

## Durham E-Theses

---

*Bourgeois and bourgeoisie from 1789 – 1844: a study  
in the evolution of French political theory*

Shirley M. Gruner

### How to cite:

---

Gruner, Shirley M. (1967) *Bourgeois and bourgeoisie from 1789 – 1844: a study in the evolution of French political theory*. Masters thesis, Durham University.

### Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/9616/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

Durham University

Shirley M. Gruner

Abstract of the Thesis

submitted for a Degree of Master of Arts

"Bourgeois" and "Bourgeoisie" from 1789 to 1844:

A Study in the Evolution of French Political Theory

This thesis deals with the evolution of the words "bourgeois" and "bourgeoisie" as terms in French social and political theory from 1789 to 1844.

Firstly, it analyses the use of the words in the French Revolution. Two meanings are shown to develop during this period, one to denote a small aristocracy of the rich and the other to denote the mass of citizens. Secondly, the development of the words by the liberals is considered when the terms come to refer to the industrial class, i.e. the class which has discovered a new means of production and thereby the basis for a new peaceful and prosperous society. Thirdly, the ideas of Saint-Simon are considered and it is shown that he created a new definition whereby the bourgeoisie is

regarded as a small group of idlers. A study of the Saint-Simonists shows that they extended this definition to mean the idler and non-productive class owning all the instruments of production. Moreover, in the 1830's, it came to mean all the owners of the means of production whether idler or not, in other words, the capitalists. In addition, however, the terms became associated with certain moral attributes such as egoism, greed, and selfishness. This line was especially developed by the Communists. Finally, the last popular definition is shown to be that of the Fourierist. They stated that the bourgeoisie was the extensive middle class due for extinction in the hands of the new financial aristocracy. In the conclusion, it is pointed out the terms vary in meaning according to the social theory used and do not denote a social group in the same way as, say, the terms "shopkeepers", "doctors". Consequently, if they are not expressly related to some theory, they can refer to any of a large number of different things.

March 1967

'Bourgeois' and 'Bourgeoisie' from 1789 to 1844:  
A Study in the Evolution of French Political Theory

-----oOo-----

Thesis submitted for the Degree of Master of Arts

by

Shirley May Gruner

-----oOo-----

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.  
No quotation from it should be published without  
his prior written consent and information derived  
from it should be acknowledged.

March 1967

Durham University

## CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<u>INTRODUCTION</u> .....	1 - 3
 <u>SECTION I</u> 	
Chapter I : The French Revolution .....	4 - 31
Chapter II : Class Theories of Barnave, Robespierre, and Babeuf .....	32 - 46
Chapter III : The Rule of Reason, 1795 - 1815 .	47 - 60
 <u>SECTION II</u> 	
Chapter IV : Doctrinaires or Political Liberals of the Right .....	61 - 73
Chapter V : Political Liberals of the Left and Economic Liberals .....	74 - 85
Chapter VI : Thierry and Guizot - Liberal Historians .....	86 - 99
Chapter VII : Interpreters of the French Revolution .....	100 - 109
Chapter VIII : Saint-Simon - an economic liberal? .....	110 - 130
 <u>SECTION III</u> 	
Chapter IX : Early Criticisms of Liberal Economics (up to 1830) .....	131a- 156
Chapter X : The Revolution of 1830 and the Saint-Simonists .....	157 - 168
Chapter XI : General Trends of the 1830's ....	169 - 181
Chapter XII : Social Moralists of the 1830's ..	182 - 204
Chapter XIII : The Fourierists and Louis Blanc	205 - 225
Chapter XIV : Communism and Socialism after 1839 .....	226 - 247
<u>CONCLUSION</u> .....	248 - 252
<u>BIBLIOGRAPHY</u> .....	(i) - (xvii)

INTRODUCTION

The following thesis originated from an attempt to explain phrases such as "the revolution of the bourgeoisie" and similar statements frequently used by historians when writing on the French Revolution. It occurred to me that the words "bourgeois" and "bourgeoisie" were theoretical terms of a social theory and could not actually be used without reference to such a theory. Historians appear, however, to overlook the theoretical or even ideological basis of the concept<sup>1</sup> and to apply the words as if they were in the same category as "doctors", "bakers" and so on. It has therefore been my aim to point to the origin of the words as theoretical categories in historical, social and economic systems of thought and also to show the progressive shift in the meaning of the words. In order to make this change in meaning clear, I have been insistent on examining the various uses of the terms over a period of time since quite clearly there was a definite change of emphasis

<sup>1</sup> The remarks of Marc Bloch in speaking of "feudalism and "capitalism" also apply to our term. He writes: "The historian seldom defines. He might well consider this an unnecessary precaution, if he were borrowing from a usage which was itself strictly defined. Since such is not the case, almost his only guide, even in the use of his key words, is personal instinct. He arbitrarily expands, restricts, distorts the meanings - without warning his reader; without always fully realising it himself". The Historian's Craft, Manchester University Press, 1954, p.175.

from, say, 1815 to 1830 and I consider this stress on the time factor as of particular importance in clarifying the origin and development of the terms so that, for instance, I have been careful to use only works written in the period under consideration at each time to show quite clearly the progressive changes in meaning. Moreover, it has not been my intention to show a specific liberal use or a socialist use. My aim has been solely to trace the unfolding of the terms. Once they have acquired a new emphasis, I have confined myself to that emphasis. For instance, after 1830, I have limited myself to the growth of the terms in the hands of the socialists and have not considered the continued use of the terms in their earlier sense.

My work falls roughly into three periods: the preparatory period up to 1815; the period from 1815 to 1830 with what might be called the "liberal" theory of the "bourgeoisie" predominating; and the period from 1830 with the predominance of the "socialist" theory. In each case, I have drawn upon the ideas of all the well-known thinkers of the period who have in some way dealt with social and political problems although, in some cases, they have not always furthered the theme under consideration. I have done this because I considered the negative aspect might be also of interest, that is, it might be useful to know who developed the theme and who did not. In

terminating this work, I have taken the date when the French development of the concept of the "bourgeois" and "bourgeoisie" had reached its final point of development to influence and be influenced by Marx.

It might be asked why in this respect Proudhon was excluded. I should like to state in this connection, (a) the main body of Proudhon's work falls outside this period and (b) the chief work published before 1844 "Qu'est-ce que la propriété" represents a line of thought quite distinct from the French political and social ideas of his time, bearing a far greater resemblance to the legalistic structure of German thought. Therefore, I considered the trend of the argument would not suffer by the exclusion and that moreover being far beyond the scope of this work to analyse the thought of Proudhon, an exclusion would be more fair than a brief notice.

Finally, I hope to show, firstly, that the class "bourgeoisie" is not the same as say the class of university professors but is a category of social theory and, secondly, that the words "bourgeois" and "bourgeoisie" are used not in one social theory but in several so that it is necessary when using the phrase the "bourgeois class" to add also according to the theory of Thierry, of Saint Simon, of Karl Marx and so on. I hope I have thereby made a small contribution towards the clarification of concepts and towards the understanding of the use of words during this period.

S E C T I O N I

CHAPTER I

The French Revolution

CHAPTER II

Class Theories of Barnave, Robespierre  
and Babeuf

CHAPTER III

The Rule of Reason, 1795-1815

---oOo---

CHAPTER IThe French Revolution1. Introduction

Since the aim of this investigation is to trace out the origin and development of the words "bourgeoisie" and "bourgeois" as terms in theories of society, it is necessary to point out that in France until the Revolution of 1789 there was no trace of any such usage - just as indeed there was no social theory of class development at all.<sup>1</sup> There was, of course, the idea of social classes based on economic criteria.<sup>2</sup> There was also the idea of progress but there was no notion of classes progressing according to an economic pattern and least of all the concept of the rise of the bourgeois class. It is true that the idea of society as one formed of certain privileged and non-privileged groups or castes was under severe attack and that, too, the general tendency was to divide society according to wealth and not rank. Yet, on the whole, France in the 18th century presented a situation

<sup>1</sup> Of course, the words "bourgeois" and "bourgeoisie" were widely used in 18th century France just as the words "force", "power" and so on were used before being defined as terms in a scientific theory.

<sup>2</sup> For an interesting account of the ideas of economic classes and class struggle in 18th century France see Léon Cahen, "L'Idée de Lutte de Classes au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle", Revue de Synthèse Historique, Vol. 12, Jan. to June 1906.

in which one theory of society was decaying without another theory having arisen to replace it. Moreover, the French thinkers of the 18th century were far more interested in the perfectibility of man via political change than in the study of society as such so that, when the Revolution came, there was a certain amount of agreement and understanding about the necessary political reforms but considerable ignorance and disagreement as to the pattern society was to take. In this respect, opinion in France differed from that in England for, in the latter country, the principles for a new theory of society were already being laid, as, for instance, in the works of Adam Smith and Hume. In this section, I will first try to show the conflicting views on society which arose during the French Revolution; I will then discuss the ideas of certain representative thinkers; finally I will consider the period of transition up to 1815 which might be said to mark the change-over from the "rationalist" view of society to the economic view of society.

## 2. Unity or the struggle against privilege

There are indications to show that in 1789 there was a feeling that the meeting of the Estates General was to mark a new era for France. It was to be the start of a complete regeneration of man, the birth of a new society based on Reason, the end of division or as the third estate of the town of Vienne expressed it:

"Les Français auront une patrie commune, ne seront plus qu'un seul peuple, une grande famille où les aînés n'emploieront la supériorité de leurs lumières et de leurs forces que pour le bonheur de leurs frères".<sup>3</sup>

In this exalted state of mind, all men were to be brothers, all disharmony overcome, there was to be one nation, one people and one will.<sup>4</sup> It is true that there was a remarkable contrast between this feeling and the modest demands made in the Cahiers which suggest that no violent upheaval was awaited or expected. Yet clearly this state of mind in conjunction with certain ideas could have an explosive effect.<sup>5</sup> For instance, the idea of a general will was more in tune with this feeling than the notion of individual rights. Did not Sieyès say, "the Nation is prior to everything. It is the source of everything"? In this view, Reason is the General Will and the General Will is the basis of Law.<sup>6</sup> The revolutionary implications of this were not at first

<sup>3</sup> Quoted in E. Champion, La France d'après les Cahiers de 1789, Paris 1897, p. 242. He also quotes several similar remarks from the Cahiers.

<sup>4</sup> For instance, see M.J.P. Rabaut, Almanach Historique de la Révolution Française, Paris, 1792, pp. 256-7, and in general, Mémoires de Bailly.

<sup>5</sup> For a clear statement on the effect of ideas on the French Revolution, see J. Salwyn Schapiro, Condorcet and the Rise of Liberalism, New York, 1934, pp. 32-33.

<sup>6</sup> see Bernard Groethuysen, Philosophie de la Révolution Française, Paris 1956 Bibliothèque des Idées, p.236 ff.

realised since it was presumed Reason was common to all and therefore natural rights could never conflict with the will of the nation. Yet obviously, an implicit conflict is there as Groethuysen points out<sup>7</sup> and it was to be a source not of unity but of division.

For example, if the Law is the expression of the General Will, how does the individual will accord with the General Will? Ideally every individual must be equal with equal interests. But can you have equal interests if property interests are unequal? Yet how can the notion of equal interests be reconciled to the notion of individual liberty based on individual property rights? In this way the idea of the General Will can conflict with the concept of individual rights. These conflicts were soon to appear.

However, in the early days of the Revolution, the solution to the problems of France was considered to be quite simple. It was merely a question of the abolition of privilege. As Sieyès said, "if in France we want to merge the three orders into one, we must first abolish

<sup>7</sup> Groethuysen, ibid, p.243, for example "De même, il était inévitable qu'au cours de cette dialectique, il se produisît des oppositions, par exemple entre le principe de la souveraineté du peuple et celui de la représentation, entre l'inaliénabilité des droits individuels et le droit absolu qu'avait la nation d'en disposer, entre l'idée de l'égalité des droits et celle qui légitimait la répartition inégale des propriétés".

all privileges of all kinds. The nobleman and the priest must have no interest other than the common interest and by law they must enjoy only the right of ordinary citizens".<sup>8</sup> The sole division of society then lay in privilege and not economic categories for "what divides men is not a difference in occupation or wealth or ability but a difference in interests. In the present case, there are only two interests; that of the privileged and that of the non-privileged. All classes of the Third Estate are bound together by a common interest against the oppression of the privileged".<sup>9</sup> It was a case of 25 million people against 200,000 and even the privileged could re-enter the body of the nation once they had purged themselves of their unjust privileges.<sup>10</sup> Accordingly, it was only necessary to persuade or coerce a very small group to surrender their special rights and so restore the original harmony and unity of the Nation.

### 3. Conflict - Are there divisions in the Third Estate?

The view of unity saw no divisions except that between privilege and non-privilege, at least no other fundamental one for rich and poor, town and country, all have the same

<sup>8</sup> Sieyès, What is the Third Estate? Trans. M. Blondel, London, 1963, p. 107

<sup>9</sup> Sieyès, ibid, p.77, note p.

<sup>10</sup> Sieyès, ibid, p.173

interests. It is a view which completely fails to take into account the diversity of society whereby there are some common interests but not all interests are common.<sup>11</sup> Yet the General Will idea was popular and so the problem was to show that the whole Third Estate (nation or people)<sup>12</sup> was one society capable of forming one will. Could, in fact, the Third Estate provide a political settlement without any social reorganisation? There were already in the 18th century views quite contradictory to this; views which asserted there were economic differences and one quite predominant view that property was unfairly distributed so that some writers

<sup>11</sup> Here lies of course the revolutionary nature of the ideas. Basically, it was not so much rejecting the English constitution for Sieyès but rejecting Locke and the idea of individual rights based on a natural law superior to everything - even the nation. But here lies the difficulty of the French Revolution. As Groethuysen writes, opicit, p.227, "Nous nous trouvons donc devant deux conceptions différentes de l'Etat, d'une part celle de Hobbes et celle de Rousseau, qui, quelles que soient leur divergences sur la définition du souverain, le déclarent tout-puissant vis-à-vis de l'individu, et de l'autre, celle de Locke et de ses successeurs, qui donne comme limite au pouvoir de l'Etat les droits préétablis de l'individu, c'est-à-dire la liberté et la propriété, auxquelles l'Etat ne peut porter aucune atteinte. La philosophie de la révolution française essaye de concilier les deux points de vue".

<sup>12</sup> There was some difficulty in using the word "peuple". It might express not so much the whole Third Estate as "la partie non éclairée" thereby opening up divisions! See Mémoires de Bailly ed. Berville et Barrière, Paris 1821, Vol. 1, p.147.

have attributed socialist ideas to the French Revolution.<sup>13</sup> Yet, when it came to action, many of the deputies retreated from advanced positions. Unity of course they all desired. The conflict came on the question as to how much would have to be sloughed off before the true will was reached. What in fact was the nation?

The view of Sieyès that the nation was the whole Third Estate was already disputed in 1789, as we might expect from the ideas of that time. For instance, there was the opposition between landed property owners and the rest, and there was the division between rich and poor. The view that the landowners were the true citizens had its supporters, even Condorcet had once maintained the view that only a landowner could be a citizen<sup>14</sup> and the National Assembly did effect a very neat class division giving predominance to landowners by its suffrage qualifications at least as regards the qualifications

<sup>13</sup> Alfred Espinas, La philosophie sociale du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle et la Révolution, Paris 1898. A view Lichtenberger does not support. (Le socialisme et la révolution française, Paris 1899)

<sup>14</sup> For instance, he wrote in 1787, "Dans les pays cultivés, c'est le territoire qui forme l'Etat. C'est donc la propriété qui doit faire les citoyens". Lettres d'un bourgeois de New Haven à un citoyen de Virginie. Oeuvres complètes de Condorcet, Brunswick and Paris, 1804, Vol. XII, pp. 16-17.

for deputies (marc d'argent).<sup>15</sup> This was not accepted without a struggle.<sup>16</sup> Yet at the time this struggle tended to be confused with another division, that of poor versus rich and it was the latter which eventually prevailed.

