs of Europe. Its chief members formed the first systematic plan of commerce known in the middle ages, and conducted it by common laws, enacted in their general assemblies. These regulations were in harmony with the spirit of the age, and though they were made by merchants, they were superior to the sophisticated legislation of Roman codes: their only defect was a bearing on monopoly, which is the natural tendency of commercial anarchy. These merchants supplied the rest of Europe with naval stores, and established staples in different towns, the most eminent of which was Bruges in Flanders, where they carried on a regular commerce on the most extensive scale. There the Lombards brought the productions of India and the manufactures of Italy, to exchange them for the more bulky but not less useful productions of the North. The Hanseatic merchants received the cargoes from the Lombards, and disposed of them in the ports of the Baltic, or carried them up the great river, into the interior parts of Germany.

As Bruges became the centre of communication between the Lombard and Hanseatic merchants, the Flemings traded with both to an extent and advantage which spread among them a general habit of industry; and which long rendered Flanders and the adjacent provinces the most opulent, populous and well cultivated countries of Europe.

By encouraging Flemish artisans to settle in his dominions, and by many wise regulations in favour of trade, Edward the Third gave a spirited birth to the woollen manufactures of England, and first turned the active and enterprising genius of the people towards those arts which have raised the English to the highest rank amongst commercial nations.

In the latter part of the fifteenth century, the Portuguese discovered a passage to India by the Cape of Good Hope, and about the same time the Spaniards, under the adventurous genius of Columbus, in attempting to discover a passage to India by the West, fell in with America, and called it the New World, or the

West Indies, to distinguish it from India in the East. From this period the Western nations of Europe have increased in political influence, improved in arts and sciences, and flourished in commerce and industry. They acquired possessions in the opposite quarters of the earth, and became acquainted with every climate in the world.

It is perhaps owing to commerce, more than to any other pursuit, that modern Europe has advanced to the highest improvements ever yet attained in arts and sciences. It has found markets for the ingenious productions of the artisan, and thus encouraged invention and industry; it has rewarded the sailor for his toils and his perils, and the man of science for his useful researches and discoveries. Mechanical inventions are stimulated by the encouragements of commerce, and useful contrivances substitute the force of the elements for that of human labour. No longer, as in ancient times, need "two women be grinding at the mill, bruising corn to powder between a couple of stones or flags moved by sheer hand labour." Rivers and brooks of water are arrested in their progress, and made to perform that operation, so painful to human labour. Indeed almost all the modern improvements in science and industry may be said to have been called into existence by the spirit of commerce, in opposition to the spirit of war. Commercial war, however, is now as rife as military war was formerly, and not less dangerous to progress in society; but we shall have occasion soon to show where unlimited freedom of commerce is highly beneficial, and where it degenerates into dangerous anarchy. By contrasting the history of the middle ages with the present advanced state of science and industry, we are forcibly struck by the immense superiority of modern science, and a very slight degree of reflection shows that all our present advantages are due to the creative powers of genius. Whence it follows, that the destructive ingenuity of war and spoliation is the evil spirit of humanity, and that its fostering spirit is productive industry. In accordance with this principle, it follows that a political system, in order to be consistent with the spirit of social improvement, should honour the efforts of peace and production, more than those of war and destruction, and that politicians should study the natural laws of social progress and productive interests, as well as that of military and protective power. In the present state of things, we are aware of the necessity of destructive force in order to protect productive industry; nor do we complain of this state, so long as it is inevitable: we merely wish to point out the inconsistency of allowing anarchy to reign in the political organization of productive and distributive economy, when the whole strength of civilized nations depends thereon. While conquest and spoliation were the chief objects of political existence, we can easily understand why the organization of destructive force should be the chief study of princes and of politicians, but when war and spoliation are become inferior and even odious objects of policy, on which industrious nations can no longer depend for political existence, it is strange that statesmen should still continue to concentrate their attention

on military organization, for the mere protection of feudal privilege, and to the manifest disadvantage of productive power and superiority; instead of labouring to prevent bankruptcy, fraud, and collision in the one, as they prevent anarchy, confusion, and mutiny in the other.

If the political principles of conquest are become less predominant in modern, than they were in ancient policy, and if the real progress of civilization has been less exposed to external impediment than it was formerly, still it has not been free from the depredations of war and oppression: contending interests have still desolated humanity, and numerous pretexts have been imagined to continue the destructive work of war. Diplomatic hypocrisy has been added to the brutal force of barbarity, and this constitutes the basis of progress from ancient to modern civilization. The false pretexts of religion, honour, and justice, have modified the undisguised principles of conquest; and the new science of diplomacy, by retarding and slackening the operations of war, has gained time for industry to breathe, and hence the superiority of modern society: but it still remains for real religion, morality, and industry, to crush the head of the destructive monster, and render the animal ferocity of a military profession as dishonourable as diplomatic duplicity is in itself contemptible.

Religion has been made the grand pretext for injustice and oppression in modern times; and intolerance has been almost as destructive to humanity, as the undisguised barbarity of conquest was in former ages.

The mere destroyers of the human race, the ravagers of towns, and the desolators of nations, excite terror in their day, and spread extensive ruin, which it may take ages to repair. Such have been Alexander the Great, Jenghis Khan, and Tamerlane; such have been, in different degrees, all the warriors from Nimrod to the present day: but when, like the Jews of old, and Mahomet of modern date, they add dogmas and ritual observances to the rueful deeds of arms; when they mingle superstition with the horrors and violence of war; when they establish the idea among the people that they are the peculiar favourites of Heaven, the orthodox, the faithful; that the other races of mankind are infidels and unbelievers, whom they may not consider as children of the same father, as brethren of the same family, the mischief produced by these pretended favourites of Heaven baffles all description. In their own lifetime, these most mighty hunters set one tribe of men against another, and the battle is continued through ages of bloodshed and desolation. Children are nursed up in the prejudices of their fathers, instead of learning the arts of peace and the principles of true religion. Mutual strifes and animosity, prejudice and bigotry, convert this world into a wilderness: real religion is banished from the heart of man, and superstition takes its place to produce confusion in society, instead of unity and happiness.

In modern history, the abuses of the Church of Rome have rekindled the flames of superstition and intolerance; and the Church of England has been hardly less guilty than the Church of Rome

in raising and fomenting war amongst professing Christians. Speaking of persecution for the sake of religion, in the reign of Elizabeth, Doctor Robertson thus expresses himself:—

"To the disgrace of Christians, the sacred rights of conscience and private judgment, as well as the charity and mutual forbearance suitable to the mild spirit of the religion which they professed, were in that age little understood. Not only the idea of toleration, but even the word itself, in the sense now affixed to it, was then unknown. Every Church claimed a right to employ the hand of power for the protection of truth, and the extirpation of error. The laws of her kingdom armed Elizabeth with ample power for this purpose, and she was abundantly disposed to exercise it with full vigour. . . . . A new tribunal was established under the title of the 'High Commission for Ecclesiastical Affairs,' whose powers and mode of procedure were hardly less odious, or less hostile to the principles of justice, than those of the Spanish Inquisition."

The dreadful wars and persecutions, for religion's sake, which have distracted Europe since the time of Martin Luther, are familiar to the minds of every body; but every body is not sufficiently convinced of the sordid motives of priests and princes in fomenting these wars in favour of their own ambition, and personal aggrandizement, and their recklessness of the real interests of the people. When external depredation could no longer pamper the ambition of despots, they ransomed their own subjects, under the pretext of extirpating heresy, but, in reality, for confiscating the property of heretics: and thus hypocrisy was added to barbarity to continue the work of destruction. In modern warfare, bravery and spoliation have been replaced by intolerance and confiscation; but humanity has still been scourged by blood and devastation. Though toleration has now taken root in religion, we have still to destroy the spirit of intolerance in politics. Much has been done by the benign spirit of science and industry, to weaken the malignant power of despotism, but much remains yet to be done in order to rid us of the monster, The rapacity of ambition can no longer feed on foreign conquest, nor on confiscation for the sake of doctrine: its only field of operation is to ransom industry by monopoly, fraudulent privilege, and systematic hypocrisy. The only war which threatens society at present, is a war between laborious industry and privileged monopoly: and the only means of preserving peace between these interests is to harmonize them in association.

We shall conclude this paper by contrasting the condition of the great bulk of the people in antiquity, with the condition of the labouring population in modern civilization, and infer from the progress already made, the possibility, and even the necessity of continuing to advance, in order to avoid revolutionary agitation, and premature political dissolution.

Besides the bond-servants we read of in antiquity, who found protection in the household of the patriarchs, and such as sold all they had, their lands and themselves to Pharaoh, for corn in the

time of famine, when Joseph was governor of Egypt, we read of slaves of other descriptions at very early periods. It was generally customary with the nations of antiquity to lead their prisoners of war into captivity, and these, with their offspring, were detained in servitude. Thus we see, that from the beginning, slavery was the offspring of violence and oppression. The Goths, also, in later days, after the subversion of the Roman Empire, imposed the severity of servitude on the people whom they conquered. It is generally believed that this class of slaves had its origin in the days of Nimrod, and the horrid practice of kidnapping, and selling the human species, appears to be of equal antiquity. The story of Joseph, recorded in the sacred writings, shows that there were men, even at that early period, who travelled up and down as merchants, collecting not only spices and other merchandize, but, also, human beings, for the sake of traffic. Homer mentions Egypt and Cyprus as common markets for slaves about the time of the Trojan war; and Xenophon, in describing the dramatic Grecian dance, called Harpea, gives a most impressive picture of the rueful days of antiquity, when the stealing of men, as it was accompanied with danger, was accounted, valour, and pirates sought at once emolument and honour in the equally hazardous and iniquitous business. The figure of the Harpea was thus: one of the actors, or Grecian soldiers, in the character of a husbandman, is seen tilling his land, and is observed, as he turns up the earth, to look frequently behind him, as if apprehensive of danger; another immediately appears in sight in the character of a robber; the husbandman, seeing him advance, snatches up his arms, and a battle ensues on the spot. At length, the robber vanquishes the husbandman, binds his hands, and drives him off with his cattle. Sometimes it happens that the husbandman subdues the robber, and, in this case, the scene is only reversed, as the latter is bound and driven off by the former. This entertainment was copied from real manners.

We learn from Thucydides, that the Grecians themselves, in their primitive state, and most of their contemporary barbarians who inhabited the islands and the sea coast, applied themselves to the pursuits of piracy, as their only profession and support. Whole crews, for the benefit of their respective tribes, as well as separate individuals, embarked in this business of spoliation. They made descents on the sea-coasts, drove off cattle, surprised whole villages, put many of the inhabitants to the sword, and carried others to marts of slavery. It remained for Christianity to abolish the distinction between Jew and Gentile, Greek and barbarian, bondman and freeman. At length its principles of justice and benevolence generally prevailed, against the barbarous practice of holding servants in perpetual bondage, which had so long disgraced antiquity and the Gothic ages: *pro amore dei*, (for the love of God;) *pro mercide animæ* (for the good of the soul); charters were granted for the manumission of slaves, which then composed the great majority of the people; and, about the close of the twelfth century, general liberty prevailed over the West of Europe. But, alas, the pro-

fessors of the Christian principles, after effecting these happy reformations at home, renewed the piratical manners of antiquity, abroad. The Portuguese led the way, and the Spaniards, the English, the French, and other maritime nations, soon followed the example. Within two centuries of the happy era, which, under the influence of the Church of Rome, so generally abolished slavery in this part of the world, the Europeans lost sight of real religion, bowed down before the idols of filthy lucre, committed depredations on the coasts of Africa, and dragged the wretched inhabitants into slavery. When the unhappy victims fled into the heart of their country, the Europeans entered their rivers, sailed into the interior, surprised them in their retreats, and dragged them off. Again the natives fled in consternation, abandoned the banks of their rivers, and left the robbers without a prospect of their prey. The free-booters, however, were not to be so easily deprived of their prey: they adopted different measures: they built forts and settled in the country. With the gaudy trappings of European art, they excited the wonder and curiosity of the Africans; by presents and the appearance of munificence, they seduced their confidence; they found suitable tools for their treacherous designs; engaged the fascinated chiefs to furnish them with their countrymen for slaves; and thus, when they could no longer be thieves themselves, they became receivers of kidnapped human beings. Nor are the disgraceful scenes of slavery yet entirely abolished, notwithstanding the generous efforts and expense of England. From this gloomy picture of *direct slavery* and human suffering in past ages, we may turn to the less appalling, but still unhappy scene of *indirect slavery*, and care-worn privation, in modern society. By *indirect slavery*, we mean the uncertainty of labour, and the forcible drudgery of dependent poverty.

If we sweep round the coast of civilized nations, we shall find their ports crowded with vessels, and the produce of every climate landing on their quays. Ashore are heard the hammer and the axe of the mechanic; in the fields, the voice of the husbandman. Water, air, and fire, are called upon to impel their massive machines, and alleviate their labour; while the smaller works of the handicraft and the artist, supply many elegant luxuries and conveniences unknown to former ages. By that elegant mechanism, the watch, we are constantly informed of time; by the invention of printing, science and information circulate with ease and rapidity, and by the institution of posting, we can converse with our friends in all parts of the civilized world. But these and many other advantages, are not sufficient to render the whole human race perfectly happy, nor even comfortable. We may be told that asylums are erected for the weak and the helpless, the sick and the poor, and supported by public charity; but notwithstanding these advantages, the great bulk of the people are still in wretchedness. If we have numerous hospitals and other charitable institutions, we have also gaols crowded with criminals, the unfortunate victims of ignorance, depravity, and poverty; for hundreds who live in luxury and abundance, there are millions who live in

habitual privation; and thousands who absolutely die of want and misery. The inventions and improvements of industry are constantly increasing, and still the great bulk of the population lives in poverty. Something is yet wanting to improve upon modern civilization, as this has improved upon that of antiquity. Formerly, the great majority of our species was reduced to the hardships of *direct slavery*, under the undisguised tyranny of conquest and spoliation; now, it endures the sufferings of *indirect slavery*, under the hypocritical despotism of *incoherent* institutions and privileged fraud. If external war and depredation were the chief expression of conflicting interests, and the principal causes of premature dissolution in antiquity, it is not less certain that internal fraud and jarring interests may be the causes of premature dissolution in modern states; unless proper remedies be applied in time to save them from the fatal effects of popular commotion. Unless the people can advance from the precarious existence of uncertain labour, to the first degree of real liberty and security of subsistence, nothing can save civilized society from political subversion. The only difference between the causes of dissolution in ancient, and those of modern civilized states, consists in the different degrees of power in similar elements: external and internal war are the chief causes of political dissolution in all periods of incoherency; in antiquity, conquest and invasion were more powerful than internal revolution, in dissolving empires; in our day, civil war is more dangerous than invasion: though the British Empire is threatened by civil war at home, rebellion in her colonies, and the conquest of her Indian possessions by Northern barbarians. *Brutal undisguised oppression and direct slavery were the characteristic features of ancient civilization: hypocritically disguised oppression and indirect slavery, are the predominant features of modern civilization.* The former creates little at home, and its chief policy is conquest abroad and tyrannical oppression at home: the latter applies itself to creative industry, and extensive foreign commerce, and its chief policy is privileged fraud at home, and diplomatic hypocrisy abroad. They are both able to thrive in proportion to the strength of their respective political constitutions, and their habits of industry: and both are exposed to premature dissolution in proportion to their weakness of constitution, and the imperfections of their industry. In other words, fraud and injustice are the consumptive diseases which endanger the political existence of each, and their strength of resistance and improvement depends upon the developement of science, industry and morality. The principal industry of the one is *predatory*, while that of the other is *productive*.