Let us now consider this conflict. Even before the Third Estate met, it was being reminded that all was not harmony in the "Nation". What of the third of the population not consulted? Were the poor going to be oppressed by the rich as always? Why were the poor not represented? <sup>17</sup> Babeuf in his "Cadastre perpétuel" gives an even more generous estimation of the unrepresented -

15

See Edgard Allix, "La Rivalité entre la propriété foncière et la fortune mobilière sous la Révolution", Revue d'Histoire Economique et Sociale, 1913.

16

There was a general feeling amongst the revolutionaries that this was to introduce a new aristocracy - 'aristocratie des riches' (Gregoire) 'l'aristocratie de l'argent' (Lameth) and so the many objections to it. For the various speeches against it see, Jean Jaurès, Histoire Socialiste de la Révolution française, Vol. II, L'Oeuvre de la Constituante p. 14 onwards.

17

See brochures, e.g. Cahier des Pauvres May 1789, Cahiers du Quatrième Ordre, quoted in Chassin, Les Elections et les Cahiers de Paris de 1789, Paris 1888, Vol. I, p.463 ff and Vol. II p.581 ff.

15 million out of 24 million.<sup>18</sup> The poorer inhabitants of Paris had a real grievance since owing to suffrage qualifications they were prevented from participating in the elections and therefore were in a worse position than the serfs of Mt. Jura. Yet these were but muffled voices compared to what was to come later.

The first obvious split was the establishment of property qualifications in the new Constitution. It was, as Brissot pointed out, an inequality of right supported by, as he said, "la haute noblesse, le haut clergé, la haute magistrature, et ce qu'on appelait le haut tiers ou la haute bourgeoisie".<sup>19</sup> The question was, however, difficult. As we shall see, splits were to appear amongst the revolutionaries themselves on this matter.

The freedom of the press was bringing these conflicts more and more into the open. Marat was soon to appear as

18

Babeuf, Le Cadastre Perpétuel, 1789, quoted in Babeuf Textes Choisis, ed. Mazauric, Les Classiques du Peuple, Paris, 1965, p.98.

19

Mémoires de Brissot, Vol. XXXII of Bibliothèque des Mémoires pendant le 18<sup>e</sup> siècle ed. M. de Lescure 1854-1890, pp. 426-7.

the champion of the lower orders,<sup>20</sup> the size of which was now estimated at 18 million.<sup>21</sup> They were the destroyers of the Bastille, they had made the Revolution but had they benefited from it? What good was it to destroy the authority of the nobles if it were to be replaced by an aristocracy of the rich? Marat took on the role of the champion of the underdog, suspicious of any authority not of their making.<sup>22</sup> Similar voices appear such as Hébert in the role of Père Duchesne fulminating against the aristocrats, generally in such modest roles as "marchands de vin", "limonadiers",<sup>23</sup> It is questionable whether this could be termed a sociological categoration of classes or merely a dislike of the wine sold. Still, it was all part of the campaign against the rich, the new aristocrats, so that by 1790,

<sup>20</sup> Marat started off as a champion of the unity of the Third Estate, including in it, "manoeuvres", "ouvriers", "artisans", "marchands", "négociants", "cultivateurs", "propriétaires", "fonciers", "rentiers", "artistes", "médecins", "savants", "gens de loi" unies par leurs intérêts communs". *Offrande à la Patrie ou discours au Tiers-Etat de France, Paris, 1789*, quoted in *Marat, Textes Choisis*, ed. Michel Vovelle, *Les Classiques du Peuple*, Paris, 1963, p. 98. He soon changed his mind.

<sup>21</sup> See Garaudy, Roger, *Les sources françaises du socialisme scientifique*, Paris, 1948, p. 41

<sup>22</sup> See Marat, *Textes Choisis*, Note 20, p. 213 ff.

<sup>23</sup> *Le Père Duchesne d'Hébert*, Edition Critique par F. Braesch, Vol. I, Paris 1938, p. 265, No. VII 14th October, 1790.

division is flourishing. Those in power tended to see it all as the work of a small, evil-minded group working on the base passions of the people who were, unfortunately in some cases, not sufficiently educated to hear the voice of Reason.<sup>24</sup>

By 1791, political conflict was completely confounded with class divisions. For those not in power, those in power were some wealthy clique. Moreover, by a vicious circle, the economic shortages intensified the ideas of a class struggle whilst this intensification frightened many revolutionaries into retreating behind the notion of property suffrage, and thereby confirming the ideas of

24

Lafayette said to de Ségur: "Je ne sais par quelle fatalité un parti qui se cache dans l'Ombre est venu se mêler au vrai peuple, que ne veut que justice et liberté. Il est sorti de je ne sais où, un certain nombre de brigands soldés par les mains inconnues..." De Ségur: Mémoires et Souvenirs, Bibliothèque des Mémoires pendant le 18<sup>e</sup> siècle ed. Barrière 1854-1890, p.199.

Chénier put the blame on "une foule d'orateurs et d'écrivains". Avis au peuple français 24 Aug. 1790, Oeuvres Complètes, ed. G. Walter, 1950, p.200 ff.

Bailly expressed the general idea of reason measured by property when he wrote: "si la multitude aveugle gouverne, les plus grands intérêts peuvent être sacrifiés. Les ambitieux, les riches l'agitent et la dirigent, cette multitude. Les lumières doivent être la base de tout pouvoir politique. Si les Anglais, si Turgot ont adopté les propriétés pour base de la représentation, c'est qu'ils ont regardé les propriétés, ou la richesse, comme une sorte de mesure des lumières". Mémoires, Vol. I, p.281

a class division. On the one side, there is the continual insistence that the revolution is not finished, the poor must profit from it, social divisions must be abolished,<sup>25</sup> or at least the distinction drawn between active and passive citizens.<sup>26</sup> We might also see the spectre of another division between those who want a social revolution and those who want a political one, i.e. between those who want to establish universal suffrage and those who want to establish economic equality. Yet they are still united in the belief "les abus sont l'ouvrage et le domaine des riches, ils sont les fléaux du peuple; l'intérêt du peuple est l'intérêt général, celui des riches est l'intérêt particulier".<sup>27</sup> Aspersions were already being cast upon the "bourgeois". For instance,

<sup>25</sup> See Prudhomme, Revolutions de Paris, Vol. 7, No. 82 29 Jan - 5 Feb. 1791: "Riches! consentez de bonne grâce à la loi agraire. Qu'un nouveau cadastre, composé de petites portions toutes égales, réalise enfin cette constitution solennelle qui déclare tous les hommes égaux". p.170.

Sylvain Maréchal: "Je n'aime pas les rois, j'aime encore moins les riches ... La révolution n'est pas faite ... Vous décretez l'abolition de la noblesse mais vous conservez l'état respectif des pauvres et des riches, des maîtres et de leurs valets". In Dame Nature à la barre de l'Assemblée Nationale 1791 quoted in Maurice Dommanget, Sylvain Maréchal, Paris 1950, pp. 186-187

<sup>26</sup> see Marat, L'ami du peuple, No. 531, 16 Aug. 1791, op.cit.

<sup>27</sup> Speech of Robespierre to Cordeliers April 20, 1791, quoted G. Walter, Robespierre, Paris 1961.

Prudhomme's "Révolutions de Paris" accused them of not being democratic. However, an analysis of the article shows the concern was with "la haute bourgeoisie".<sup>28</sup>

The supporters of the Constitution of 1791, i.e. those who considered the revolution ended, were in a more difficult position. How can you reconcile property suffrage to the notion of the General Will? How can you assert the unity of the Third Estate if you have already divided it? Often, of course, they sank to the level of the "brigand" theory.<sup>29</sup> Yet chiefly their explanation is that the General Will is not the voice of all, but the voice of the majority. They have the people on their side. The General Will is neither the voice of the very rich (their particular interest is too great) nor the voice of the very poor (because they have not yet been sufficiently educated) but the voice of the huge majority in the middle as Barnave said

28

Prudhomme, Révolutions de Paris, Vol. VIII No. 87 5th - 12th March 1791. This article is in fact much less aggressive than the one mentioned in note 25.

29

All the agitation is usually put down to a small group, e.g. "une minorité active, agitée par des passions totalement étrangère au bien public". Oeuvres de Barnave ed. M. Berenger de la Drome 1843 Vol. I, Pt. II, p. 148.

from "le négociant à l'ouvrier".<sup>30</sup> Objections to this are that divisions are admitted and that now the voice of Reason speaks only from a certain group, and the rest will be forced to submit to their will. In answer, it was suggested that all are equal in civil rights and political

30

See Barnave's speech of Aug. 11, 1791, to the Assembly. He lists three conditions for liberty - knowledge, interest in the "chose publique" and independence of fortune and then said: "Ces avantages, je ne les cherche point dans la class supérieure des riches; car il y a là sans doute trop d'intérêt particulier, qui sépare de l'intérêt général. Mais s'il est vrai que je ne doive pas chercher les qualités, que je viens d'énoncer, dans la classe éminemment riche, je ne les chercherai point non plus parmi ceux que la nullité de leur fortune empêche d'acquérir des lumières parmi ceux qui, sans cesse aux prises avec les besoins, offriraient à la corruption un moyen trop facile. C'est donc dans la classe mitoyenne des fortunes, que nous trouverons les avantages que j'ai annoncés, et je demande si c'est la contribution de 5 ~~livres~~ jusqu'à 10, qui peut faire soupçonner que l'on mettra les élections entre les mains des riches." Buchez et Roux Vol. II pp. 280-281. This is repeated verbally in Oeuvres de Barnave, Vol. I, p. 269. The version given by Jaures opicit Vol. 3 is different, for instance it says "classe moyenne" and not "classe mitoyenne". As regards people, Barnave said: "Ce qu'il faut appeler peuple, c'est, depuis le négociant jusqu'à l'ouvrier, toute la parti industrielle de la nation ... Oeuvres de Barnave, Vol. II, p.72.

A similar view was expressed in L'ami des Patriotes No. 16, 12 March 1791, "le peuple était composé de la bourgeoisie, de cette foule d'hommes occupés, vertueux, qui ne sont corrompus ni par l'opulence ni par la misère; ils sont véritablement la nation et c'est à leur volonté souveraine qu'il faut que l'on obeisse tôt ou tard". Quoted Georges Michon, Essai sur l'histoire du parti feillant: Adrien Duport, Paris 1924.

functions are not rights but capabilities acquired with the progress of knowledge, and to the objection why should payment of a certain amount of taxes equal knowledge, it was stated, more or less, that this was the only way to measure it.<sup>31</sup> This points to later liberal theory but it was not very successful in 1792. To be plausible certain Rousseauan concepts had first to be abandoned.

As the economic situation grew worse, the popular journalists swelled their attacks blending now into the picture the "agioteurs", "financiers", "monopoleurs"; for instance, Jacques Roux, of whom it was said he had constantly on his lips the word "accapareur".<sup>32</sup> But now, too, the "bourgeoisie" was being opposed to the "people".

<sup>31</sup> Saint-Just at this time was a partisan of such ideas. He wrote for instance: "L'égalité naturelle est conservée en France; tous participent également de la souveraineté par la condition uniforme du tribut qui règle le droit de suffrage; l'inégalité n'est que dans le gouvernement; tous peuvent élire, tous ne peuvent être élus; la classe tout-à-fait indigente est peu nombreuse; qui ne paye point de tributs, n'est point frappé de stérilité; elle est condamnée à l'indépendance ou à l'émulation, et jouit des droits sociaux de l'égalité naturelle, la sûreté de la justice". 'Esprit de la Révolution et de la Constitution de France' in Oeuvres Complètes de Saint-Just ed. Charles Vellay, Vol. I, Paris, 1908, p. 271 f.

<sup>32</sup> "Ecartez des magistratures plébéiennes et de toutes sortes d'emplois .. ces agioteurs patriotiques qui ont accaparé les billets nationaux, les comestibles et les denrées de toute espèce .... 24 May 1792, quoted in M. Dommanget, Jacques Roux, Le Curé Rouge, Paris 1948, p. 20.

For instance, Brissot wrote at the end of November 1791 that the "bourgeois" want to put themselves in the place of the nobles and leave their place to the artisans.

Petion continued the attack although more in sorrow than in anger. He wrote in his famous letter to Buzot of February 6, 1792:

"La bourgeoisie, cette classe nombreuse et aisée, fait scission avec le peuple; elle se place au-dessus de lui; elle se croit de niveau avec la noblesse qui la dédaigne, et qui n'attend que le moment favorable par l'humilier".

They should unite again with the people and fight the sole enemy, the "privileged".<sup>33</sup> In both cases, and in that of Prudhomme, I feel the term "bourgeoisie" here is being used for "haute bourgeoisie". The reply of André Chénier was as follows:

.. cette lettre assure ... que la bourgeoisie n'est plus aussi attachée à la révolution. Si ce fait important est vrai, il me semble qu'il aurait dû inspirer à ce magistrat d'autres réflexions que celles qu'on est dans sa lettre. Il aurait du considérer que cette classe, qu'il désigne par ce mot de bourgeoisie, étant celle qui est placée, à distance égale, entre les vices de l'opulence et ceux de la misère ... fait essentiellement la masse du vrai peuple .. que cette classe est la plus sobre, la plus sage, la mieux active, la plus rempli de tout ce qu'une honnête industrie enfante de louable et de bon ..<sup>34</sup>

<sup>33</sup> This letter is quoted in full in Jean Jaurès op. cit Vol. III La Législative, p. 333 ff.

<sup>34</sup> André Chénier "De la Cause des désordres qui troublent la France", 26 February 1792 in "Journal de Paris", Oeuvres, see Note 24, p. 272 ff.

I think it is quite clear that they are talking of something quite different under the same name. Chénier seems to be referring to anything but the haute bourgeoisie, if anything the petite bourgeoisie! The word "bourgeoise" is beginning to reveal its useful elasticity. Depending on which side you are, it can shrink to an aristocratic élite or expand to form the mass of the nation.<sup>35</sup>

The conflict is repeated all over again in the period 1792-3 with the same arguments on either side, only the sides are different. It might be thought that by now it should have been obvious that the concept of a General Will as a servant of Reason, the natural thinking of all men, with all making the laws and freely submitting to them without force was incapable of establishing any order, any security, or any government. Yet, some still believed that the sole defect was the political split due to property suffrage and that, once democracy was established, there would be no more dissent. Of course, they reacted in astonished indignation when the divisions remained, usually

35

Of course, the favourite expression of the elite group is 'L'aristocratie bourgeoise' but this term is not clear either - is it an aristocratic section of the bourgeoisie or are all bourgeoisie aristocrats? By using such blurred terms they could fit the cap to the wearer.

blaming some small band of agitators.<sup>36</sup> As Gensonné asked Robespierre: "Pourquoi nous présentez-vous toujours le peuple comme divisé en classes de citoyens ennemis les uns des autres"<sup>37</sup> In their eyes, often enough, economic inequality was part of the social and natural order and was not a question of politics. Condorcet supported this view. There were no durable oppositions of interests in the economic field for as man developed his knowledge, the fellowship of man would appear automatically. In any case, if man was left to himself, his natural interests would so work out that there would be a rough economic equality.

<sup>36</sup> For instance, Brissot speaks of "the men for the perpetuation of their own power, finding it necessary to perpetuate disorders, have divided society into two classes; those who have something and those who have nothing". J.P. Brissot, To his Constituents, translated from the French London 1794. Similar ideas in the Mémoires of Mde. Roland and Louvet.

<sup>37</sup> Gensonné's speech of 2nd January 1793 reproduced in Orators of the French Revolution, ed. H. Morse Stephens, p. 406 ff, vol. 12. Buzot also wrote: "Si nous eussions voulu faire une contre-révolution en France, nous aurions commencé par diviser le peuple en deux partis, dont l'un, d'abord moins nombreux, mais composés de pauvres, de fainéants, de gens flétris, habitués au désordre et au crime, eût été porté naturellement à ruiner, outrager, opprimer l'autre, composé de riches, de commerçans, d'hommes industriels, honnêtes, habitués à la paix des bonnes moeurs; nous aurions profité des dispositions des premiers, que nous nous serions attachés à tout prix pour soulever contre les seconds; nous aurions dépeint ceux-ci comme des aristocrates, des accapareurs, des hommes suspects, qu'il fallait piler, voler"...Buzot, Memoires sur la Révolution Francaise, ed. M. Guadet, Paris 1823, p. 79 f.