The rapacious ambition of antiquity was obliged to have recourse to conquest and spoliation to obtain that concentrated wealth it was unable to produce by peaceful industry. The wily and rapacious ambition of modern civilization is obliged to obtain by fraud and oppression, from laborious industry at home, that which it cannot grasp by conquest and external spoliation. The only means of destroying injustice in modern civilization is to produce wealth in superabundance, and the only means of doing this is to organize all the various

pursuits of industry according to principles of unity, justice, and harmony. Unless this be done, discord and dissolution are the inevitable doom of modern states. But it may be interesting to examine more minutely the general seeds of political dissolution, and the proper means of neutralizing them effectually.

Of Political Dissolution and Organic Progress.

Having glanced at the feverish existence and the pestiferous influence of fallen empires in antiquity, it remains for us to discover the consumptive elements of modern *incoherent* civilization, and effectual means of neutralizing them in time to obviate the dangers of decay and premature dissolution: and, in reasoning on this subject, we confine ourselves, at present, to mere scientific and political discussion, without venturing far on higher grounds of Destiny and universal Providence, to which the reasonings of men must ever be subservient.

The fall of man was the original cause of all injustice and iniquity on earth, and since that fall, subversive passions have continued to destroy the human race, collectively and individually, and hence these passions may be deemed the cause of premature decay and dissolution in political existence; and until these passions can be thoroughly regenerated by superior training in religious, moral, and industrial discipline, according to the laws of truth and justice, and the precepts of Christianity, there can be no permanent security for national existence.

Ignorant ambition, avarice, and animality have hitherto opposed the influence of all other passions in the human breast, and caused the dissolution of political existence in antiquity, as well as the perdition of those individuals whose lives have been subjected to their influence since the Christian dispensation has been given to the world; and eighteen hundred years of positive experience proves that the false policy of moralizing negatively only by *repressive* legislation and vindictive discipline, *compressive* doctrine and mere spiritual fear, *depressive* influence and industrial degradation,—this false one-sided policy, we say, is proved to be inadequate by sad experience prolonged to the extent of eighteen centuries, and, therefore, we must sow the seeds of positive religious unity and elevated training on the negative foundation of compressive discipline, in order to absorb those passions of mere selfish animality which cannot be destroyed by man, and have not been subdued by all the powers of arbitrary policy.

The subversive passions of mankind produce the evils which corrode society, and though these passions are quite incompressible, they are not inconvertible to truth and harmony, when duly regulated and subdued by unitary influence. What discipline alone, or mere religious fear and worldly vengeance, have not been enabled to accomplish, Faith, and Hope, and Charity, or Love, the positive basis of religious unity, will easily effect. Here, however, lies the difficulty; for Statesmen and Divines, with all their learning and experience, still continue the old error of compressing that which has been proved to be quite incompressible; and manufac-

ture creeds, and laws, and punishments, to curb and alter human nature. All seem to doubt the wisdom and the power of Providence in striving to disfigure, and compress, and mutilate those passions he has given to man, as savages compress and mutilate their bodies, to conform to a false standard of corporeal beauty which they deem superior to that of Nature. The ignorant moralist believes his standard of perfection in the mind superior to that which God reveals in human instincts and affections, and the savage Indian believes his standard of perfection in the body more complete than that of simple nature undisfigured. Is not one as foolish as the other? and are they not alike deficient in true Faith? We believe they are; that both are infidels in different degrees; and that the deepest infidelity is that which can and does resist the light of Christianity, which teaches us that man should be *regenerated* in true Faith, and not that he should be incessantly enslaved to ignorance and fear, and all the darkness of oppression and iniquity; by which he is depressed below the light of heaven, and bound down hand and foot in the abyss of hell.

The passions are perverted by this policy, and their subversive heavings and commotions cause the premature decay and dissolution of political existence, and of national organic unity.

The false developements of human passions and activity are, then, the causes of political calamity and dissolution. Ignorant ambition, avarice, and selfish animality developed in destructive policy and spoliation, to the utter insecurity and crippling of productive industry, may be deemed the elements of general disease and premature decay in national existence, and these subversive elements will ever be the causes of decay and dissolution, unless they be absorbed by higher motives of activity, and greater sources of attraction in the human mind. They can never be destroyed by human power, but they may easily be saturated by abundance in the physical, the moral, and the intellectual creations of religious and industrial unity. And, until they can be neutralized and turned to better purposes by such abundant saturation, they will never cease to generate those evils of depravity and discord which have hitherto destroyed the peace and growth of nations. But let us not be understood to mean by *saturation*, gluttonous excess or sensuality: we mean to say, that all the passions of the human mind should be alternately engaged in useful and legitimate activity, in order to prevent their false developement when not employed in useful occupations and diversions; for compression, and repression, and depression, are but negative and insufficient means of wasting that activity which ought to be employed for public good, instead of being rendered dangerous by inadequate control and criminal explosions.

It may, perhaps, be said, that there are evils and consumptive elements in national existence, which are independent of mere human policy and imperfections, but on close examination we shall find that many sources of decay and dissolution which appear to be beyond the sphere of human wisdom and control, are altogether subject to its influence.

Amongst the many evils which, at certain periods, afflict society, and which man generally attributes to causes quite independent of his will, we may place famine and pestilence; for they are both generated by the neglect of man, whose primary function on earth is to cultivate the land, and render the atmosphere salubrious, by that very industry which produces plenty, and affords enjoyment. Those who are familiar with history, will easily perceive that plagues are much more rare and less severe in cultivated countries, than in the neighbourhood of deserts and uncultivated wilds; in modern ages of industry, than in former ages of carnage and conquest. These, and other evils, are the causes of political decline. It would not be difficult to find a numerous catalogue of evils which corrode society, and ultimately hasten dissolution; but to hasten our conclusions, we will merely give a rapid glance at—

The General Elements of Dissolution in all Periods of Incoherent Civilization, and particularly in those of Antiquity.

Injustice, violence, neglect of industry, and the conflicting interests of different classes.

Contrary creeds, habits, and manners.

Mortal disease produced by bad food, over fatigue, malignant fevers, and famine.

Mortal disease produced by plagues and pestilential affections, introduced from other climes.

Civil war from the re-action of slavery against tyranny.

Invasion, exterminating war and spoliation by conquest.

The contagion of subversive elements which endangers a whole nation, when any class or any province is attacked by one, or by several of these causes of destruction.

The constant compression of our natural impulses, which alters the faculties of reason, and generates depravity in all classes.

A general tendency to discover the arts of destruction and vanity, in preference to those of national utility.

Individuals become more and more immoral as they advance in knowledge, by adding the vices of cunning to those of brutality.

They honour the arts of destruction, and respect the privileged bodies who practice oppression.

They neglect the arts of production, and despise those who live by honest industry.

They ignore the means of producing wealth in abundance, so as to provide sufficient food, clothing, and comfort, to preserve health, strength, and peace in the great body of the people.

They make but few discoveries, and improve but slowly in the useful arts of industry; and by their activity in the works of destruction, the few useful discoveries that are made by any single nation, are exposed to the risk of oblivion when that nation is dissolved by violence.

They apply immense proportions of human labour to produce comparatively trifling effects, from ignorance of mechanical force and the art of generalizing improvements.

They waste in vain pomp and shameful profusion those pro-

ductions which are scarce and valuable, instead of studying general utility in production, and economy in consumption.

They are sceptical and superstitious: either disbelieving in Providence, or adoring fire, animals, planets or false gods: they misconceive and misrepresent the attributes of Deity, and bring religion into disrepute, disgrace, and darkness.

They immolate human victims, either directly on the altars of superstition, or indirectly on the altars of hypocrisy and selfish persecution.

By desolating neighbouring nations in pursuing conquest and plunder, they draw upon themselves similar effects of vengeance in their turn, instead of civilizing their neighbours by the arts of peace, so as to render them useful allies.

They tend toward disunion among themselves, by the cold selfishness of individuals and the mutual jealousy of different castes, constantly attempting to obtain unjust privileges, rather than unity and internal strength, so that they thrive with difficulty, and are easily subdued.

They are the slaves of prejudice, false morals, stagnant creeds, and superannuated institutions.

They ignore the principles of a progressive policy, and the means of neutralizing the seeds of political dissolution.

Civilization declines in proportion to the direct ratio of these tendencies, and advances in proportion to the predominance of productive industry and distributive justice.

Civilization is threatened also in proportion to the ignorance of statesmen concerning the effectual modes of guaranteeing society against fraud and oppression on the part of privileged bodies, existing either *de jure* or *de facto*: and divines are not less blinded by imperfect creeds which have been substituted in the different branches of the Christian Church in lieu of Scripture and progressive light in general divinity.

By the aid of these consumptive diagnostics, we may easily perceive the weak points of political organization in ancient or in modern nations. If a nation is feebly constituted in several or all of these points, and strongly attacked by a number of active and direct causes of dissolution, it must inevitably fall; but if it be strongly constituted, and exempt from most of these consumptive habits, it may recover from very severe attacks of external violence and internal disease.

If we read history attentively, or reflect on what we know of fallen empires, we shall see that several or all of these causes were instrumental in their destruction; and by an impartial examination of the present state of civilized nations, we may form an adequate idea of the degree of danger to which they are respectively and collectively exposed, from similar causes. If it were not too extensive for our present design, it would be interesting to trace the various degrees of influence which each of these subversive elements has had in the destruction of fallen states; but those amongst our readers who are familiar with history, may easily

indulge their curiosity in following out these and other national cancers, through all their deadly ramifications. The few historical sketches we have introduced in the preceding pages, are too fragmentary and imperfect to afford sufficient matter for the application of these general diagnostics, and therefore we are obliged to refer to general history for more satisfactory elucidation.

Incoherent civilization in all its degrees, from the rudest barbarity of antiquity to the most refined civility of modern society, is more or less subject to debility in its vital functions; and the further we go back, the more we find society corruptly and consumptively organized.

When nations are weak on all points, and strongly attacked on several, they are prematurely dissolved as ancient states were; when comparatively strong in several vital parts of their religious and political constitution, and but partially attacked by active dissolving principles, they may recover for a time, as England did in Cromwell's time; and France, after its violent revolution of 1789: and more easily in proportion to their strength and the unity of their healthy functions, as France recovered from its convulsive attack of 1830.

These general elements might be subdivided into an infinite number of particular dissolving principles, if we were not afraid of becoming tedious by too minute an analysis; but in order to convey a notion of what we understand by a *regular* subdivision, we will quote a very *loose* enumeration of similar facts presented by the French minister, Sully, to King Henry IV. We translate from the "Memoirs of Sully." "In order to know if my ideas accorded with his, the King desired me to give him a list of all the causes which I deemed most powerful in effecting the ruin of an empire. I here transcribe that list as an abridgment of the principles which served me as a guide in my duties of minister. The causes of decline and ruin in powerful empires are the following, carried to excess:—Monopolies, principally those of corn; neglect of commerce, manufactures, and agriculture; extreme complication in executive government; unnecessary placemen, and excessive power in inferior branches of administration; the iniquity of laws; idleness; luxury, and its concomitant effects, depravity and immorality; want of proper attention to the distinctions of rank; adulteration of the coin of the realm, and fluctuation in its standard value; imprudent and unjust wars; the despotism of Kings, and their blind partiality for certain persons; their prejudice in favour of certain ranks and professions; the cupidity of ministers and favourites; the humiliation of the nobility; their contempt for, and forgetfulness of, literary men; their toleration of abuse, and infractions of the law; the endless multiplicity of useless and fettering regulations."

These elements are somewhat vague and indefinite, and some of them are perhaps absolutely erroneous, but they are curious enough as an historical document. It would not be difficult to enumerate a vast number of particular dissolving principles, much

more definite and correct than these; but, as we have already said, they would be more curious than useful in the present instance.

If we examine the constitutions of civilized nations in Europe at the present day, we shall find that they are much less secure internally and externally than we may at first imagine; and by reflecting on history, we shall see that many of those ancient states which are now buried in ruins, were as much superior in productive industry and general refinement to the coarse barbarians who destroyed them, as we are to the ignorant nations whom we affect to despise. We know that Greece and Rome were what is commonly termed learned and powerful, and more or less industrious; and though their science and their industry were inferior to ours, they were infinitely superior to the ignorance of their contemporaries by whom they were finally subdued.

Dr. Robertson, in speaking of Palmyra, says,—

"It is evident that a state which could derive little importance from its original territory (a few leagues diameter of fertility in the midst of an immense desert of sand, 85 miles distant from the Euphrates and about 117 miles from the nearest coast of the Mediterranean,) must have owed its aggrandizement to the opulence acquired by extensive commerce. Of this the Indian trade was undoubtedly the most considerable and most lucrative branch. But it is a cruel mortification, in searching for what is instructive in the history of past times, to find that the exploits of conquerors who have desolated the earth, and the freaks of tyrants who have rendered nations unhappy, are recorded with minute and often with disgusting accuracy, while the discovery of useful arts, and the progress of the most beneficial branches of commerce, are passed over in silence, and suffered to sink into oblivion.

"After the conquest of Palmyra, trade never revived there. At present a few miserable huts of beggarly Arabs are scattered in the courts of its stately temples, disfiguring its elegant porticoes, and exhibiting a humiliating contrast to its ancient magnificence." (*Disquisition concerning India.*)

The very fact, of which Dr. Robertson complains, is a proof that the importance of industry was little understood by politicians, and that every thing was made subservient to the policy of conquest, where government was based on military power. And if this opinion be not erroneous, the most obvious *sequitur* is, that half the civilized nations of Europe, at the present day, are semi-barbarians, struggling in the wiles of diplomacy to extricate themselves from their ambiguous positions. Feudal prejudices and military institutions are constantly drawing the policy of statesmen towards a retrograde movement on the one hand, while, on the other, the daily progress of science and industry as incessantly propels us forward towards real civilization, and its natural policy of peace. The result of this ambiguous position is hypocrisy and indecision among statesmen; and thence, duplicity is the fundamental art of state diplomacy. There are two ways of threading this maze of dissimulation; either to move rapidly forward towards

unity and peace, or to fall frankly back upon military power and barbarian policy. Whoever gets the start will win the day, if prudence and resolve lead fearlessly. These opinions relate to external or international policy, and not to the internal policy of any civilized nation. That an industrious people may be conquered by their barbarian neighbours, is abundantly proved by experience, as the preceding quotations tend to show; and it must be admitted that these, and similar events related in history, are alarming examples of political dissolution for the contemplation of modern civilization.