Accordingly, Condorcet believed that to divide the country into rich and poor with completely opposing interests was simply a political manoeuvre to win power.<sup>38</sup>

Of course, the most famous opponent of this view was Robespierre. He did not believe in automatic progress. A corrupting element had entered society - wealth. The rich were vicious and the poor virtuous. Like Rousseau, he did not believe in the abolition of property as a whole. He suggested perhaps an even more difficult feat, a sort of moral renunciation of it.<sup>39</sup> Certainly for Robespierre, there was a deep split in society but was this really an economic division or a moral division? Surely it was not a case of one class replacing another, but a system of corrupt morality going to be replaced by another of true

38

Condorcet wrote: "Je vais donc essayer de prouver que ces prétendues oppositions d'intérêts n'existent pas; que le développement des facultés de l'homme, le progrès de la civilisation .. ne tendent point naturellement à séparer les hommes, mais à les rapprocher .. et que l'homme ne peut devenir ennemi de l'homme que l'effet des lois injuste ou des institutions corruptrices". in *Que toutes les classes de la société n'ont qu'un même intérêt*, Condorcet Note 14, Vol. XVIII p. 45 ff.

39

For instance in No. 4 of "Défenseurs de la Constitution" 1792, he wrote on riches: "Il est pour les âmes pures et élevées des biens plus précieux que ceux-là. Les richesses qui conduisent à tant de corruption, sont plus nuisibles à ceux qui les possèdent qu'à ceux qui en sont privés". Quoted in Oeuvres de Max. Robespierre, ed. Laponneraye, Paris, 1840, Vol. 1, p. 389.

morality. <sup>40</sup>

However during the 1792-93 struggle, Robespierre tended to stress the idea of bourgeois aristocrats usurping power from the vast mass of the people. For instance, he wrote in "Lettres à ses Commettans" in February 1793:

"Quand le peuple a vu lui-même, avec mépris cette antique idole, brayée, par son ordre sous la hache des lois, quelle tyrannie nouvelle pourrait lui en imposer? Comment l'aristocratie bourgeoise, par exemple, pourra-t-elle se hisser sur le piédestal brisé des nobles, des prêtres et des rois? Tous les vices qu'enfante la tyrannie n'ont pas disparu avec le tyran; ceux qui se seroient prostitués à lui, se prostituent à l'orgueil, à l'ambition, à la cupidité; la minorité de la nation corrompue lutte contre la majorité saine ... Ils favorisent de tout leur pouvoir les riches égoïstes et tous les ennemis de l'égalité". <sup>41</sup>

Robespierre is here in the usual manner combining economic and political groups. Often enough, by the word "bourgeois" "bourgeois aristocracy", he refers to the "Girondéens". For instance, in the much quoted documents found amongst his papers after his death saying, "Les dangers intérieurs viennent des bourgeois; pour vaincre les bourgeois, il faut rallier le peuple. Tout était disposé pour mettre le peuple sous le joug des bourgeois ..... Obviously dating

<sup>40</sup> He said on May 8, 1793.. "Il n'existe que deux partis, celui des hommes corrompus et celui des hommes vertueux. Ne distinguez pas les hommes par leur fortune et par leur état, mais par leur caractère ... Oeuvres Complètes de Robespierre, Paris, Vol. VIII, 1954, p. 488.

<sup>41</sup> No. 7, Oeuvres Complètes, Vol. V, p. 304 ff.

from his "Kampfzeit", this document reveals the tendency to equate the "Girondøns" with these "bourgeois" and combine the opposition against the rich, the commercials etc. with the political opposition against the party in the Convention (The "Girondøns" had, of course, done the same thing as regards the "Feuillants"). In fact, the Girondøns are the "bourgeois" or the "aristocratie bourgeoise" just as were the Dantonists at a later date.<sup>42</sup> Of course, in accordance with his way of thinking, Robespierre also saw it in a moral light.

#### 4. The Class Struggle

The years 1793 and 1794 were not very suitable for establishing a Republic of Virtue. Food shortages, and other shortages due to the economic inflation, war and civil war, were all not very conducive to bring out the best in man. The concept of unity seemed to be gone for ever. Everywhere there was a search for scapegoats. On the lowest level, bread making must have been a dangerous

42

See proposed speech of Robespierre February 1794: "Ce sont les mêmes hommes qui encourageaient sourdement l'aristocratie bourgeoise à reprendre cette audace contre-révolutionnaire que la faction girondine lui avait inspirée". Robespierre, Textes Choisis, Vol. III, Editions Sociales 1958, p.144 (Sur la faction Fabre d'Eglantine).

occupation.<sup>43</sup> On the Roux and Maréchal level, the source of all evil were the "accapareur, monopoleur, financier, banquiers", more generally "l'aristocratie marchande - plus terrible que l'aristocratie nobilère".<sup>44</sup> Everywhere was the conviction that although one aristocracy had gone, another had replaced it, an aristocracy of financiers, of merchants or of bourgeois.<sup>45</sup> It enters even into the act of accusation of the poor Bailly .. "que le peuple, et surtout ceux qui voulaient la liberté générale, qui ne voulaient pas qu'une portion, connue sous le nom de bourgeoisie, s'emparât du credit des deux ordres anéantis; qui désiraient enfin que la masse générale participât aux avantages de la révolution qu'elle avait faite." <sup>46</sup>

<sup>43</sup> Wine vendors, too, see report of Pourvoyeur 27 Dec. 1793, "Dans plusieurs groupes, l'on parlait beaucoup de l'aristocratie des marchands; l'on se plaignait que les marchands de vin vendaient du vin comme l'encre". Paris pendant la Terreur, ed. Pierre Caron, Paris 1910, Vol. II, p.40.

<sup>44</sup> Roux, Le Manifeste des Enragés 25 June 1793, see Note 32.

<sup>45</sup> For instance, protocol of the Section du Mail of 21 May 1793. "Il y a d'autres aristocrates. Ce sont tous les riches, tous les gros marchands ... Les riches restent chez eux ils voudraient une république aristocratique .. Die Sansculotten von Paris, Dokumente zur Geschichte der Volkshewegung 1793-1794 ed. by Markov and Soboul, Berlin 1957 p.48

<sup>46</sup> Mémoires de Bailly, Vol. II, p. 413

Analysed as a view of society, it appears to suggest that part of the Third Estate had formed a new aristocracy, had attempted to assert its particular will, the will of riches, against the general will, and further had tried to gain power in order to enrich itself further and enslave the rest of the nation. Since it was not of noble origin, it was bourgeois, a bourgeois aristocracy, sometimes likened to that in Switzerland and Holland.<sup>47</sup> This aristocracy of wealth had first to be overcome before the people (or sansculottes)<sup>48</sup> could come into their own. And for many it had not only to be overcome politically but socially. A general will could not be found until the distinction between rich and poor was ended. How was this to be achieved? Was the fault a moral one, a state of mind,

<sup>47</sup> For instance, Robespierre wrote on Holland in No. 5 of 'Lettres à ses Commettans' O.C. "Nous y recontrons l'aristocratie des richesses, le culte d'or et l'ésprit mercantiles". Vol. V, p. 272.

<sup>48</sup> Are they a moral category or an economic class? Revolutions de Paris No. 214 October 1793 wrote, "tout citoyen qui n'est ni royaliste, ni aristocrate, ni mauvais riche, ni égoïste, ni modéré, mérite d'être salué du titre honorable de sans-culottes" but at the same time "ne cherchez pas de vrais sans-culottes parmi les riches ...n'en cherchez pas dans la caste des gros marchands, des gros fermiers, des grands propriétaires". Prudhomme, Révolutions de Paris, Vol. 17, p.177 ff.  
 See also Sobow, The Parisian Sans-Culottes and the French Revolution, Oxford 1964.

aristocratism or "négociantisme"<sup>49</sup> to which anyone might fall a victim or was the fault in the economic structure? In other words, there could be a moral revolution which would then achieve an economic revolution or there could be an economic revolution, a class war with a resultant redistribution or communalization of property, thereby ending all the vices of wealth. This is a fine distinction and was not generally realised for the two are often confused. Yet it does appear it was this distinction Robespierre was trying hard to establish although his own ideas tend to confuse the two.<sup>50</sup>

Whatever was the attitude of Robespierre, it is certain that the last period of the French Revolution does show signs of a class war. Discounting the many manifestations of violent behaviour and language in the streets,<sup>51</sup> there are still signs that some interpreted the struggle as one

<sup>49</sup> "Le crime de 'négociantisme' était celui dont se rendaient coupables les hommes qui, par cupidité, ne recherchaient dans la Révolution que l'occasion de s'enrichir". Letter of Garnier to Committee of Public Safety quoted Pierre Bécamps, La Révolution à Bordeaux, Bordeaux 1953 p. 247.

<sup>50</sup> After all, virtue for him was embodied in a section of the French population. See also Talmon, The Origins of Totalitarian Democracy, London 1952.

<sup>51</sup> For numerous examples see A. Schmidt, Tableaux de la Révolution Française, Leipzig, 1867.

of class eradication.<sup>52</sup> One of its manifestations appears to have been amongst the representatives on mission. As, for instance, Jullien wrote to Robespierre on October 1<sup>st</sup>., 1793, "Partout je m'attache à relever le peuple, à montrer que la Révolution est faite pour lui, qu'il est temps que les pauvres et les sans-culottes dominant, puisqu'ils sont la majorité sur la terre et que la majorité doit dominer".<sup>53</sup> Le Bon also said "Sans-culottes, c'est pour vous qu'on guillotine; si l'on ne guillotine plus, vous n'aurez plus rien, vous mourrez de faim. Il faut que les sans-culottes prennent la place des riches".<sup>54</sup>

Most interesting is the document called "Instruction adressée aux autorités constituées des Départemens de Rhône et de Loire ... par les Représentans du Peuple" and approved by Collot d'Herbois and Fouché. It runs:

<sup>52</sup> Chalier at Lyons in January 1793 swore "D'exterminer tout ce qui existe sous le nom d'aristocrates, de feillantins, de modérés, d'égoïstes, d'agioteurs, d'accapareurs, d'usuriers". Jaurès, Vol. VII, p. 79.

Desfieux on March 25, 1793, demanded a last revolution to "détruire le parti des riches ... et qu'il ne reste plus qu'un parti, celui des sans-culottes" ... Quoted Alfred Espinas, La philosophie sociale du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle et la Révolution Paris, Paris 1898, p. 174

<sup>53</sup> October 1<sup>st</sup> 1793 quoted in Henri Wallon, Les Représentants du Peuple en Mission, Paris 1889, p. 91 V. A. 2.

<sup>54</sup> Wallon, ibid, p. 146. V. 6/5.

La Revolution est faite pour le Peuple; c'est le bonheur du peuple qui en est le but; c'est l'amour du Peuple qui est la pierre de touche de l'esprit révolutionnaire.

Il est bien aisé de comprendre que par le peuple, on n'entend pas cette classe privilégiée par ses richesses, qui avoit usurpé toutes les jouissances de la vie, et tous les biens de la Société. Le peuple est l'universalité des Citoyens Français; le Peuple, c'est sur-tout la classe immense du pauvre, cette classe qui donne des hommes à la Patrie, des défenseurs à nos frontières, qui nourrit la société par ses travaux, qui l'embellit par ses talens, qui l'orne et qui l'honore par ses vertus; la Révolution seroit un monstre politique et moral, si elle eût eu pour but d'assurer la félicité de quelques centaines d'individus, et de consolider la misère de vingt-quatre millions de citoyens; c'eût donc été une dérision insultante à l'humanité, que de réclamer sans cesse le nom de l'égalité, quand des intervalles immenses de bonheur eussent toujours séparé l'homme de l'homme, et qu'on eût vu étouffée, sous les distinctions de l'opulence et de la pauvreté, de la félicité et de la misère, la déclaration des droits qui ne reconnoissoit d'autres distinctions que de celles des talens et vertus...

And what would happen if the rich would allow full rein? "L'aristocratie bourgeoise, si elle eût vécu, eût produit bientôt l'aristocratie financière; celle-ci eût engendré l'aristocratie nobiliaire; car l'homme riche ne tarde pas à se regarder comme étant d'une pâte différente des autres hommes: d'usurpation en usurpation, on en seroit venu au point, que l'on eût regardé comme nécessaire de les consacrer par quelques institutions nouvelles; ~~voilà le clerge .....~~" 55

Of course, it is not the class struggle of later times. There is much moralism in it, it completely lacks the idea of economic progress. Yet if not reading too much into it, it is still an expression of class discord whereby the rich will always set up a state opposed to the interests of the

55 See Markov and Soboul, Note 45, p. 218 ff.

poor and therefore in the final end, it is not a question of destroying the love of wealth but of destroying first the wealthy. Undoubtedly, it could still be viewed as a war against vice but as Augustin Robespierre pointed out: "Il existe un système d'amener le peuple à niveler tout; si on n'y prend garde, tout se désorganisera".<sup>56</sup> It is interesting to recall here the warnings uttered in "Révolutions de Paris" about the 'prolétaire'. The 'prolétaires' are not the sans-culottes, the healthy and industrious party, they are "des ramas d'individus paresseux qui ne rougissent point d'accepter un salaire avant de l'avoir gagné par un travail honnête... Ils tendoient la main au premier intrigant ... Ils lui disoient: Fais couler sur nous et nos enfants un filet d'eau du trésor national et nous te prônerons partout .."<sup>57</sup> So below the sans-culottes is still another group!

### Summary

The French Revolution had advanced considerably from the 1789 idea of unity in the Third Estate in the Nation with one will. It had advanced so far that by 1794 not only is a unified Third Estate decried but even the notion

<sup>56</sup> Correspondence of Maximilien et Augustin Robespierre ed. Georges Michon, Paris 1926, ps. 252-253 - letter to Max. Robespierre of 3 ventôse an. II,

<sup>57</sup> Révolutions de Paris No. 225, 28 February 1794 in Révolutions de Paris, Vol. 17, p. ~~520~~ 530.

of a General Will is in doubt. Instead of being present, waiting to be found, it has first to be made. For our purpose, two concepts of the "bourgeoisie" emerge. In the one view of society, they are the majority, the mass of sensible, industrious citizens from the semi-rich to the semi-poor who if their particular interests are followed will lead to happiness and prosperity of the nation. Therefore, their interests are the interests of all. In the other view, they are the minority of rich, egoistical power-seekers eager both for money and influence. Their interests are perverted, corrupt and either they have to undergo a moral regeneration in the Rousseau fashion or they have to be abolished altogether. In these two concepts lie the starting points for liberalism and communism but only the starting points. Many other ideas have to be added.

CHAPTER IIClass Theories of Barnave, Robespierre and Babeuf1. Barnave<sup>1</sup>

Barnave represents the liberal trend.<sup>2</sup> He is not a liberal in the full sense but he was the first to sketch out a line of thought which was to form the basis of later ideas. In fact, we might say the French Revolution was a common ground from which thinkers groped their way to diverse explanations, without as yet any set patterns in our sense. Barnave, for instance, was still in some ways under the influence of Rousseau and he could still afford

1

Antoine Pierre Joseph Marie Barnave was born in 1761 in Grenoble. In 1789 he was elected to the Estates-General as deputy for Grenoble. He was guillotined in 1793. In spite of occasional revivals - as for instance in the works of Jaurès and in Laski's The Rise of European Liberalism - his works have been neglected to a very surprising degree. Laski says of him: "He had been one of the leaders of the liberals in the National Assembly; and the ideals for which he fought may be fairly identified with those which, in a broad way, became the settled principles of the social constitution of France after the defeat of the Jacobins. More than this: the careful student of Barnave's speeches will find in their substance affiliations of ideas with what became, with Royer-Collard and Benjamin Constant, the essence of French Liberalism after the Restoration". The Rise of European Liberalism, Unwin Books, London 1962 p.149.