It is not enough for civilized nations to cultivate art, science, and productive industry at home, then; they must civilize their neighbours also, if they wish to be secure from danger. A nation is but a simple member of humanity, and so long as any other nation is suffering under the evils of ignorance, privation, and depravity, the whole body of the human race is more or less affected by the individual affliction. There is an inevitable *solidarity*, or mutual and collective responsibility, between all the nations of the earth, and all the individuals of each nation. If one country is infected with pestilential disease, all the others are exposed to the dangers of contagion; if neighbouring states are allowed to remain in poverty, under the illusions of military glory, they will, sooner or later, conquer and spoliate their opulent neighbours. In fact, if we do not civilize barbarians, they will finally reduce us to barbarity. The civilization of Europe is constantly exposed to destruction by the barbarians of Russia and Turkey, who are now as well skilled in the improved arts of war as we are. This is, perhaps, the only science which they have borrowed from us, because it is more in harmony with their barbarous designs of conquest, and the enslaved ignorance of their population, than are our refined arts of industry and peaceful progress.

It is related in the "Memoirs of Napoleon," that when he spoke of the political state of Europe, during his exile at St. Helena, he was in the habit of saying, "That in fifty years time, Europe would either be conquered and reduced to a state of slavish dependence by Russia, or the principles of liberty must conquer and destroy the barbarous policy of that nation." According to his calculation in 1820, this revolution would be effected before the year 1870.

Such an opinion, given by a man who had so much practical knowledge in the fate of empires, is peculiarly interesting when corroborated by theoretical speculation. The dangers of political dissolution by external war will appear imminent, if we reflect, that Europe has only enjoyed twenty or thirty years' peace, during the last century, and that all the princes in Christendom are still trained almost exclusively to the arts of destruction: that each of the powerful nations have hundreds of thousands of men constantly under arms, and that, besides this threatening attitude of latent war, the seeds of discontent and internal commotion are every day increasing in extent and violence.

Nor do politicians and diplomatists in general know how to

avert the dangers which threaten society: on every side they are beset with mental obscurity:—

Obscurity in Political Organization: from ignorance of combinative principles.

Obscurity in Moral Principles: from the confusion of uncertain and arbitrary science.

Obscurity in Neutralizing Tactics: from ignorance of the subversive tendencies of popular passions.

Obscurity in General Incoherency: from ignorance of real religion, and the natural relations between man and man, man and God, man and the universe.

Instead of procuring for society the advantages of—

"Individual happiness.
Riches in proportion to industry.
Universal justice and unity of interest amongst all classes of society."

They produce or aggravate those conditions which are the very reverse;—

"Corroding care and general discontent.
Poverty in proportion to slavish industry.
The universal prevalence of vice, injustice, and uncertainty, with jarring interests and incessant danger of convulsive agitation."

A slight analysis of diplomatic obscurity concerning European policy, and the imminence of external war, may give us an idea of the general incapacity of statesmen, and the political darkness which beclouds their intellect.

It is evident that Russia is not a civilized nation: its social institutions are based on domestic slavery. We know they have been very active in adopting certain mechanical inventions and scientific improvements; but it is also very evident that improvements in military science and destructive power have attracted their attention much more directly and extensively than those of useful industry; and though they have paid considerable attention to the arts of production, still we have every reason to believe them actuated rather by the desire of rendering their slaves more valuable instruments of profit, than by any liberal idea of introducing freedom. They detest the very name of liberty, and persist in maintaining slavery as the basis of their social institutions, and despotism as the leading principle of government. The Romans were, to all intents and purposes, a barbarous nation, and yet they made prodigious efforts of industry in constructing military roads and public monuments; but they, nevertheless, persisted to the last in upholding domestic slavery. They were certainly much more refined on many points than the Russians of the present day, though they had not the same unlimited advantage of borrowing improvements from neighbouring states in advance of themselves. It is not the degree of power or refinement amongst privileged castes which constitutes what is, or ought to be, understood by the word civilization; it is the degree of liberty and wealth which is enjoyed by the people. Wherever personal and direct slavery exists

amongst the great body of a nation, the government is necessarily despotic, and its *natural* policy is *barbarian;* that is to say, predatory and destructive. The more such nations are powerful and active, the more they are dangerous to their neighbours and to liberty.

The natural policy of a barbarous nation is an exact contrast to that of civilization; the one being *external industry*, or conquest by spoliating invasion, the other *internal industry*, or conquest by scientific production. This has been sufficiently shown in our observations on Roman civilization, which ought to be termed Roman barbarism.

The Russians have an army as numerous and as powerful as those of the most civilized nations of Europe, and their navy is every day becoming more and more formidable. These forces are constantly turned against some one or other of their neighbours: at one time, against the Turks; at another, against the Persians; now to subdue the Poles, and then the Moldavians and Wallachians. If left to their own policy, they will, in time, subdue Turkey, Persia, and all their Oriental neighbours, depriving England of her possessions in India, and, finally, subduing all Europe as well as Asia. This may appear impossible; and so it is to those who do not know how it might be effected; but it is like many other apparent difficulties, very easy for those who have the means of execution in their hands, and know how to use them. Fortunately, however, for Europe, the Russians have not yet acquired the science of making the most of their means; but the young vulture will naturally learn the arts of darting on its prey, as growth and experience fortify its powers.

For want of a thorough knowledge and conviction concerning the natural and the *necessary* difference between the policy of barbarian, and that of civilized nations; notwithstanding the lessons of history, and the actual proceedings of Russia, Turkey, and Egypt; the statesmen of Europe dare not think of combining their respective powers of aggression to destroy at once, or one by one, the military and naval forces of barbarian nations. Selfish cunning carries their calculations beyond the mark of general prudence, and they lull themselves in a delusive security, based on apparent advantages in the balance of trade. They have not sufficient sagacity to understand that their first duty is to lay aside mutual jealousy and intrigue, until they have clipped the wings of their common enemy; forcing him to fall back upon the arts of productive industry alone, as a means of aggrandizement. This policy would render him serviceable to his neighbours, instead of being a constant *night-mare*, by forcing them to support immense standing armies, to protect themselves against his rapacious designs. When absolute outrage shows them the necessity of reducing one of these barbarian powers, they are dull enough to form an alliance with their most powerful enemy, to facilitate his supremacy and their own downfall. In the late attack on Turkey (battle of Navarino), the French and the English absolutely assisted the Northern barbarians in weakening the most formidable check

on Russian usurpation; and in recently subduing Egypt, without any unitary understanding with regard to Russian power and policy. The other powers have left much standing which threatens danger to the peace of Europe and the world. The following sketch of Egypt and the Pasha, copied from a leading periodical, will show what may be looked for from that quarter, unless due precautions be established by a general congress of the European nations to control and influence such gigantic powers of barbarism.

"At the present moment, when the eyes of all Europe are fixed on Egypt, and Mehemet Ali is reaping the fruits of his long and persevering efforts, a slight sketch of the principal features of Egyptian policy and manners may not be uninteresting; we shall therefore publish the following extract of a letter from one of our friends who is just returned from Egypt, where he has been residing for the last six years. This letter proves that, if the Pasha has greatly improved the military organization of Egypt, every thing remains yet to be done, in the way of civil and industrial improvement.

"'If the civilization of Europe is deeply tainted by vice and corruption, what shall we say of Egyptian barbarism? Here the people are nothing but an instrument which may be used as the owner thinks fit. They are destined to labour for the great, the Pashas, the Beys, and other dignitaries, who levy taxes, and live in luxury, while the *fellah* or peasant is obliged to maintain himself and his family on 20 paras a day, (one penny farthing).

"'Almost all landed property belongs to the State, and is either rented by the *fellahs*, or held by the Pasha, and denominated *chefflick*. When the land is let to the *fellahs*, they are obliged to pay an enormous tribute, as rent, and if, at the appointed time, any individual is deficient in payment, the whole district is taxed for the deficiency. In case of refusal on the part of the collective body, the principal individuals are scourged on the back, and on the soles of the feet; their furniture, their cattle, and even their children are seized; it often happens that every thing which they possess is taken from them, and then depopulation commences: the fellahs leave their homes, and the country remains uncultivated. The land is taken by the Pasha, and becomes a *chefflick*, or government domain.

"'The *fellahs* who have deserted their homes and been retaken, are generally forced to cultivate the *chefflicks*. They are chained together like transports, and disciplined with whips. In the evening they are led to their cells by a brutal Turk, and locked up for the night. The man who is *chefflicated*, or reduced to this state of servage, is the most miserable of beings; the food which he receives is of the worst kind, and barely sufficient for keeping body and soul together. He is generally quite naked, and his sufferings are beyond description.

"'It must be confessed, however, that Mehemet Ali is not the direct cause of these inhuman practices, though we cannot presume to say he has any proper feeling for the sufferings of his people.

The governors of provinces, who have an unbounded power, are the greatest tyrants of the country. They can take away life, or bestow favours, just as they like, and their chief aim is to extort as much money as possible from the cultivators of the soil. Every thing is regulated by the power of the *bacchis*, a word which signifies *gift* or *present*. By the influence of a rich present, you may obtain whatever you like; corruption stalks the streets in open day, and is deemed perfectly legitimate.

"'In each province there are deputy governors and collectors, who pay annual tribute to the governor for permission to spoliate the people at will. The governor waits until his deputies have accumulated considerable wealth, and then, on the slightest pretext, he sentences them to two hundred or two hundred and fifty strokes of the *baton*, and turns them adrift. In about a month's time the disgraced deputy is reinstated in office, and becomes more rapacious than ever. The *bacchis* has obtained the underling's pardon, and unlimited power to pursue his course of spoliation. By this policy, the governors will soon reduce Egypt to one vast *chefflick*, or government domain.

"'This brutal system of government has had a most deplorable influence on the morality of the people: the *fellah* is notorious for deception: he persists in imposture, with a firmness worthy of truth, and seems to believe his own lies by dint of repetition. These poor wretches are the living caricatures of ignorant vanity, when, seated in the midst of filth and actually engaged in killing the body vermin which leave them not a moment's rest, they attempt to laugh at Europeans, and despise them.

"'The degraded and oppressed *fellah* wreaks his sufferings upon his wife and children. Every house is a little hell where nothing is heard but cries, groans, and angry disputes; nothing seen, but filth and vermin. Discord never ceases between Mussulmen and their wives: the women are constantly fighting and tearing each other's hair, the children join chorus by one continual cry.

"'If any European recently arrived in Egypt is invested with a directorship, and wishes to dispense with the use of the *baton* in conducting the fellahs under his care, he soon finds out his mistake; and, in spite of himself, he is forced to have recourse to the discipline of fear, if he wishes to be obeyed. Experience proves to him, that before the system of repression can be modified, the social state of the people must be changed. Long habits of servitude have weakened the intellect of the race, and we are of opinion that a considerable length of time, and perhaps a thorough regeneration of the race, will be necessary to fit them for receiving that civilization which we received from their forefathers.

"'Don't be deceived by the romantic descriptions of Egypt; literary travellers write to amuse rather than instruct their readers. Egyptian civilization has been vaunted from the simple fact of the Pasha having a steamer to carry him from Rosetta to Thebes, but nothing is said of the wretched population, nine tenths of whom go barefoot. It is not generally known that the *fellahs* are obliged to pull up the corn by the roots, and cleanse canals with their

hands, having neither spades, nor sickles, nor instruments of any sort. One traveller writes of the general prosperity of the country, because raw cotton has been sold at high prices, but nothing is said of the government monopoly, and the privations of the *fellah;* another speaks of the excellent arrangements for acquiring medical skill, but nothing is said of the medical students being trained exclusively for the army. Others are now occupied in writing the history of modern Egypt, but, instead of making themselves thoroughly acquainted with the social condition of the labouring population, they are passing their whole time at Cairo, amongst the privileged and wealthy Turks who enjoy every luxury, while the people are actually dying of want and misery.

" 'And yet this beautiful country might become one of the richest and most prosperous in the world: the inclemencies of winter are here unknown, and the heat of summer is tempered by the constantly prevailing winds from the North. The fertility of the soil is beyond the conception of those persons who never travel beyond the limits of such a country as France, and yet, notwithstanding these natural advantages, little is produced: labourers are scarce, and mechanical instruments are unknown. The produce of the land is limited in variety, and inferior in quality. The ignorance of the labouring population is the curse of the country, and the barbarous policy of the chiefs is but little calculated to remove the evil.' " These are facts proved by actual observation since the year 1830, and a short extract from " *Oliver's Travels in Persia,*" will sufficiently indicate the barbarous state of that kingdom.

"The king is considered to have a general right to the labour of artisans; but he does not commonly exercise that right, receiving instead a certain tax, the amount of which varies according to the man's income. But, if a man gets a reputation for any particular trade, the king, or the governor of the province, where he is, sends for him and makes him work for the monarch, and for the courtiers and great men, and he may think himself well off, if he can get them to pay him even such miserable wages as may enable him just to keep himself from starving. This makes every man anxious to avoid the reputation of being an expert workman, or of having made improvements in his art. Mr. Fraser, in his " *Narrative of a Journey into Khorassan,*" mentions a man who made some improvements in pottery, so far as to manufacture a sort of porcelain, or tolerable china ware. His fame quickly spread, and soon reached the court. When the king heard of it, he sent an order for the man to repair immediately to the capital, and make china for the shah. The poor fellow, who knew the consequences, was terribly frightened at this order. He went, however, but not to make china. He scraped together all the money he could, and sold every thing he had to raise a bribe for the prime minister, whom he entreated to tell the king that he was not the man who made the china; that the real potter had run away, nobody knew where; and that he himself had been put under restraint by mistake, and prayed to be released. The prime minister put the money in his pocket, and told the story to the king, who sent a release to the

poor man, who joyfully returned home, vowing that he would never more make a bit of china, or attempt any kind of improvement as long as he lived."

In order to avoid long and tedious extracts, we refer our readers to the History of Russia, for detailed information concerning the barbarity of Russian manners and institutions; but every body knows that the Russians are an uncivilized people, who prefer the arts of war and plunder to those of peace and industry. It is the duty of civilized Europe to force these barbarians into a line of progressive policy, which will render them useful, instead of dangerous neighbours.

According to the most advanced state of incoherent civilization in Europe, peace is the *natural* policy of England, France, Spain, Portugal, Austria, Prussia, Belgium, and Holland. They ought to unite in a temporary, if not permanent, alliance, for the sole purpose of successively reducing, by threats, or by force, the military and naval forces of Russia, Persia, Turkey, and Egypt,* to the lowest possible standard compatible with the necessities of self-defence, in case of insurrection or invasion. They would be rendering an immense service to these barbarians, by obliging them to turn their attention to the conquests of industry at home, when all prospects of satisfying their martial ambition by spoliating conquests abroad were effectually and permanently cut off. A complete neutralization of barbarian policy would necessarily and rapidly lead to *incoherent* civilization, substituting the *natural* policy of peace, commerce, and productive industry, in lieu of war, violence, poverty, and ignorance.

Indeed, the present state of diplomatic incoherency should be superseded by a permanent diplomatic congress of all the *civilized* states in Europe, for the purpose of effecting a *unitary* system of international policy; but whether this measure could or could not be rendered immediately practicable, the absolute reduction of barbarian powers of attack should be effected without delay; for, if Egypt be allowed to conquer Turkey, and Russia, Persia, these overgrown military empires would be continually at war with each other, involving the civilized nations of Europe in one perpetual broil, and dragging the genius of improvement from the pursuits of production into those of destruction. The reduction, then, of Russian and Egyptian military force is absolutely necessary to the welfare and the progress of civilized Europe.