2

In this case, "liberal" refers to the whole economic, and historical outlook and not only political forms.

to admire Mably even if he did not accept his conclusions.<sup>3</sup>

### History and Economic Progress

Barnave is quite remarkable here in outlining the whole of the later liberal (and socialist) scheme of history. It is still more remarkable that later thinkers knew nothing of Barnave. The common ground may have been the works of English thinkers of the 18th century.

Barnave sees history as a series of progressive stages. The first stage was hunting when there was no property, the land was common to all and therefore the political form was one of primitive democracy. The next state was that of agriculture, the establishment of property and the end of equality, for an aristocracy was formed, civil and military, with the formation of a class of big landowners. The group alone made the laws and therefore created the social concepts for the whole.

In some way, however, arts and commerce appear.<sup>4</sup>  
This results in the growth of a new kind of wealth giving

<sup>3</sup> Barnave found Mably's ideas very just but hardly applicable in the actual state of affairs. Barnave, Oeuvres, ed. M. Berenger de la Drome 1843, Vol. 4, p. 279 ff.

<sup>4</sup> It is really: "la marche naturelle des sociétés .. de croître sans cesse en population et en industrie jusqu'à ce qu'elles soient parvenues au dernier degré de la civilisation".. Elsewhere Barnave says: "La Nature a destiné les Européens à surpasser par leur active industrie tous les habitans du globe" due to climate, fertility etc. Vol. I, pp. 12 and 28.

power to the 'classe laborieuse'. This in turn results in a political revolution: "une nouvelle distribution de la richesse produit une nouvelle distribution du pouvoir".<sup>5</sup> Just as the system of land-owning produced an aristocratic government, so industrial property produces a democratic form by bringing the people to power.<sup>6</sup> In small states, however, there is a possibility that a new aristocracy might be formed - "une sorte d'aristocratie bourgeoise et marchande".<sup>7</sup>

In terms of Europe, there was first an all-powerful feudal aristocracy. However, a gradual change occurred whereby Europe increased in population and riches, or as Barnave expressed it:

"Il est, pour les nations des temps de pléthore où le gouvernement qui existe ne peut plus les contenir, où la plénitude et la fermentation qui la suit préparant une explosion... Trois choses, ordinairement liées constituent cette pléthore: la population, les richesses, les nouvelles idées. Cette dernière est presque l'effet de la fermentation des deux autres".<sup>8</sup>

The working part of the people built up those "grand atelier de manufactures qu'on appelle les villes", thereby forming the basis for democracy.<sup>9</sup> In this way, too, they

<sup>5</sup> ibid, p. 13

<sup>6</sup> "De même que la possession des terre a élevé l'aristocratie, la propriété industrielle élève le pouvoir du peuple". ibid, p. 13.

<sup>7</sup> ibid, p. 14

<sup>8</sup> ibid, Vol. II, p. 173

<sup>9</sup> ibid, Vol. I, p. 31

increased their knowledge and therefore ended the power of religion.

All resulted from the rise of industry. First came industry, then new political forms, then new intellectual ideas. It is true in some states, such as Holland and Switzerland, that the progress to democracy was halted by the appearance of a new aristocracy based on industrial or commercial wealth, an aristocratie bourgeoise, "un extrait aristocratisé de la démocratie",<sup>10</sup> but it is no less true that all these republics were founded by democracy. Moreover it is different in monarchies. There all the industrial elements remain democratic, unite with the monarchy against the feudal aristocracy resulting at first in an increase in the power of the ruler but only until the people are strong enough to form "la monarchie libre et limitée, le plus heureux, le plus beau des gouvernemens qui ait jamais régné sur la terre".<sup>11</sup>

#### The Industrial Society <sup>12</sup>

It is a peaceful society for commerce is opposed to war. War is the origin of the nobility; industry or

<sup>10</sup> ibid, Vol. II, p. 141

<sup>11</sup> ibid, Vol. I, p.60

<sup>12</sup> Not only in the sense of industry but industrious too - e.g. "la richesse industrielle .. est le partage de la portion laborieuse du peuple; son origine est le travail" ..p.31.

work is the origin of the power of "la classe laborieuse du peuple". It is no good looking back to the days of Ancient Greece and puzzling over the virtues of riches or poverty for that problem has solved itself. In large territorial empires, covered with an immense population, "la liberté, l'égalité, l'unité ne peuvent exister que par un très haut degré de prospérité, de richesse et d'industrie mercantile et manufacturière".<sup>13</sup> Moreover, agriculture leads to domination of the few; towns and manufacture give strength to the mass.<sup>14</sup> The only way the people can become something is by the introduction of a new kind of wealth so that they can have power and influence. In this way, equality is born as the fortunes become equal and knowledge spreads.

### Conclusion

On the whole, Barnave presents a striking account of history as a form of economic determinism resulting finally in the power of the bourgeoisie or the people for they are one and they make the society. There are, of course, dangers of a bourgeois aristocracy forming an "extract aristocratized" from the whole which thereby makes it obvious that when Barnave talks of bourgeoisie

<sup>13</sup> ibid, Vol. II, p.200

<sup>14</sup> ibid, p. 202

he means all the people. Bourgeoisie = people = "la classe laborieuse", all those who work, i.e. "ouvrier, manufacturier, ou marchand".<sup>15</sup> What is that but the "la classe industrielle" of Saint-Simon? There is also the neglect of agriculture in this scheme so noticeable in later thinkers of this type. It is a "bourgeois" scheme because the new society, the new politics and the new outlook are created by the working people of the towns.

## 2. Robespierre

The class concepts of Robespierre are in a reverse tendency to Barnave. The bourgeoisie has shrunk to an élite of the wealthy and the bourgeois aristocracy is not so much an extract of the bourgeoisie as the bourgeoisie itself, and that appears to mean all those who are greedy for riches, who are egoistical, who think only of making money and acquiring luxury - the evil spirit of commerce and business is in them. What for Barnave was going to lead to democracy and equality was going to have the opposite effect for Robespierre. It was going to lead to the tyranny of the rich (or vice) and the oppression of the people (or virtue).<sup>16</sup> All this leads straight back to Rousseau and beyond, the virtues

<sup>15</sup> ibid, Vol. I, p. 48

<sup>16</sup> See, for instance, "Lettre de Robespierre à ses commettans" No. 10. 10th April 1793, O.C. Vol.VIII p. 376 ff. "tous les aristocrates bourgeois, qui ont horreur de l'égalité".

of the simple life, frugality, the hatred of towns and all their nefarious activity.<sup>17</sup> This does not necessarily lead to a condemnation of property but property is no longer regarded as the mainspring of liberty, let alone the basis of democracy. It is harmless in small quantities but it has always a potential towards evil. It must therefore be regulated.<sup>18</sup>

Robespierre is then opposed to the "new" industry just as he is opposed to the old feudalism and usually sees them both merely as different facets of the same evil. The society he wishes to establish is not based either on landed property or industrial property, nor is it based on the light of Reason.<sup>19</sup> It is based on Virtue.

<sup>17</sup> "Les vertus sont simples, modestes, pauvres, souvent ignorantes, quelquefois grossières; elles sont l'apanage des malheureux et le patrimoine du peuple. Les vices sont entourés de tous les trésors, armés de tous les charmes de la volupté et de toutes les amorces de la perfidie". Robespierre, Textes choisis, Vol. III, Editions Sociales 1958, p. 104 (Speech "Sur les Principes du Gouvernement Révolutionnaire")

<sup>18</sup> See "Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen". Lettres à ses Commettans No. 10 21st April 1793 O.C. Vol. V. p. 361 "La propriété est le droit qu'à chaque citoyen de jouir et de disposer de la portion de biens qui lui est garantie par la loi". .."Le droit de propriété est borné, comme tous les autres, par l'obligation de respecter les droits d'autrui".

<sup>19</sup> As Daunou said in his Mémoires, ed. Barrière & Lesure in Bibliothèque des mémoires 1854-1890, pp. 452-3, according Robespierre "nul n'avait le droit d'être plus sage que le peuple; les riches, les philosophes, les hommes de lettres, les hommes publics étaient les ennemis du peuple".

It has its centre point in that moral metamorphosis mentioned in Rousseau,<sup>20</sup> although Robespierre rather complicates the issue by equating his virtue with the people and leaving us in doubt as to whether he is talking of an economic class or a moral category. The people, that centre of natural virtue, are to rule and when they do, corruption will be ended for no longer will riches and luxury be desired; there will be no egoism, greed.<sup>21</sup> Riches will be despised and therefore no one will be rich. It seems then there is an intention to replace one morality by another. Yet if the people are virtue, is it not also replacing one class by another?

<sup>20</sup> See Rousseau, The Social Contract, Everyman Edition, London 1947 pp. 15-16. "The passage from the state of nature to the civil state produces a very remarkable change in man, by substituting justice for instinct in his conduct, and by giving his actions the morality they had formerly lacked".

<sup>21</sup> See Défenseur de la Constitution No. 4, 1792: "Le peuple, cette classe immense et laborieuse .. n'est point atteint par les causes de dépravation qui perdent ce qu'on appelle les conditions supérieures .. Le peuple ne connaît ni la mollesse, ni l'ambition, qui sont les deux sources les plus fécondes de nos maux et de nos vices. Il est plus près de la nature et moins dépravé .." p. 386 f. Oeuvres de Max. Robespierre, ed. Laponneraye, Paris, 1840, Vol. I.

I cannot see how Robespierre could be considered to have influenced democratic theory as Cobban considers him to have influenced it. (See The English Historical Review LXIII 1948 p.29) .. For Robespierre surely was trying to apply the words of Rousseau "Were there a people of gods their government would be democratic", only to realise "so perfect a government is not for men".

As Garaudy says, there is something of a "mystification métaphysique" here.<sup>22</sup> Perhaps Robespierre was too involved in a kind of thinking foreign to us. Certainly, there is often a tendency to judge him on his supposed intentions rather than his actual words and actions.<sup>23</sup>

However, for our purpose, he is influential in that he presents an alternative view of society to the Barnave one, based on a pre-liberal moral outlook whereby riches of all kinds are wicked and therefore the class which is rich is wicked.<sup>24</sup> He and Babeuf were to be of importance in the 1830's when the liberal outlook was found unsatisfactory. This is not to say that he was a Socialist or a Communist but his thought rests on the same moral basis as

<sup>22</sup> He also writes on Robespierre's ideas: "Ce n'est pas le peuple qui impose sa domination à la bourgeoisie, c'est la lutte du bien contre le mal". Roger Garaudy, Les sources française du socialisme scientifique", Paris, 1948, p.59. On morality see Speech of 7th May 1794 and Speech of 5th Feb. 1794, Textes Choisis, p.112 ff. p.156 ff.

<sup>23</sup> Cabet in fact is certain he was marching in a straight path towards Communism whilst in more recent times Talmon appears to think the same thing only to Cabet it was good and to Talmon it is bad. Cabet, Histoire Populaire de la Révolution française, Paris, 1839, Vol. 4; Talmon, Origins of Totalitarian Democracy, London 1952

<sup>24</sup> Note that Robespierre's views on riches and the rich have a long tradition in European thought starting from the Greeks and it was Barnave's ideas which were in this respect truly revolutionary. Robespierre's ideas are not particularly revolutionary in this respect. It was however revolutionary to make them a basis of political life. See No. 4 of Défenseur de la Constitution, in Laponneraye, Note 21, p.378 ff.

these later movements.

### 3. Babeuf

Babeuf was the first to give definite form to the idea of a class struggle and to see Communism as the only practical solution for it. Like several other thinkers of this period, Babeuf was primarily interested in achieving equality and this led him to the idea of the complete abolition of property. So long as property existed, there could be no equality and therefore no virtue. Accordingly, whilst the end appears to be the same for both Babeuf and Robespierre - justice, the means are different.

#### Class Concepts

History has been a permanent class conflict ever since the establishment of property.<sup>25</sup> As the ownership of land fell into a small number of families, a large mass of "salarisés" was formed dependent on the former for their livelihood with the result that a small minority could live in opulence and idleness whilst the rest had to work constantly in order to earn the bare minimum necessary for life. Moreover the rich controlled the state and made the laws for their own benefit, perpetuating

<sup>25</sup> Réponse du Tribun du Peuple à P. A. Antonelle quoted in Gerard Walter: Babeuf et la Conjuration des Egaux, Paris 1937, p. 182 f.

the injustice<sup>26</sup> and this state of affairs had existed for thousands of years.

The French Revolution was then this struggle become a war owing to the unbearable nature of the oppression. So long as the people or the plebians "la plus saine, la plus laborieuse, la plus nombreuse portion" have not rid themselves of their oppressors, the revolution is not ended.<sup>27</sup> The Directory is nothing but a new feudal edifice with the rich in charge. The Revolution must be finished so that a true equality can be established with all partial interests destroyed.<sup>28</sup>

There are then two classes, the rich and the poor, the patricians and the plebs or as Babeuf said:

"Je distingue deux partis diametralement opposés en système et en plan d'administration publique ... Je crois assez que tous deux veulent la République; mais chacun la veut à sa manière. L'un la désire bourgeoise et aristocratique; l'autre entend l'avoir faite et qu'elle demeure toute populaire et démocratique. L'un veut la République d'un million qui fut toujours l'ennemi, le dominateur, l'exécuteur, l'opresseur, la sangsue des vingt-quatre autres .."<sup>29</sup>

<sup>26</sup> See Analyse de la Doctrine de Babeuf, Tribun du Peuple No. 41 in Buonarroto, Conspiration pour l'égalité dite de Babeuf, Vol. 2, Editions sociales Paris 1957.

<sup>27</sup> See Tribun du peuple No. 36 of Pages Choisies de Babeuf, ed. Dommanget, Paris 1935, p. 266.

<sup>28</sup> See Réponse à une lettre signée M.V., Buonarroto Note 26.

<sup>29</sup> Tribun du Peuple No. 29, Dommanget, Note 27, P. 192 ff.

Who are then these one million oppressors? "Une caste d'accapareurs<sup>30</sup> ... "la minorité des sociétaires ... parvenue à accaparer dans ses mains les richesses foncière et industrielles"<sup>31</sup> "les spéculateurs et marchands .. tenir à leur disposition le véritable producteur".<sup>32</sup> In many ways this seems almost a criticism of capitalism. Yet, although the economic categories are better defined in Babeuf than Robespierre, there is still no progressive kinds of oppression. It is all another form of feudalism. Noticeable too is the hatred of towns, commerce and industry, as for instance, "le commerce était le poison le plus subtil dont se servaient les tyrans pour inculquer aux peuples asservis à leur joug le goût désastreux du luxe et du faste..<sup>33</sup> He also attacks the idea that commerce can lead to a prosperity for all. How can it when the speculators and merchants have the upper hand? The people will always be oppressed "plus d'exploitants, plus d'exploités". Babeuf despises luxury in the Rousseau

30

Le Tribun du Peuple No. 34, Dommanget, Note 27, p. 257.

31

Les crimes de Carrier quoted in Fleury, Babeuf et le socialisme en 1796, Paris 1851, p. 30.

32

Letter to Germain in prison of Arras quoted in Victor Advielle, Histoire de Gracchus Babeuf et du Babouvisme, Paris 1884 Vol. I, p. 147

33

À Charles Germain in Dommanget, Note 27, p. 207

and Robespierre manner and, as far as he can see, commerce and industry will only serve luxury.<sup>34</sup>

### Morals

Once the struggle has ended, the new man will appear. Abolish property and virtue will arise. There will be a new golden age modelled it seems on a Spartan concept of equal frugality for all.