After having muzzled the Northern bear, and stunted the fangs of the Turkish and Egyptian tigers, the civilized powers ought to reduce their own armies to a standard of mere defensive power against sudden aggression and internal agitation. The military and naval powers of each nation should be reduced as much as possible, so as to preserve exactly the same proportions which they bear to each other at present; except the uncivilized states, which should be constantly reduced to a state of military inferiority. The

* This was written in Paris, three years ago, before the Pasha's power in Egypt and in Syria had been limited by European policy.

same relative degrees of superiority might be thus preserved, without the ruinous expense of useless armies.

But, leaving aside the question of a general system of disarming amongst civilized nations, may we not ask ourselves, why the Russians are allowed to have such a powerful military and naval force? If the other European states are momentarily obliged to maintain large standing armies to protect them against invasion and rebellion, and because their neighbours persist in a similar policy, Russia cannot certainly plead the same excuse. A very small army would be sufficient to protect her against the chances of rebellion and accidental aggression, for, surely, no power would ever think of invading her frozen dominions, with a view to holding them in permanent possession. The chances of rebellion in Poland cannot be seriously objected, for the Russians have no legitimate claim to that kingdom. But, even granting that they have, their military power is out of all proportion with the mere necessities of order and internal discipline.

It is clear, then, that the monstrous military and naval powers of Russia are not merely for defence, but chiefly, and we may say almost solely, for attack: not for protecting an industrious population against the contingencies of invasion and piracy, but for flattering a grasping ambition with the prospect of future conquest and wholesale spoliation.

And the statesmen of Great Britain do not know how to take the first essential step towards protecting our Indian possessions from the clutches of these predatory barbarians.

In spite of the eloquent warnings of the celebrated Lord Chatham, they do not know how to maintain the power of Turkey and Persia as barriers against such an attempt. They do not know how to oppose one barbarian to another, holding the balance themselves, according to the rules of a mere negative policy. Nay, as we have already said, they even assist Russia in subjugating Turkey.*

The more we reflect on these subjects, the more reason we find for being seriously alarmed for the political independence of Great Britain. The precarious tenure of her colonial possessions, the imminence of civil war and national bankruptcy, are staring us in the face, and supercilious illusion affirms there is no real danger: that a national debt is a great advantage, and that England is safer and happier than ever she was!

However we may be lulled into a slumbering vain security by the sceptical spirit of indifference which prevails in fashionable circles, our very dreams must necessarily be exposed to the oppressive *nightmare* of these alarming realities; however the eye of common sense and observation may refuse to look upon them, the every day scenes of bitter strife will inevitably reflect their scorching rays upon our imagination: nothing can prevent the approaching clouds of stormy events from casting their appalling shadows

* It is true that they have partly modified their policy since this was written.

over our thoughts, and depressing our minds with apprehensions for those who are most dear to us.

These dangers may yet be averted by a well-directed and timely policy. All our internal difficulties may be overcome by proper attention to combinative principles; and we have abundant means for securing ourselves against the aggressions of barbarians; all we want is the science of applying them properly.

Instead of treating Russia as one of the civilized powers of Europe, we should force her to disarm. We say *force her*, either directly or indirectly, because her population is too ignorant, and her oligarchy too cunningly ambitious, to progress at once to moral freedom and civilized policy, by abandoning domestic slavery at home, and spoliating conquest abroad. All barbarian grandees deem it easier and more honourable to conquer industrious nations, and render them tributary, than to civilize their own slaves, by teaching them those arts of industry which would lead to freedom.

It is an egregious error to suppose that the superior education of Russian princes and statesmen is enough to counterbalance the disadvantages of a barbarous population, and civilize the nation by a rapid introduction of religious and industrial improvements. That the Russian nobility are as well informed as that of other European states, there can be little doubt; but that is no proof of a civilized policy obtaining amongst them. It is not improbable, even, that Russian statesmen are more learned and acute than those of other nations; but that does not prove either a desire to prefer the arts of peace to those of war, or the possibility of forcing a barbarous people into the ordinary paths of an external policy, which is superior to their internal organization. Besides, conquest is the NATURAL policy of all barbarian nations, because it is congenial to the prejudices of an ignorant people, and flattering to the martial vanity of despotic princes, and their ambitious nobility. There can be no greater proof of the reluctance of privileged castes to introduce liberty amongst their vassals, than the resolute attempts of the Tories, temporal and spiritual, to effect a retrograde movement in England. It is not the liberality and enlightenment of feudal lords, which imposes *incoherent* civilization on a barbarous people; it is, on the contrary, the progress of low-born science and industry amongst the people, which forces liberty and civilization upon the privileged castes of feudal and barbarian states.

But, supposing Russian statesmen to be really desirous of introducing freedom and superior industry amongst the people, it does not follow that they know how to proceed in such an undertaking, without endangering their own lives and fortunes. It would, in fact, be absolutely impossible for them to introduce civilization, so long as they maintain immense standing armies. They must either impoverish their nascent industry to support their armies in peace, and thus render the military and the people disaffected, or, they must conduct them to foreign countries in quest of plunder, and thus draw the people's attention from industry, to the more tempting prospects of military glory and sudden wealth. It would be

easy to prove, however, that they are neither able nor willing to introduce freedom amongst the people.

Though Russia is, in reality, the most powerful nation in Europe, supposing she knew how to take advantage of her resources, still she is perhaps more dangerously circumstanced than any other state, so long as she remains ignorant of those resources, and mystified by the prevailing policy of civilized courts. That inaction which only paralyzes civilized nations, enabled to maintain large standing armies by their own industry, is the latent cause of conspiracy and convulsion, in a barbarous nation whose internal resources are insufficient for such an enormous expenditure. Russia was in agony when her military colonies revolted; and unless she succeeds speedily in her designs of conquest, she will become more and more exposed to conspiracy and anarchy. The European powers would be rendering her the greatest service by forcing her to disarm and civilize her people; for it is very evident, that with all the boasted intelligence of her statesmen, she does not thoroughly understand either the natural difference between a barbarian and a civilized policy, or the real advantages of her present position. It is, perhaps, fortunate for civilization, that Russia is as ignorant as other nations are concerning the real resources of subversive policy; yet nothing would be easier than for her to conquer them, while they remain ignorant of the natural principles of progressive policy, or for them to cripple her, while she remains ignorant of her own resources. By a general blockade, and an active interference on behalf of Poland, the European powers might subdue Russia, and force her to lay down her arms, without a blow being struck, and without entering her territories. But the statesmen of civilized nations are too nearly allied to the privileged castes of feudal origin, and too much prejudiced in favour of semi-barbarous institutions, to understand and execute the principles of a superior and beneficent external policy. They do not even understand those of internal progress: they are constantly turning in a vicious circle of incoherence, like a squirrel in his wheel. They are totally ignorant of the principles of unitary policy and real economy. Their blindness must be providentially subservient to some grand mutation, for it is as strange as it is unaccountable to those who see it in its depths of darkness.

These strictures may appear presumptuous, but we confess that, without the advantage of having studied universal principles, we should probably have been still more ignorant on these subjects than statesmen in general are: and we willingly acknowledge that they have given proof of extraordinary skill in keeping society together, in spite of the innumerable difficulties arising out of jarring interests and general incoherence. In expressing these opinions concerning general policy, we must not be misunderstood to say that it is necessary to meddle directly with the affairs of Russia, in order to effect improvements in other states; by introducing the principles of truth and association in our own social organization, we should civilize barbarians by the sole influence of example. What

we have said respecting external policy, relates merely to the necessity of protection against the designs of conquest.