Babeuf like Robespierre was neglected for over thirty years after his death but in the 1830's and still more in the 1840's his ideas were again influential. Of especial appeal was the strong avowal of the class conflict, the assertion of the complete irreconcilability of these two

<sup>34</sup> In this connection, see Claude Mazauric, Babeuf et la Conspiration pour l'égalité, Editions Sociales Paris 1962, e.g. p. 161 "Dans le fragment d'un Project de décret économique les grandes villes sont ignorées et dans la société d'égaux, il était envisagé de les démembrer pour des raisons morales et sociales.." Also Jean Dautry "Le pessimisme économique de Babeuf et l'histoire des Utopies" Annales Historiques de la Révolution française No. 163, 1961, p. 222 f. "Il ne voit pas le développement des nouvelles techniques de production, des nouvelles branches de production. Il ignore l'industrie capitaliste et sa croissance. Dans sa bouche, les prolétaires et les artisans pauvres sont indistinctement des sans-culottes. Et surtout l'abondance n'est pas près d'être à portée de la main des hommes. Jusque dans les chansons babouvistes, l'âge d'or est situé dans le passé.." Considering, however, that hardly anyone in France has as yet realised this, it is not surprising Babeuf had not. I find it surprising he has such a clear concept of economic oppression, i.e. those who own the instruments of production and those who do not, not only as regards land but as regards industry so that if the premises are accepted it follows logically that so long as there is property there is oppression and therefore classes.

classes, rich and poor, bourgeois aristocrats and people democrats, whereby there could be no victory until the latter had completely overcome the former, abolished every form of property and established a reign of true equality and virtue.<sup>35</sup>

#### 4. Conclusion

The above three thinkers foreshadow certain developments in class theory, in particular they outline two theories on the "bourgeoisie" which were later to be of considerable importance. Yet they are not very representative of their time. The ideas of Barnave remained unknown. Robespierre could not be regarded as anything but a hopeless failure and Babeuf was simply considered to be an obscure conspirator. In 1795, the victory went to those who uphold different ideas, ideas such as held by Condorcet. They strove for Enlightenment, the realization of the Rational man via changes in government, laws and methods of education. They could not comprehend what the struggle of classes meant. For them,

<sup>35</sup> Whatever the terms used by Barnave, Robespierre and Babeuf, the object referred to is apparently the same. Numerically Barnave's bourgeois aristocracy could only equal the rich of Robespierre and the Babeuf caste of one million, while Barnave's bourgeoisie could only mean the people of Robespierre and the plebeians of Babeuf.

it could only be the work of intriguers and troublemakers. The only division they could view in society was between those who had Reason and those who had not.<sup>36</sup> For a time, these ideas were maintained but, as we shall see in the next Chapter, they were gradually replaced by the new "liberal" theory of society.

36

On this theme, see Henryk Grossman "Evolutionist Revolt against Classical Economics", The Journal of Political Economy, Vol. II, Feb.-Dec. 1943 and Heinrich Cunow, Die Marxsche Geschichts-, Gesellschafts-, und Staatstheorie, Berlin 1923, pp. 160 ff.

CHAPTER IIIThe Rule of Reason 1795-1815

After 1794 there appears to have been a period of disillusionment, a feeling that the revolution had been a failure - the disappointment of such wonderful hopes.<sup>1</sup> A certain cynicism enters political life, typified by the comment of Lanj<sup>u</sup>anais on the intention to retain in the new declaration of rights the formula "le but de la société est le bonheur commun". He said, "il y a 2,000 ans que l'on comptait 288 espèces de bonheur".<sup>2</sup> Yet the government had to go on. Driven by a barrier of terror from any radical solutions of the Jacobin type, yet determined to resist "royalism and aristocracy", the Directory tried to steer a course between these two extremes. An attempt was already being made to crystallise out of the Revolution a concept of the True Revolution whilst at the same time to resist the notion that this was actually a sort of middle thing between

<sup>1</sup> "Il n'est pas moins évident qu'une partie de la classe inférieure de la nation pensa que la Révolution n'avait pas été achevée, puisque tous les hommes n'étaient pas heureux"...  
Lichtenberger, Le socialisme et la Révolution française, Paris 1899, p. 290. See also Dalin: Babeuf Studien on "Marc-Antoine Jullien nach dem 9 Thermidor", p. 151 ff. for the feeling of disappointment and inability to comprehend what went wrong.

<sup>2</sup> Quoted in Albert Mathiez, La Réaction Thermidorienne, Paris 1929, p. 283

opposing interests. This theory strongly denied that the post-Thermidor solution was a compromise between royalism on the one hand and some radical doctrine on the other hand.<sup>3</sup> Republicanism had triumphed and therefore all opposition was now one - both royalists and anarchists were striving for the same end. Philosophy or Reason had fulfilled itself. It could go no further.<sup>4</sup>

Ideologically it took its stand on the Condorcet position - the rule of Reason, the needs of education, the presumption that in the economic field private interests equalled public interests, the belief in the perfectibility of man, the dislike of religion and the idea of progressive enlightenment via science.<sup>5</sup> Unlike Condorcet, however, the upholders of this theory had come

<sup>3</sup> See Schmidt, Tableau de la Revolution francaise Leipzig, 1867-71, Vol. III. Tableau Analytique of 1798, p. 344. "En 1792 les Républicains ont triomphé, et par une prétendue analogie on affecte de craindre que les anarchistes triomphent incessamment. Mais qu'est-ce qui a fait triompher les républicains au 10 août? C'est cette puissance de la philosophie qui avait préparé la révolution, qui avait renversé la Bastille ... cette même puissance de la philosophie qui a détrôné Robespierre, qui a fait 18 fructidor.." This is noticeably different from the later view.

<sup>4</sup> Smith, Note 3, e.g. p. 345, "Le gouvernement n'est point placé entre deux factions, il n'a qu'un seul ennemi, le Royalisme, qui arbore tour à tour la cocarde blanche et le bonnet rouge".

<sup>5</sup> see Francois Picavet, Les Idéologues, Paris 1891, p. 20 ff.

to believe that the mass of the people were not yet ripe for self-government. As Boissy said, "l'égalité civile, voilà tout ce que l'homme raisonnable peut exiger".

Otherwise they had to be governed by the best and the best are those who have reason and therefore wish to maintain the laws. These men are those who have property attaching them to their country and providing them with sufficient leisure to acquire knowledge.

This was a common view of the "Idéologues" but many hoped for an eventual enlightenment of the people. For instance, Cabanis said that the new constitution of 1799 was democracy purged of all its inconveniences. All was done for the people, nothing could be done by it. Yet he was interested in education, not only so that the people could achieve the true happiness but because it was necessary for public peace, especially with a system of representative government. For whilst this system was the best of all, founded on public opinion, it was necessary for this opinion to be good and the people capable of making judgments so that the views of the enlightened man will soon become the views of the whole nation. Also ignorance perpetuated misery and dependence of the poor so that there could be no equality and no

true liberty.<sup>6</sup>

In this belief, the Directory initiated an extensive system of public education as well as a strenuous campaign against religion. Most of this was to end under the rule of Napoleon<sup>7</sup>; and furthermore, political speculation had to give way to the more general study of science, in particular the study of the science of man.<sup>8</sup> However, although the censorship prevented the publication of political works, it did not prevent the development of ideas and this was the period when liberal ideas were first developed.<sup>9</sup>

Destutt de Tracy was one of the most notable writers of this period in politics and economics. Believing that

<sup>6</sup> See Cabanis, "Quelques considérations sur l'organisation sociale et sur la nouvelle Constitution" 1799 and "Lettre de Cabanis sur la Perfectibilité" 1799 quoted in Picavet, Note 5, pp. 223 ff and 591 ff.

<sup>7</sup> See Flint, History of the Philosophy of History, Edinburgh, 1893, p. 340.

<sup>8</sup> See Cabanis, Mémoires, "Belle et grande est l'idée de considérer toutes les sciences et tous les arts comme des rameaux d'une même tige, unis par une origine commune et par le résultat qu'ils sont destinés à produire, le perfectionnement et le bonheur de l'homme".. quoted Picavet, Note 5, p.226

<sup>9</sup> Constant and other liberals formed their ideas at this time and of course many 'idéologues' continued to influence ideas in the Restoration, e.g. Destutt de Tracy, Daunou, Fauriel.

the reasonable will equals the public interest, he admired representative government since it permitted free course to all inclinations except the depraved and allowed the free development of industry. It also tended towards equality not by violent upheaval but by the furtherance of knowledge and talents thereby opening to everyone the path to fortune and glory<sup>10</sup> - presumably because it no longer believes in repression but enlightenment and because it is to its interest to have all citizens educated and reasonable. Representative government is accordingly the political expression of reason based on philosophy representing no one interest group.<sup>11</sup> Its interest is that of the people and therefore it should never allow property to become a means of oppression. It must "laisser agir la nature".<sup>12</sup> Its

<sup>10</sup> "Il (gouvernement représentatif) se bornera à diminuer, autant que possible, la plus funeste de toutes les inégalités, celle des lumières: à développer tous les talents, à leur donner à tous une égale liberté de s'exercer, et à ouvrir à chacun également tous les chemins vers la fortune et la gloire".. Destutt de Tracy, Commentaire sur l'Esprit des Lois de Montesquieu, Paris 1822 (written 1806) p. 52.

<sup>11</sup> Destutt de Tracy has three stages of development - democracy or despotism of force based on ignorance; aristocracy or religion based on opinion; and representation or philosophy based on reason. Destutt de Tracy, Note 10, p.57

<sup>12</sup> "Les gouvernements fondés sur la raison n'ont qu'à laisser agir la nature, et à la suivre sans la contrarier .. Destutt de Tracy, Note 10, p.201

laws are the will of the majority.

At this time, Saint-Simon was a follower of the "Idéologues" and therefore a great believer in the rule of reason as may be seen from his "Lettres d'un habitant de Genève" 1803. According to his ideas of this time, there are three classes in society, the "savants", i.e. the scientists, the artists and the men of liberal ideas. The second class are the property owners and the third class those without property.

The first class is the superior one for it has enlightenment and therefore the other two classes should acknowledge this for "domination is proportionate to enlightenment". Moreover, it is in the general interest for the general interest lies in the progress of the sciences. It would be foolish for either of the two other classes to reject this. As can be seen from the French Revolution, the property-owners got the worst of it because they opposed the "savants"; but the third class too should acknowledge that only enlightenment can reduce oppression and that in defying the other two classes they can only produce anarchy. Accordingly, whilst the property-owner should direct temporal power owing to their intellectual superiority over the non-property owners, they should both acknowledge the overall supremacy of the spiritual power, that of the "savants". Obviously at this time, Saint-Simon has not

reached the notion of the "industriels".

In this respect, Saint-Simon in 1803 and Saint-Simon in 1815 typify a general change in outlook over this period. The earlier period has quite a different emphasis. As Flint says, this ideology scarcely survived the Empire - there was a definite change from a belief in reason and first principles to an excessive deference to history and precedent.<sup>13</sup> The age we are now considering was one of Rationalism whereby the study of society was considered an extended version of the science of man with reason supplying the fundamental principles.<sup>14</sup> Physiology or the study of man was to be the basis for morals, politics, and history. Saint-Simon is again a typical representative of this line of thought. For instance, the nature of man, his type of thinking and his various faculties are reflected in the forms of society.<sup>15</sup> Man therefore is the measure throughout. The problem of course was to find

<sup>13</sup> Flint, note 7, pp. 341-345

<sup>14</sup> See Picavet, Note 5, passim, Leroy, Histoire des idées Sociales en France, Vol. 2, Paris 1946. p. 171 ff.

<sup>15</sup> As Flint sums it up, Note 7, p. 403: "The human spirit manifests its rational activity in analysis and synthesis.. in ascending from particular to generals ... Societies, like individuals, employ sometimes analysis and sometimes synthesis .."

one a priori principles as the basis of all knowledge in similarity to the now rejected principle of God. In Saint-Simon's view, the savants were going to fill the role of a new clergy.<sup>16</sup> It is not our purpose to enter into this except to make clear the change that was to come. Saint-Simon was shortly to give up his search for a first principle in the concepts of Newtonian science (e.g. the force of gravitation). A new outlook swept away these ideas. It was based on economics and it was to effect a radical change in the whole outlook on politics, economic, and history, yet it did not have an easy inception into France.

In respect to economics, the Physiocratic hold was very strong. As we have seen, the Terror had led to the revival of the idea of property suffrage and by some this was interpreted to mean that the landowner was now really the only true citizen - even Saint-Simon gave him a superior position - for in their eyes, land was the only property. Strangely enough, the man who introduced Adam Smith to France, Germain Garnier was the chief opponent of his views.<sup>17</sup> He firmly believed that land

<sup>16</sup> See, for instance, Saint-Simon, *Travail sur la Gravitation Universelle*, Oeuvres Choisies ed. Lemonnier, Bruggels, 1859.

<sup>17</sup> There were earlier translations in 1780 and a shortened version by Condorcet in 1790 but none had the popularity of Garnier's translation.

was the only true basis for government and in fact that divorce between the two had led to the French Revolution.<sup>18</sup> We have also to remember that at this time invariably "propriété" alone meant landed property and "propriétaire" the landowner.<sup>19</sup> Such a view as this of Garnier had its opponents, for instance, Roederer. He specified three types of proprietors: the landed proprietors; those who owned movable capital, money or goods; those who have a "fond d'industrie", such as craftsmen, the artists and the scientists as he said "le fond d'industrie est un capital créé par les frais d'apprentissage". In his opinion, the last two were the most important types of capital for without them society could not produce wealth.<sup>20</sup>

With the translation of Smith and the publication of Say's work, "Traité d'économie politique", the doctrine of Adam Smith gradually gathered strength. Smith, of course,

<sup>18</sup> See Edgard Allix, "La Rivalité entre la Propriété foncière et la fortune mobilière sous la Révolution", Revue d'Histoire Economique et Sociale, 1913.

<sup>19</sup> Stark points out in his article "Saint Simon as a Realist", The Journal of Economic History 1943 Vol. III, that Saint Simon uses the word "propriété" to mean landed property. But certainly Saint Simon is not the only one and simply it denotes the once general idea that there was only one kind of property whereby it appears to have taken some time before the fundamental meaning of the word "propriété" changed.

<sup>20</sup> See Allix, Note 18, pp. 322 ff.

favoured town to country; he asserted that labour is the basis of value and he believed in the virtue of private interest although he did point out its occasional defects.<sup>21</sup> It was Say, however, who made these ideas well known in France. Industry, for he preferred the word "industry" to work as it was more inclusive<sup>22</sup> - is the source of wealth. It sprang up in the free states of Italy during the Middle Ages, spread to Europe with the "enfranchissement" of the towns and then over the whole countryside. His ideal class is "la classe mitoyenne" which is neither too rich nor too poor - "c'est dans la classe où se rencontrent les fortunes honnêtes, les loisirs mêlés à l'habitude du travail".<sup>23</sup> Of course, he attacks the false notions of the physiocrats and asserts that industry has provided the means whereby the mass of the population can exist without being

<sup>21</sup> See Adam Smith, 7 lectures, Chicago 1928, e.g. "Adam Smith and the Currents of History" by John Maurice Clark; "Smith's Theory of Value and Distribution" by Paul H. Douglas (pointing out the Socialist results of A. Smith's theory of value); "Adam Smith and Laissez Faire" by Jacob Viner; "The introduction of Adam Smith on the Continent" by Melchior Palyi (on Say and pointing out his influence on Destutt de Tracy and Saint Simon)

<sup>22</sup> On value, Say said "Smith trouve que c'est le travail de l'homme, qu'il aurait dû appeler industrie, parce que le mot industrie embrasse des parties que le mot travail n'embrasse pas", Say, Traité d'économie politique, Paris 1826, Préliminaire p. lix. Surely Say here starts the vogue for "industrie" and "industriel".