With respect to the internal policy of civilized states, it is vain to suppose that large standing armies are necessary for maintaining peace and order at home, for no military power is sufficient to quell a general revolution, and a very trifling force is enough to put down partial insurrections. Besides it is much more easy to eradicate the seeds of discontent, by a proper attention to the interests of all classes in society, than to maintain them permanently within the bounds of submission by military compression. The difficulties of internal government vanish at once before the mechanism of corporate combination and its immediate consequences,—truth, equity, and unity. The trite objection of impossibility, inferred from the uniform experience of past and present incoherency, is almost too frivolous to merit refutation.

If we pretend to be rational in arguing from past experience to future probability, we must draw positive and not negative conclusions. To say that harmony never can exist in society because it never did, is defective in every sense. In the first place, it is not certain that harmony never did exist upon earth; we might reasonably infer the contrary, from both sacred and profane traditions concerning Eden, Paradise, the golden age, Arcadian bliss, &c. &c.: but even supposing harmony never did exist in society, we cannot reasonably conclude that it never may, any more than our forefathers of the 15th century could rationally pretend that a Western passage to India did not exist, because it was unknown to them: in fact, every new discovery proves that things which were never known before can be brought into existence. Besides, why did the Creator plant in the heart of man an insatiable desire for happiness in this world, if it were never to be satisfied? and why do statesmen talk about improvement in political institutions, if they believe them impossible? If it be answered, that they aim at improvement only, and not at perfection, we reply, that our pretensions are not more absolute—we only expect to approach, but not to attain perfection. All we maintain is, that in order to know how to advance towards perfection, we must first know in what it consists.

If we dwell protractively on these arguments, it is merely to meet the objections of sceptical indifference: those who are already well convinced of the dangers of the present state of society, may abandon these critical dissertations, and examine the principles of general policy at once; but the obstinate incredulity of the public forces us to treat the following topics, with more or less attention, before we venture upon more advanced inquiries:—

The supineness of philosophy, concerning the natural and effectual modes of progressing from the present to a superior state of society, as we have already progressed from barbarous conquest to extensive industry.

The necessary existence *in principle* of a true science of society, composed by God from all eternity; concealed in revelation and in nature, waiting for discovery through faith and industry.

Of the doubts of statesmen and philosophers concerning the permanence of *incoherence* in society.

Of the decline of civilization and the progress of depravity.

Of the uncertainty of labour, the first natural right of man.

Of divine reason in *creating* the natural desires of man, contrasted with human reason in *compressing* them.

Of the reasonableness of studying *spiritual* attraction, as a source of revelation in addition to the Scriptures, after the success of astronomers and chemists in studying *physical* attraction.

Of the necessary unity of system in the providential revelations of both prophecy and science; and the probability of *universal attraction* being a permanent and invariable source of revelation and discovery, as well as inspiration and mysterious prophecy.

We deem it absolutely necessary to dwell on these and other incidental questions, in order to undermine the spirit of scepticism, before we expose new principles: indeed, experience has taught us, that many people have a dislike to the study of positive science, and that the only means of captivating their attention, is by descriptive illustration and critical dissertation. To dispel the illusions, therefore, of those who confide in political agitation, as an adequate means of effecting general reform, we will inquire *what degree of confidence may be placed in the conflicting doctrines of political parties.*

The causes of political decay and premature dissolution being a false developement of human passions and activity in spoliation and destructive policy, it follows that the natural security of progress and refinement in society consists in neutralizing and absorbing all subversive tendencies, both national and individual, by higher sources of activity and industry, true knowledge and refinement, religious unity, and general productive policy. How far divines and statesmen seem to be acquainted with these universal principles, will become more evident as we proceed in our analysis of incoherent policy and infidelity.

The general disinclination to read continuous dissertations and voluminous productions, has induced us to decline publishing the continuation of these critical essays, in the form of a book, but they may be found scattered in short articles through the various numbers of our weekly publication, the London Phalanx.

Critical dissertation is perhaps of little use, at any time, and therefore, the shorter it is the better, for, those who do not *feel* the weight of falsehood and depravity, and long for a superior and better state of things, will not be apt to *see* and understand the cause of error and iniquity by aid of argument alone in theory; and those who feel that something is required to better the condition of society, and wish to learn the principles of progress, may obtain true knowledge on this subject from the book of Revelation by the prophets and the book of science as developed by superior genius, and particularly by the late Fourier.

WORKS of CHARLES FOURIER and the PHALANSTERIAN SCHOOL. Sold at the Office of the "*London Phalanx*," 3 A, Catherine Street, Strand.

OUVRAGES DE CHARLES FOURIER.

Theorie des quatre Mouvemens et des Destinées Générales, (1808). 1 vol. in 8vo.	£0 9 0
Le Nouveau Monde Industriel et Sociétaire, (1829). 2 vol. in 12mo.	0 6 0
La Fausse Industrie, Morcelée, Repugnante, Mensongère, (1835). 2 vols. post 8vo.	0 14 0
Traité de L'Association Domestique Agricole, (1822). 2 vols. in 8vo.	1 4 0

(The first edition of this work has been sold off, and a second edition is now in the Press.)

OUVRAGES DE M. JUST MUIRON.

Essai sur les Procédés Industriels, 2nd edition, (1840).	0 3 0
Transactions Sociales, Religieuses et Scientifiques, (1832).	0 4 0

OUVRAGES DE M. VICTOR CONSIDERANT. CAPT. DU GENIE.

Destinée Sociale, (1835). 2 vols. in 8vo. . . .	0 16 0
Debacle de la Politique en France . . .	0 2 6
Manifeste de l'Ecole Sociétaire	0 2 0
Trois Discours à l'Hotel de Ville . . .	0 3 6

M. JULES LE CHEVALIER.

Etudes sur la Science Sociale, 1 vol. in 8vo.	0 7 0

By HUGH DOHERTY.

THE BIOGRAPHY OF CHARLES FOURIER. 1 vol. post 8vo. .	0 2 0

With a brief Sketch of his Theory of Attractive Industry, by Abel Transon and Victor Considerant; to which are added, Fourier's Defence of the Christian Faith and Religion.

THE MORNING STAR: a series of Papers on Fourier's Science .	0 1 0

ALBERT BRISBANE, ESQ.: NEW YORK, U. S.

THE SOCIAL DESTINY OF MAN, *or Association and the Organization of Attractive Industry*. Published by C. F. Stollmeyer, 64, South Fourth Street, Philadelphia, U. S. 1 vol. in 8vo. nearly 500 pages	0 6 0

This volume contains a general view of the system of Fourier. The first part is devoted to a discussion of general topics relating to Social Reform, and to the extensive advantages of production and economy which would result from association; the second part passes in review the poverty and other evils which oppress the mass of the people; the third part contains a study of the passions, and an explanation of the mechanism of *Groups and Series*, or the means by which *Industry* is rendered *attractive*; the fourth part contains an examination of the principal forms of society, which have already existed upon earth; *i. e. Savageism, Patriarchalism, Military Barbarism*, and *Competitive Civilization*; the sixth part contains an exposition of Fourier's plans of Education.

There are some chapters especially devoted to general subjects; such as THE CAUSE OF EVIL, and the DESTINY OF MAN: chapters 16 and 17.

A REVIEW OF THE SOCIAL DESTINY OF MAN. From the United States Magazine, and Democratic Review. 48 8vo. pages	0 0 6
THE PHALANSTERY, OR ATTRACTIVE INDUSTRY AND MORAL HARMONY, translated from the French of Madame Gatti de Gamond, by an English Lady. In 1 vol. 12mo. . . .	0 3 0

William Stevens, Printer, Bell Yard, Temple Bar.