<sup>23</sup> Say, Note 22, p. xciv

dependent on the big landowners and can live peacefully without pillage or war. Similar to Roederer's third class, he developed the notion of the "entrepreneur" or the "principal agent of economic progress" who directs production and superintends the distribution of wealth in combining productive services.<sup>24</sup> In accordance with the trend of his time, Say was convinced that he had found a completely scientific theory proceeding from facts (point de fait), substantiated by the "nature des choses" and far removed from the "point de droit" of such authors as Rousseau.<sup>25</sup>

Whether it was truly scientific or not, there was something about the "nature des choses" at that time to make it popular. Destutt de Tracy soon became an ardent follower of Say. He had always been a radical when it came to property and now he was quick to perceive the

<sup>24</sup> See also Gide and Rist, A History of Economic Doctrines, London 1919, pp. 111-118

<sup>25</sup> "Le point de droit reste toujours plus ou moins duø domaine de l'opinion; le point de fait est susceptible de certitude et de preuves", Say, Note 22, p. liii Note 1

On "scientific" character of Say, Allix wrote: "La doctrine de Say et de ses amis n'est pas, comme on voit, une doctrine simplement spéculative, un système purement scientifique opposé à un autre système; elle a le caractère d'une formule politique. C'est la Politique des vingt dernières années du dix-huitième siècle qui explique l'Economie politique des vingt premières années du dix-neuvième". Note 18, p. 348.

class division inherent in the new theory - the opposition of productive wealth to idle wealth. For Destutt de Tracy, labour is the basis of wealth and commerce is society; it is the new source of morality, the author of all good, the bringer of peace, "tout le lien des sociétés humaines est dans la bonne application du travail; tout le mal dans sa déperdition".<sup>26</sup> As a result, he viewed with disfavour the lazy rich who live off the "classe laborieuse".<sup>27</sup> Obviously here is the basis of a new class division between all the productive classes or the productive class and the non-productive class living off them, in other words "les travailleurs" and "les oisifs",<sup>28</sup> a very important division and the question is going to be where do the "bourgeoisie" fit in here.

<sup>26</sup> Destutt de Tracy, Note 10, p.86

<sup>27</sup> As regards population amongst civilized people he wrote, "Chez eux, il n'existe des hommes qu'autant à proportion que les gouvernans, les grands, les riches, et en général tous les oisifs, laissant des moyens de subsistance à la classe laborieuse et paugre, qui produit plus qu'elle ne consomme" .. Note 10, p. 345

<sup>28</sup> See Leroy, Maxime, Histoire des idées sociales en France, Paris 1946, Vol. 2, for influence of Destutt de Tracy and the "idéologues" on Saint Simon.

Summary of Section I

Summarising Section I, it could be said that, firstly, over the period 1789 to 1815, no distinctive theory of the bourgeois emerges either in the liberal or socialist pattern. Admittedly, the French Revolution presents certain very interesting starting points, such as the initiation of the dual use of the word "bourgeoisie", firstly in an extended and then in a contracted sense reflecting two movements of ideas. Firstly, there was the attempt to confine class divisions to legal distinctions so that once legal distinctions were abolished so were classes and, secondly, there was the equally prevalent notion that classes were based on economic distinctions and could only be overcome once some form of economic equality was established. Moreover, with Barnave, we meet with the first attempt to prove economically that society is or will be classless once the industrial or bourgeois class have extended its prosperity over the whole of society. However, these can only be considered as starting points and assume importance because we know their later significance. In actual fact, of course, the French Revolution represents in general the triumph of ideas derived from the 18th century French "philosophes", in particular two ideas - not necessarily associated with each other - that the aim of politics is

to create the rational man and that the rational man is the leisured man, generally the modest landowner, neither rich nor poor but in the middle and therefore is supremely fitted to represent the nation and lead it to the virtuous life of Reason. It must be emphasized that this line of thought is quite distinct from the later emphasis on economics for its criterion is always the advance in Reason. However, as a final point, the period 1795 to 1815 did see the first beginnings in France of the socio-economic doctrines of liberalism, the chief representatives being at that time Say and Destutt de Tracy. This theory presents quite a new view of society considering it in terms of economic organisation whereby the chief point is that a new method of production has been established by the "industrial" class capable of completely transforming the whole of society. According to this view, society is not divided into the rational and non-rational, nor into property-owners and non-property owners, but simply into those who work and those who do not - the "industrials" and the "idlers". The importance of this for our concept "bourgeoisie" will be seen in the next Section.

S E C T I O N    I I

CHAPTER IV

Doctrinaires or Political Liberals  
of the Right

CHAPTER V

Political Liberals of the Left and  
Economic Liberals

CHAPTER VI

Thierry and Guizot - Liberal Historians

CHAPTER VII

Interpreters of the French Revolution

CHAPTER VIII

Saint-Simon - an Economic Liberal?

---oOo---

CHAPTER IVThe Doctrinaires or Political Liberals of the Right

The Restoration might be said to have divided France into two ideological groups - those for the Revolution of 1789 and those against it. As a result there is a tendency to class all the opposing forces under the name "liberal". However, just as there were several French Revolutions, so were there several groups within this opposition body. For instance, there were those who saw the Revolution embodied in the "Charte" (and in fact only joined the opposition in 1820); there were those who saw it in the 1791 Constitution; there were those who saw it in Republicanism, and even those who saw it in Bonapartism. Moreover, some saw it as a political change, some as an economic change. United in opposing the ideas of the emigrés and the ultras, they were far from united in their own doctrines so it is impossible to speak of one liberal party or even to generalize about their beliefs. Michel, for example, accuses the liberals of ignoring the social and economic questions of the day yet not all liberals can be accused of this.<sup>1</sup> Some are purely

<sup>1</sup> See Henry Michel, L'idée de l'état, Paris 1896, p. 315. Guido de Ruggiero similarly throws together such diverse characters as Constant, Daunou, Tracy, Guizot and Royer-Collard, see A History of European Liberalism, trans. by R. G. Collingwood, Beacon Paperback 1961, p.164.

interested in politics yet some concentrate solely on economics. It could, of course, be said that this particular split was one which tended to lead away from liberalism altogether. Yet at this period all opposition groups aspire to the name liberal and there is no appearance of any non-liberal left. It is rather difficult in this period to assess the various directions according to some later category "liberal". For instance, it is often disputed whether Saint Simon was or was not a liberal but the decision is often made in terms of a later movement, "socialism", not known at all in this period.

In this Section, I try to distinguish between the various liberals, in particular I have considered three groups: the Doctrinaires, the political liberals of the left such as Constant, and a third group which I have called the economic liberals. I have called them that because they maintain the economic ideas of Smith and Say whereby society and politics will be transformed in terms of a new method of production and at the same time uphold the liberal assumption that private interest will equal public interest. Whether the name is completely appropriate or not, it is certain that they must be clearly distinguished from the other liberals otherwise only confusion results. Secondly, the works of the liberal historian, Thierry, will be considered because he virtually initiated the historical theory of the

bourgeoisie. At the same time, the historical works of Guizot will be reviewed to distinguish him from the historical school of the economic liberals. Thirdly, it will be necessary to study the interpretations of the French Revolution at this time in order to show how the theory of the "bourgeois" revolution of 1789 develops. Finally, the works of Saint Simon will be analysed in order to consider his position in the liberal scheme.

The "Doctrinaires" have always occupied a distinct position in French liberalism and, in fact, they represent what might be termed the constitutional conservative element. Politically speaking, they are liberals only in so far as they are not supporters of absolutism. The events from 1815 to 1830 had the effect of driving them into the opposition so that often their actions appear more liberal than their ideas. Moreover, they tended to maintain both the view that society is divided only into two groups - the old nobility and the new bourgeoisie or Third Estate representing the vast portion of the nation and at the same time the aristocratic concept that political functions can only be fulfilled by the enlightened and leisured section of the community. They seek, of course, to reconcile these views by suggesting that the limitation of political rights is different to discrimination in legal rights for political rights are in fact not rights.

but functions open only to the qualified. The functions do not divide nor create inequalities. In this way, the Doctrinaires sought to maintain a progressive attitude. For instance, Royer-Collard took his stand on the Revolution, he was opposed to privilege, he asserted a belief in democracy, he maintained that the whole Nation was equal to the Third Estate. In accordance with the view of his time, he traces the rise of the nation from the Communes in the Middle Ages to its victory in the Revolution with the establishment of liberty and equality.<sup>2</sup> Admittedly, he agreed to the existence of an aristocratic element or interest represented in the upper house but outside this was only the nation ... "si vous cherchez encore la diversité, la pluralité, l'inégalité, vous cherchez les différences entre les rayons d'un cercle".<sup>3</sup> Moreover, he said "la démocratie coule à plein bords dans la France".<sup>4</sup> Only the government resisted it. To destroy this new France it would be necessary to go right back to the enfranchisement of the communes.<sup>5</sup> But what was this Nation?

<sup>2</sup> Speech of Royer-Collard 1820 quoted in Barante, La Vie Politique de M. Royer-Collard, Paris 1861, Vol. 2, pp.16-17

<sup>3</sup> ibid, pp. 19-20

<sup>4</sup> Speech 1821, ibid, p.134

<sup>5</sup> Speech 1827, ibid, p. 298

Royer-Collard sees it represented in what he calls the middle class. He is full of praise for it. "C'est, en effet, évidemment dans la class moyenne que tous les intérêts pouvaient trouver leur représentation naturelle; au-dessus est un certain besoin de la domination, contre lequel il faut se tenir en garde; au-dessus, l'ignorance, l'habitude et le besoin de l'indépendance".<sup>6</sup> Starting from the communes, it has grown from industry to riches, from riches to leisure, from leisure to knowledge. It is the soul of democracy.<sup>7</sup> It wants no privilege for itself. Its sole demand is Reason and thereby has the claim to represent all the interests of the nation. Although associated with property it is not exclusive. In order to prove this, Royer-Collard presents a rather complicated theory aiming to show that property suffrage is not a sign of capacity but only incapacity. "Quiconque n'est pas exclu est appelé".<sup>8</sup> The limits imposed are not personal nor permanent but suspensive and temporary.

Doubtlessly, Royer-Collard was honest in these theories but is he not really attempting to justify in liberal terms a rule of a wealthy elite? Only those who

<sup>6</sup> Speech 1815, ibid, Vol. I, p. 290

<sup>7</sup> Speech 1821, ibid, Vol. 2, p. 134

<sup>8</sup> Speech 1820, ibid, Vol. 2, p. 20

pay 300 francs in taxes can represent the general interest and that was about 80,000 out of the 32,000,000 people in France. One may well ask with Montlosier: "On pourrait demander à Royer-Collard ce qu'il entend par des classes moyennes qui se sont élevées, qui s'élèvent sans cesse, même jusqu'à dépasser les classes supérieures et qui, cependant, selon l'appellation générale et selon la sienne demeurent toujours classes moyennes".<sup>9</sup> True he is not defending a caste in the sense of a group with special legal privileges but surely there is implied nonetheless a privileged political position.<sup>10</sup>

Guizot falls into the same inconsistencies. He is one of the great thinkers of this period and by the dominance of his ideas, he virtually created a party. Yet in spite of his apparent avowal of the cause of the Third Estate, it is a concept of the Third Estate peculiar to himself.

Firstly, Guizot is eager to show that society is not divided. All have the same interest. It was of course

<sup>9</sup> Quoted in Dominique Bagge, Les Idées Politiques en France sous la Restauration, Paris 1952, p.127

<sup>10</sup> See also Victor Cousin: Histoire de la Philosophie Morale, Paris 1839. He similarly distinguishes between castes and classes. The present society he says is different from feudalism in that "il y a bien des classes inférieures et des classes supérieures, mais la distinction existe de fait et nullement de droit; chaque jour l'inégalité de capacité et de travail fait monter et descendre les citoyens d'une classe à l'autre". Vol. 1, p.320.

divided before the French Revolution.<sup>11</sup> At that time, there was a struggle between liberty and privilege but that struggle ended in the French Revolution when the people or liberty was victorious - a fact embodied in the Charte.<sup>12</sup> Guizot is then on the side of the people, he supports the new society.<sup>13</sup> Certainly he felt that the enemy was on the right.<sup>14</sup>

Yet all this did not make him a partisan of democracy not even in the remote future. If he disliked aristocracy as the rule of privilege, he equally disliked democracy as the rule of the majority. In fact, for him, democracy was only another form of aristocracy, i.e. it was the absolute sovereignty of one group over the rest based not on capacity but on the chance of birth, not on reason but on force. According to him, no group could be sovereign for sovereignty rested in a sort of divine law

<sup>11</sup> See Douglas Johnson, Guizot; Aspects of French History, London 1963, p. 74

<sup>12</sup> See F. Guizot, Du Gouvernement de la France depuis la Restauration, Paris 1821, pp. 1-3

<sup>13</sup> See Bagge, Note 9, p. 130 quoting Guizot: "Je soutins avec ardeur la cause de la société nouvelle telle que la Révolution l'a faite, ayant l'égalité devant la loi pour premier principe et les classes moyennes pour élément fondamental".

<sup>14</sup> See Charles H. Pouthas, Guizot pendant la Restauration 1814-1830, Paris 1923, p.177.

perceived by the reason of man.<sup>15</sup> He wrote, "no power exercised by man over man is legitimate if it wants the sanction of reason, justice, and truth which are the law of God".<sup>16</sup> Sovereignty was founded not on will nor interest but on an insight into this law.<sup>17</sup> Obviously all this was not for the masses. So high a concept required elevated minds to search for it. In fact, the whole system of representative government is the search for these laws - a "natural process, by which public reason, which alone has the right to govern society, may be extracted from the bosom of society itself".<sup>18</sup> The deputies it seems gather together as disciples awaiting the light of God to descend upon them. "After having deliberated and laboured, they find a ground of agreement in a common idea, from whence can proceed one will, then alone will the true unity, which resides in reason, be evolved." <sup>19</sup>

<sup>15</sup> F. Guizot; History of the Origin of Representative Government in Europe, trans. Andrew Scoble, London 1852, pp. 61 ff.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid, p. 346

<sup>17</sup> Ibid, passim, see also Pouthas, Note 14, p. 319

<sup>18</sup> Guizot, Note 15, p. 348

<sup>19</sup> Ibid, page 79

In this way, we appear to arrive at something similar to Plato's republic - the rule of the best and Guizot does say it is so. Often enough, Guizot talks of representative government as if it were a filter through which only great minds could pass.<sup>20</sup> Those who can perceive the divine law are not the whole of society since men are unequal in talent, some are definitely superior to others.<sup>21</sup> Still, according to Guizot, this system is not aristocratic because it is not based on privilege. One could, however, say it alone is truly aristocratic - the rule of the best based on a natural inequality. As he himself once said "la révolution ... produira naturellement et nécessairement sa propre aristocratie qui prendra la tête de la société .." <sup>22</sup> As Faguet puts it .. "Guizot et son parti ont eu, plus qu'une aristocratie, le défaut d'une aristocratie, pour cette raison précisément qu'ils ne croyaient pas en être une."<sup>23</sup>

<sup>20</sup> He said for instance "all the combination of the political machine then ought to tend .. to extract whatever of reason, justice or truth exists in society, in order to apply it to the practical requirements of government.." Guizot, Note 15, p. 64

<sup>21</sup> "The desire and tendency of society are in fact towards being governed by the best, by those who most thoroughly know and .. respond to the teachings of truth and justice..", Guizot, Note 15, pp. 65-66

<sup>22</sup> Guizot, Note 12, p. 108

<sup>23</sup> Faguet, E, Politiques et moralistes du XIXe siècle, Paris, 1890, pp. 340-341

More remarkable, however, is Guizot's attempt to reconcile this theory of Reason to the facts of society. This aristocracy of talent, this voice of Reason is the voice of the Middle Class, paying 300 francs in taxes. They are the Middle because in the invariable terms of this line of thought they are supposed to be neither too rich nor too poor. They are the ones who over the centuries have gradually asserted their place in society by their talents and are now rich enough to have the leisure to cultivate their reason. They are that section of the people who have proved themselves, have found favour in Providence in that, knowing its laws, they have prospered and all who do the same will also rise up from the mass and join this elite. The rise to riches and Reason is open to all who have the ability.<sup>24</sup> Capacity as the faculty to perceive the divine law is in some way associated with the talent to acquire wealth. Yet why after praising the middle class, does he support a suffrage limit of 300 francs? In fact, Guizot is supporting not a middle class but a Middle Rich and his "juste milieu" is between the very rich and the not so

<sup>24</sup> He wrote for instance, "Le pouvoir acquis sur les hommes et tous les moyens de l'acquérir, comme la richesse, l'habilité, la science, découlent originairement d'une supériorité naturelle". Guizot, Note 12, pp. xxxii-iii

rich. Therefore his equation of Reason = the leisured rich = the Middle Class is open to question on every term.

The fact is that, in spite of his denials, Guizot advocated an aristocracy. His rulers of Reason appear to have their basis in a mixture of the new and the old aristocracy or to quote Faguet - "Il a été le dernier ministre du gouvernement aristocratique en France, et le dernier chef de l'aristocratie politique en France. La France n'a été gouvernée aristocratiquement que de 1815 à 1848. Elle a eu pendant ce temps une aristocratie hétérogène et un peu improvisée, composée des débris de l'ancienne noblesse et de la partie la plus active de la haute bourgeoisie.." <sup>25</sup> Or as Le Charivari wrote in 1843 "All we have gained is to have substituted for the old Oeil de Boeuf the aristocracy of the Vatouts, the Barthes, the Testes, the d'Argouts, the Persils, the Decazes, the Lacave-Laplagnes".<sup>26</sup> Guizot was a conservative whose ideas were formed during a period when he had to fight another aristocracy distasteful to him and he therefore built up an abstract concept of a noble "Middle Class" not based really on any economic function for he had no interest in economics nor based

<sup>25</sup> Faguet, Note 23, p. 369

<sup>26</sup> Quoted in Johnson, Note 11, p. 79

on any analysis of society.<sup>27</sup> No doubt he felt sure his concept had social reality and that it was all liberal but he had no faith in the people who were supposed to support his system. He despised the "bourgeois".<sup>28</sup> In this contradictory nature of his thought, we find a key to the contradictory ideas on the "bourgeoisie". It was his conscious aim to appear as a supporter of the people and to employ the term "bourgeoisie" in its extended meaning yet he constantly supported measures favouring a limited elite, in other words "bourgeoisie" in its contracted meaning, or a bourgeois aristocracy. In this way, he undoubtedly succeeded in confusing "liberalism" with this notion of a "bourgeois aristocracy".<sup>29</sup>

<sup>27</sup> Ibid, p. 76 and pp. 78-79

<sup>28</sup> Pouthas writes, Note 14, p. 331, "en ces temps de lutte contre le ministère Polignac, il parle avec quelque dédain de cet esprit bourgeois 'peu ambitieux, peu entreprenant, timide même'.." In 1849 Guizot also complained that France could not be governed by or with the middle class - aristocracy was preferable and he especially admired the English aristocracy and country gentleman, see Johnson, Note 11, p. 78

<sup>29</sup> Pouthas says on Guizot, "L'esprit de Guizot, parti de l'observation de la vie, s'évade dans un univers artificiel fait à la fois d'expérience et de raisonnement qui figure à ses yeux la réalité véritable. Avec le durcissement de l'âge, il lui deviendra impossible d'en sortir. Beaucoup plus qu'un intérêt de classe ou que la peur du peuple, c'est le mécanisme propre de sa pensée, qui fait désormais de Guizot un conservateur". Pouthas, Note 14, p. 476

From this, it might be said that, although the Doctrinaires did strive to associate themselves with the new ideas of the time, they could never free themselves from older concepts. They could never rid themselves of the notion that only the leisured landowners could really represent the nation and that these landowners represented the virtuous middle classes in the Aristotlean manner. Both ideas seem derived from an earlier era and were fundamentally in conflict with the new "industrialism". It is interesting to note here the transition which is taking place in the concept of the middle classes or the bourgeois class. The Doctrinaires apparently view it still in terms of leisured culture, the new economic liberals see it clearly in terms of work and industry.

CHAPTER VPolitical Liberals of the Left  
and the Economic Liberals

Before considering the theory of the economic liberals, it is necessary to look at the political liberals to the left of the Doctrinaires. In general, they were more open to the doctrines of Smith and Say and, in fact, quite willing to see themselves as the representatives of industrials of any kind provided these industrials were willing to recognise the liberal principles, that is, provided the political formulas of liberalism were given priority since, in the eyes of this group, liberalism was a form of government, not a method of economic production.

The case of Benjamin Constant is an interesting example of the transition from the conservative attitude. At first, he felt that only landowners could maintain liberalism.<sup>1</sup> Industrial property was too insecure and changing, intellectuals too dangerous. Yet gradually he shifts his position. Doubtlessly under the influence of the ideas on the new "industrialism", he transfers his support from the landowners to the industrials. He became convinced that commerce and industry were vital

<sup>1</sup> Constant, Principes de Politique, in Oeuvres, ed. Roulin, Paris 1957, p. 1147.

factors in society.

"Le commerce et l'industrie sont aujourd'hui les régulateurs des Etats et les arbitres des gouvernements. J'ai prouvé ailleurs que ces deux puissances avaient changés la face du monde. Tandis que les peuples anciens étaient presque uniquement guerriers, les peuples modernes sont essentiellement commerçants. Toutes nos institutions doivent subir les changements que cette différence rend nécessaires; et ces changements sont un bien réel, un pas immense dans le sens de la liberté et des lumières. Car le commerce ne vit que par la liberté".<sup>2</sup>

These are then factors making for liberty, peace and eventually equality. All this is the language of the Smith-Say school. Accordingly, Constant supports now what he calls "la classe industrielle". This "classe industrielle" which appears to correspond to his earlier "classe intermédiaire" is neither rich nor poor. Unlike the first their interests are general, those of the whole of society, unlike the second, they are educated. He became very fond of this class and came to regard it as the backbone of his political system. It was independent, it was filled with the spirit of equality, it was patriotic - "à elle appartient d'affermir par ses choix la liberté constitutionnelle, seul élément nécessaire à sa prospérité, et, chose admirable, en soignant ses intérêts propres, elle fera le bien de tous".<sup>3</sup> Notice how he gives them an important role in political

<sup>2</sup> Constant, Cours de Politique Constitutionnelle, 3rd ed. Bruxelles 1837, p. 407

<sup>3</sup> ibid, p. 453, See also pp. 242 ff.

liberalism as if that system was created for them - a fact which Saint-Simon was busily denying!

In this way, Constant bases his idea of government on the extended concept of the "bourgeoisie", (although he never uses the word) now "la classe industrielle". This is a true middle class - the big middle excluding the very rich and the very poor - paying a tax of 3 to 700 francs. As he said on the election laws of 1817 concerning a project to have the suffrage from 3 francs "L'adoption de ce projet va donner une base large et nationale au système représentatif; elle assurera le maintien de nos institutions, en confiant le choix des députés à la majorité des Français indépendants par leur fortune, intéressés aux institutions et éclairés sur leurs intérêts".<sup>4</sup> Constant then virtually comes to rest at a constitutional monarchy based on a wide franchise, his doubts about the big middle class appearing to fade as his belief in industrialism grows. In this respect, he differs from the Doctrinaires in that he truly wishes to base his system on the "middle class". Yet he is not so far left politically as the Republicans. Moreover he is to be distinguished from the "Economic Liberals" in that he always put the political form of liberalism in the first place. The new "industrialism" was, it is true, a means to attain political liberty and equality but it was not an end in itself.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid, page 249

In this way, Constant stands at the turning point between political liberalism and economic liberalism. He was first a supporter of the leisured middle class ideal and perhaps he never fully grasped the economic import of the "industrial class" but he steadily moved to the new position to effect a partnership with the new forces.

Before we consider these new forces, it is necessary to look at two other supposedly "liberal" groups - the Bonapartists and the Republicans - groups which in effect drove a wedge between the political liberals and the economic liberals and in the end virtually caused Saint-Simon to formulate an anti-liberal doctrine. It is a fact that up to 1824, the Liberal opposition on the left was almost completely Bonapartist in outlook. Even Constant was in tactical alliance with this group of which Manuel appears to be one of the most famous representatives. Manuel's Bonapartism was not, of course, based on the despotism of Napoleon for indeed he had liberal ideas, he was also in favour of "industrialism", he was a friend of Laffitte and wanted the sovereignty of the people and not a "Charte" based on the will of the monarch. Yet he was also a Bonapartist in that he had the concept of a Liberal Empire based on monarchy, not of a Bourbon but of Napoleon II.<sup>5</sup> In this respect,

<sup>5</sup> See Bonnal, Manuel et son temps, Paris 1877.

he represents that group which viewed the Revolution not only in liberty but in glory and the Restoration period was very powerful in fabricating a myth of Imperial Liberalism. So strong indeed was the influence of this group that until 1824 all criticism of this myth was violently decried.<sup>6</sup> They had a strong hold on the journals and were well represented in the secret societies. One of the rare liberal journals not under this influence was "Le Censeur Européen" and this together with the publications of Saint-Simon put up a strong opposition to Bonapartist influence.<sup>7</sup>

Flowing into this movement and often difficult to distinguish from it were the Republicans centred on Lafayette.<sup>8</sup> Undoubtedly the desire for glory often characterising the Republicans came originally from the Bonapartists. Both groups were active in secret societies and attempted revolts so that necessarily their work was mostly underground, yet certainly both were political groups at this time, i.e. they sought their solution in a change of government and were indifferent

<sup>6</sup> For details on the influence of the Bonapartists, see Paul Thureau-Dangin, Le parti libéral sous la Restauration, Paris 1888. Also Pierre de la Gorce, Louis XVIII, Paris 1926.

<sup>7</sup> On "Le Censeur Européen", see Thureau-Dangin, Note 6, p. 70-71

<sup>8</sup> See I. Tchernoff, Le parti républicain sous la Monarchie de Juillet, Paris 1901.

to economic or social considerations.<sup>9</sup> Many of the Republicans were to change in the course of the 1820's but for the moment it is merely necessary to note that for a period the liberal party appeared to be dominated by groups which to some appeared completely anti-liberal.

Distinctly separated from the political liberals yet influencing them and being influenced by them in turn was a group of liberal thinkers striving to propagate a new concept of society, history and morals based on a theory of "industrialism". Centred round "Le Censeur Européen", it was the school of Charles Comte, Dunoyer, Thierry and in part Saint-Simon. They were the ones who continued the Smith-Say ideas and wanted in fact to transform the whole of society in accordance with the new economic ideas. Industry was the key. In their eyes, it had transformed and was still transforming Europe. From it all wonders sprang. It had brought liberty ever since the "enfranchissement" of the communes, it had brought peace and new virtues, it had thereby created a new morality. Far from ruining liberty, as Rousseau had said, it alone was liberty.<sup>10</sup> What had the world been like before industry came? There had been nothing but

<sup>9</sup> ibid

<sup>10</sup> See Charles Dunoyer, De la liberté du travail, Paris 1845, Vol. I, pp. 343 ff.

domination, the brutal division of men into oppressors and oppressed. History had merely been the story of one class subjecting another, living off it, dominating it with its laws and power.<sup>11</sup> This age of slavery had only been broken by the gradual appearance of a new kind of property, industrial property,<sup>12</sup> favouring the rise to influence of the industrious or industrial class. Taking its beginnings in the Middle Ages, it achieved its full force in 1789 when the open class conflict began between the new system and the old. Unfortunately, it was not altogether successful owing to the false ideas of the philosophes "sans la moindre notion de l'organisation sociale, ils se sont tournés vers l'antiquité pour proposer des institutions fondées sur la guerre et l'esclavage comme modèles à une civilisation moderne".<sup>13</sup> The conflict had then not ended in 1789 - that was only the start. Europe was still divided into two camps, two classes - that of the old warriors and monopolists and that of the peaceful and freedom-loving people.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>11</sup> See Charles Comte, Traité de Legislation, Paris 1827, Vol. IV, p. 502.

<sup>12</sup> See, for instance, Dunoyer, Note 10, Vol. I, passim.

<sup>13</sup> Charles Comte: "Considérations sur l'état moral", quoted in Ephraim Harpaz, "Le Censeur Européen" Histoire d'un journal industrialiste" Revue d'Histoire Economique et Sociale, Vol. 37, 1959

<sup>14</sup> Harpaz, Note 13, p. 209

This was the historical picture to be continued by Thierry and Saint-Simon and in a distorted form by Guizot. From the economic angle, society was viewed as follows. It was divided into two classes, the old and the new, the "idle" and the "industrious", the "bees" and the "drones", the productive class and the non-productive class.<sup>15</sup> The old class is idle because it does not work and therefore lives off the worker for only he who works produces wealth.<sup>16</sup> Obviously the warriors and monopolists come in here, as the old oppressor class. But what of others? What about those who live off the workers such as capitalists or rentiers? Clearly in this theory any idler must be lined up in the old class. As Destutt de Tracy wrote, "il est certain que la consommation vicieuse appelée luxe et en général toute la consommation des capitalistes oisifs, bien loin d'être utile, détruit la plus grande partie des moyens de prospérité d'une nation".<sup>17</sup> Yet there is another class of "productive capitalists" or the "entrepreneurs" who mix talent and capital together to create industry and productivity. In this way, the productive class is divided into three groups, "savants",

<sup>15</sup> The idea of bees and drones appear to have originated with Dunoyer (see Harpaz p.203). The productive and non-productive terms are from Destutt de Tracy.

<sup>16</sup> Destutt de Tracy, Traité d'économie politique, Paris 1823, p. 95.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid, p. 254.

"salariés" and "entrepreneur".<sup>18</sup> This is a continuation of Say and also bears the Achilles heel of the founder, Adam Smith. Even if the idle capitalist is condemned, what of the difference in interests between the "entrepreneur" and the "salariés"? Say denies that there is in the long run any difference of interest for we are all consumers, we all profit from low prices.<sup>19</sup> There will, of course, always be some inequality in society because we are not equally made by nature.<sup>20</sup> The most industrious, the most intelligent, the most active are the most happy, the most rich, and the most free. It is unfortunate but one cannot alter "the nature of things". Yet industry does give a free chance to everyone and conditions will certainly improve as wealth spreads out.<sup>21</sup>

This is a very interesting theory. It presents society in a new light with a sharp division into two economic classes, those who work and those who do not, with all "workers" forming a solid front, as creators of an entirely new society, something never known before.

18 Ibid, p. 95

19 Say, Traité d'économie politique", Vol. II p. 290-291, similarly Destutt de Tracy, Note 16

20 See Dunoyer, Note 10, p. 371 ff.

21 Ibid, p. 470.. "L'histoire de la civilisation, depuis la chute de l'empire romain, n'est, à proprement parler, que l'histoire de l'avancement des classes laborieuses".

Unfortunately for us, it is not always clear from the works of the writers studied here which class they consider to be the bourgeois class. Clearly the historical theory makes the non-productive class the old oppressors, i.e. the old aristocracy and their followers. Yet the economic theory simply equates the non-productive with the non-working class. The favourite phrase "oisifs bourgeois" used often to mean "oisifs riches" would tend to prevent any simple equation of the bourgeoisie with "la classe laborieuse". Be that as it may, it is certain that only one change is contemplated from the old oppression to the new freedom and once industrialism is attained obviously there is going to be no more "idlers", the idler mentality being nothing but a remnant of a past age.

The aim is then to achieve this new society. How? First the new society must be freed of its fetters and free reign given to the individual so that in this new age the pursuit of individual interest can achieve the fulfillment of the general interest.<sup>22</sup> The government is then only a means and not an end in itself. The State is reduced solely to "police" functions. There is no need for huge state administrations with big armies swallowing up taxes in complete unproductivity. "L'idéal

<sup>22</sup> See Destutt de Tracy, Note 16, p. 179

d'une société industrialiste est celle où tout le monde travaillera et où personne ne gouvernera".<sup>23</sup> It is true that this group of thinkers tended to associate "industrialism" with political liberalism but rather as the means to the end.<sup>24</sup> In the long run it would be merely a question of leaving the individual to follow his interests and to achieve this magnificent future of the human race. The Golden Age of man was in the future. It was to fulfill the age-old longing for happiness for everyone and the key had at last been found. The motto of Destutt de Tracy was "Aimez-vous les uns les autres" and it was this picture of the brotherhood of man achieved which these thinkers found so inspiring.<sup>25</sup> Industrialism seemed to be the golden key to happiness for once it had gained power, there would no longer be any more need for oppression by one class of another since prosperity could be obtained not by slavery or servitude of others but by the free work of each making for the

<sup>23</sup> Harpaz, Note 13, p. 207 f.

<sup>24</sup> On this and altogether on the ideas of "Le Censeur Européen", I refer to the excellent article of Harpaz, Note 13.

<sup>25</sup> See Leroy, Histoire des Idées Sociales en France, Paris 1962, Vol. 2, p. 171.

Saint-Simon could well have been included here but his outstanding position together with his rather excessive ideas have persuaded me to make a separate category for him.

benefit of all.

On this optimistic note, it could be said that the "age of the industrial" commences and with it a completely new outlook on political and social theory. It is no longer solely a question of political forms, it involves a new society born out of a new form of production, gradually spreading and changing all the globe economically, socially, politically and intellectually. Moreover, it is quite distinctly a class theory for all these achievements are the work of a certain class of society.

CHAPTER VIThierry and Guizot - Liberal Historians

The new history based on "industrialism" obviously starts with Smith and Hume. It is present in the works of Barnave but the true initiators in France were the members of the Smith-Say party, notably Charles Comte and Charles Dunoyer together with the most famous representative, Augustin Thierry.<sup>1</sup> Already as secretary of Saint-Simon, Thierry was revealing his fondness for the new economic school of thought. This can be seen from his contribution to the first number of Saint Simon's journal "L'Industrie" which followed in the footsteps of "Le Censeur Européen".<sup>2</sup> It is filled with the same praise of industry as the initiator of peace and liberty.<sup>3</sup> Liberalism is industrialism. "Un régime constitutionnel, un régime libéral...n'est autre chose... qu'un régime fondé sur l'industrie".<sup>4</sup> All this development of industry found its first political

<sup>1</sup> See Harpaz, Note 13, Chapter V, passim

<sup>2</sup> Harpaz writes on the success of "Le Censeur Européen" and says "L'entreprise s'est révélée une excellente affaire au point que Saint-Simon l'a imitée dans L'Industrie"..Note 13, Chapter V, p.355

<sup>3</sup> "L'Industrie" Vol. I, seconde partie 1817 by A. Thierry, Oeuvres de Saint Simon et d'Enfantin, Vol. XVIII, p. 37 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid, p. 108

recognition in the enfranchisement of the communes.<sup>5</sup>  
 This might well be the key thought for Thierry since  
 from it springs his whole history. The study of the  
 communes and the burghers becomes for him a history of  
 the bourgeoisie.<sup>6</sup> He was seeking to find in history a  
 support for his political beliefs.<sup>7</sup> He wanted to  
 rehabilitate the "classes moyennes ou inférieures ...  
 Né roturier, je demandais qu'on rendît à la roture sa  
 part de gloire dans nos annales ... les souvenirs  
 d'honneur plébéien, d'énergie et de liberté bourgeoise".<sup>8</sup>

According to him, "bourgeois" history was a history  
 of conquerors and conquered. This was by no means a new  
 idea, being the backbone of the whole new system.

Thierry, however, associated it with an older concept -

<sup>5</sup> Ibid, p. 38

<sup>6</sup> It is sometimes suggested Thierry derived all his  
 ideas from Saint-Simon, see A. Augustin Thierry,  
Augustin Thierry 1795 - 1856, Paris 1922 pp.39 ff.  
 Georg Plechanow, "Über die Anfänge der Lehre vom  
 Klassenkampf", Die Neue Zeit 1902-1903 1 Band.  
 Yet Thierry and Saint-Simon together only derive  
 their ideas from Hume, Smith and the Liberal  
 Economists whilst the Frank-Gaul conflict was long  
 existent - Sieyès already associated the Third  
 Estate with the Gauls.

<sup>7</sup> See Augustin Thierry, "Oeuvres Complètes", Vol.V.  
 Paris 1864, 8th edition, "Lettres sur l'histoire  
 de France". In the introduction, Thierry writes  
 "En 1817, préoccupé d'un vif désir de contribuer  
 pour ma part au triomphe des opinions  
 constitutionnelle, je me mis à chercher dans les  
 livres d'histoire des preuves et des arguments à  
 l'appui de mes croyances politiques" p. 1.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid, Vol. VI Dix Ans d'Etudes Historiques, Preface.

much discussed in 18th century France - of two races, the Franks and the Gauls so that in Thierry's view the history of the Third Estate becomes blended with a theory of races. "Ouvrez l'histoire au point que vous voudrez.. si vous recontrez une peuplade d'hommes..vivant sous un régime de servitude, soyez sûr qu'en remontant plus haut vous trouverez une conquête".<sup>9</sup>

Anyone writing on French history of the early times was bound to come across the Frank-Gaul issue.<sup>10</sup> Moreover, Montlosier has just made the whole question actual again in his book "De la Monarchie française". In this work, Montlosier tries to show that the true nation was the nobility and that the Third Estate was descendants of slaves who from the enfranchisement of the communes in the 12th century had gradually gained influence, thereby usurping a position in the state at the expense of the true nation, the nobles. As Thierry pointed out, although Montlosier was on the wrong side, he had the right idea.<sup>11</sup> In fact, Thierry needed only to say quite right and a good thing too. Yet, whilst this race conflict fascinated

<sup>9</sup> Ibid, p. 208

<sup>10</sup> For a very clear account of the numerous opinions on this issue during the 18th century in France, see the introduction to Thierry's Récits des Temps Mérovingiens précédés de Considérations sur l'histoire de France, Vol. 1.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid, p. 174. Montlosier's book was published in 1814.

Thierry,<sup>12</sup> the transformation of a race conflict into a class conflict is actually of more significance for us,<sup>13</sup> and he was the first Frenchman of that time to see history in this light.<sup>14</sup> Moreover, he was the first to use the term "bourgeoisie" consistently to mean "la classe industrielle".

The study of history is then the study of liberty won, how the vanquished became the victors, how the crushed and conquered slave race rose to riches and power - not by force nor by war but by the gradual extension of industry based on peace. As Thierry rather proudly states: "nous sommes les fils des hommes du tiers état; le tiers état sortit des communes, les communes furent l'asile des serfs; les serfs étaient les vaincus de la conquête".<sup>15</sup> The subjected race-class did not live by war but by work.

<sup>12</sup> For instance, he applied the theory not only to French history but English, tracing the Civil War to the results of the Norman Conquest. Histoire de la Conquête de l'Angleterre par les Normands. Paris 1825.

<sup>13</sup> See Garaudy, Les sources françaises du socialisme scientifique", Paris 1949. p.99. "Le grand mérite d'Augustin Thierry ne tient pas à ces interprétations 'racistes' des luttes de classes, mais à sa conception très nouvelle du relais historique des classes". It is strange how in later times a similar race theory - of Aryans v. Semitics was also based on different economic virtues, only this time in the reverse sense.

<sup>14</sup> At least, he is the first to make it the basis of historical analysis.

<sup>15</sup> Thierry, Note 8, p. 240.

Sheltered within the towns, some of them preserved the remnants of Roman civilization and on these foundations gradually built up a new one, although they were still of course under the domination of the Franks, that is, the "nobile guerrière, oisive et turbulente".<sup>16</sup> Gradually these town dwellers, increased by the escaped serfs and consisting of merchants and artisans, grew in wealth and power and demanded their enfranchisement - a necessity of the age as Thierry writes.<sup>17</sup> The term "bourgeois" became a sign of liberty, a title of honour for a free man who participates in the government of his town. Over the centuries, the principles born in the idea of a "commune" give rise to the idea of a "constitution".<sup>18</sup> "Ainsi se trouva formée cette immense réunion d'hommes civilement libres mais sans droits politiques, qui en 1789 entreprit, pour la France entière, ce qu'avaient exécuté, dans de simples villes, ses ancêtres du moyen âge."<sup>19</sup>

Clearly in this concept of history, there can only be two races or classes, the conquerors and the conquered, the oppressors and the oppressed. Admittedly in the early

<sup>16</sup> See Thierry, Histoire de la Conquête de l'Angleterre par les Normands, Vol. I Introduction p. 5.

<sup>17</sup> Thierry, Note 8, p. 185

<sup>18</sup> Ibid, p. 192

<sup>19</sup> Thierry, Note 7, p. 363

time, the town dwellers appear as a superior group within the whole, their towns little oases in the desert of serfs and nobles. Yet they are but the forerunners of a transformation for all; the benefits they discover are benefits for all. They can lead the whole of humanity out of the chain of oppression and oppressors for they have discovered how to live without slavery, serfdom and domination so that all men can live peaceably with each other simply by following their interests.<sup>20</sup> This is the unique contribution of Europe. In this way then, the "bourgeoisie" are ever extending so that in the end all will be "bourgeois" as the old nobility disappear and the poor discover the virtues of industry.

In this way, Thierry firmly anchors the theory of industrialism to a fixed scheme of historical development by outlining the progress from "bourgeois" to "industrial" and thereby clearly associating the bourgeoisie with the industrial class. Admittedly, other theoreticians of the Smith-Say school had pointed to the

<sup>20</sup> Thierry in *L'Industrie*" Note 3, p. 50 makes clear the moral basis of this point of view. It is in fact Christianity realized, e.g. "C'est par la multiplication des besoins et des travaux divers que la fraternité des hommes peut devenir un objet de pratique. La véritable société chrétienne est celle où chacun produit quelque chose qui manque aux autres, lesquels produisent tout ce qui lui manque. L'intérêt d'union, c'est l'intérêt des jouissances de la vie; le moyen d'union, c'est le travail." p.50

connection between the Medieval towns and the modern system of commerce and industry for this in fact was stated by Adam Smith himself. Yet Thierry was the first in France to apply this concept to the study of history and so to create the framework of a new history which was, of course, to become so very popular. From now on, historical interest was often concentrated on the rise, development and triumph of the bourgeois class. From the smallest and meekest beginnings, the bourgeoisie was destined to inherit the earth.

As might be expected, the history of Guizot is different from that of Thierry and the "industrialists". He seldom dwells on economics, being far more interested in political development and the providential role played by Europe in this respect. Similar to Thierry, Guizot was interested in justifying his beliefs by studying history but his beliefs were different.<sup>21</sup> His aim has been defined as putting "toute l'histoire au service du gouvernement représentatif".<sup>22</sup> Naturally in this connection he was not unaffected by the Thierry trend.

Admittedly, Guizot has often been classed along with Thierry, Mignet and Thiers as a determinist in history

<sup>21</sup> See R. Flint, History of the Philosophy of History, Edinburgh 1893, p. 491

<sup>22</sup> Pouthas, Note 14, Chapter IV, p. 312

and often regarded as an economic determinist.<sup>23</sup> Yet, unlike the above-mentioned historians, he had a rather Hegelian concept of history, with the hand of Providence leading man via struggles and conflicts to their true destiny. Man is changed, society is therefore changed, and therefore institutions change and so man is changed,<sup>24</sup> "ainsi .. l'homme avance dans l'exécution d'un plan qu'il n'a point conçu, qu'il ne connaît même pas; il est l'ouvrier intelligent et libre d'une oeuvre qui n'est pas la sienne ... Concevez une grande machine dont la pensée réside dans un seul esprit, et dont les différentes pièces sont confiées à des ouvriers différents, épars, étrangers l'un à l'autre; aucun d'eux ne connaît l'ensemble de l'ouvrage ... Ainsi s'exécute, par la main des hommes, le plan de la Providence sur le monde".<sup>25</sup> Accordingly, everything fits into a pattern, nothing is in vain, nothing retrograde.<sup>26</sup> Nor is anything sudden or unexpected; revolutions, for instance, "revolutions .. do not unfold themselves in an abrupt and sudden manner. They are conceived and nurtured in the womb of society

<sup>23</sup> See Plechanow; Note 6, p. 282 ff.

<sup>24</sup> Flint expresses this clearly, p. 503-504 Note 21, in showing Guizot expresses the interconnection between the development of the inner man and the changes in society.

<sup>25</sup> Guizot, Histoire de la Civilisation en Europe, Paris 1871, 11th edition, pp. 301-302.

<sup>26</sup> Guizot, Essais sur l'Histoire de France, Paris 1847, 7th edition, p. 248

long before they emerge in the light of the day".<sup>27</sup>

It is true, as Plechanow points out, Guizot does say history is a struggle of classes but firstly, as we shall see, these classes are not purely economic and moreover they are only material representatives of spiritual principles, i.e. the struggle of liberty against privilege - "et je dirai encore que la révolution, amenée par le développement nécessaire d'une société en progrès, fondée sur des principes moraux, entreprise dans le dessein du bien général, a été la lutte du droit contre le privilège, de la liberté légale contre l'arbitraire".<sup>28</sup> Moreover in this struggle no one class is going to win but only the principle embodied in the outcome of the struggle - it is in fact almost the dialectic of Hegel.<sup>29</sup>

Europe had then produced not so much a new economic outlook as a new social and political outlook with the principle of this embodied in the "bourgeoisie" which starting from lowly origins gradually advanced to a place in society and then government.<sup>30</sup> All this of course has

<sup>27</sup> Guizot, Note 15 Chapter IV, p. 2

<sup>28</sup> Guizot, Note 12, Chapter IV, p.xxviii. See also Guizot, Note 25, p. 209,; Plechanow, Note 6, p. 282.

<sup>29</sup> Guizot, Note 25, pp. 209 ff., Guizot, Note 12 Chapter IV, xvii ff., Johnson, Note 11, Chap. IV, pp. 337 ff.

<sup>30</sup> Guizot, Note 26, pp. 31 ff.

a certain similarity to Thierry. In the early days there were only the conquerors forming the state, the rest are dispersed in the countryside or in the towns and have no political existence. But "le temps, l'industrie, le commerce, le christianisme, les essais d'ordre enfin qui sont une nécessité de l'état social rédiront à la population vaincu un peu plus de sécurité".<sup>31</sup> When strong enough, they assert their right to political recognition, fight the aristocracy and form themselves into the third estate - the new nation ready to take over the government and replace the rootless old system. It made the revolution of 1789 against privilege for the liberty of all.<sup>32</sup> But the product of this struggle was not the triumph of the poor over the rich or the proletariat over the proprietor or of any group over another, it was the realisation of a higher principle born in the course of the struggle - the concept of liberty and rights for all against the concept of exclusive privilege.<sup>33</sup>

Who, according to Guizot, were the "bourgeoisie" in this struggle? It is noticeable that Guizot is not a partisan of "industrialism". His bourgeoisie admittedly

<sup>31</sup> Guizot, Note 12, Chapter IV, p. ix ff.

<sup>32</sup> Guizot, Note 12, Chapter IV, pp. xiv ff.

<sup>33</sup> Guizot, Note 12, Chapter IV, p. xvii

originates in the communes but it does not remain a class of merchants, artisans and commercials.<sup>34</sup> They are only one branch involved in the struggle and in themselves quite insufficient to realise the true principle - timid, afraid and riddled with dissension as they were.<sup>35</sup> Other elements are added as the struggle assumes another form, superseding the weak efforts of the towns in the Middle Ages. The Third Estate is not a static body. "Il faut voir naître successivement dans son sein de nouvelles professions, de nouvelles situations morales, un nouvel état intellectuel.." <sup>36</sup> A vital new group were the royal officials, the "légistes" - for a long time part of the Third Estate. The following passage is very revealing as regards Guizot's concept of the bourgeoisie.

"Ces juges, ces baillis, ces prévôts, ces sénéchaux, tous ces officiers du roi ou des grands suzerains, tous ces agents du pouvoir central dans l'ordre civil devinrent bientôt une class nombreuse et puissante. Or la plupart d'entre eux étaient des bourgeois; et leur nombre, leur pouvoir tournaient au profit de la bourgeoisie, lui donnaient, de jour en jour plus d'importance et d'extension. C'est peut-être là, de toutes les origines du tiers état, celle qui a le plus contribué à lui faire conquérir la prépondérance sociale".  
.. 37

<sup>34</sup> See Guizot, Histoire de la Civilisation en France Vol. 4, Paris 1853, pp. 211 ff.

<sup>35</sup> Guizot, Note 25, p. 211, Guizot, Note 34, pp. 241 ff.

<sup>36</sup> Guizot, Note 25, p. 209

<sup>37</sup> Guizot, Note 34, p. 273

These bourgeois who in fact destroyed the liberty of the communes were the most vital part of the bourgeoisie. One can see why Pouthas says that Guizot in contrast to Thierry, "fait bon marché des libertés communales".<sup>38</sup> The bourgeoisie nearest to Guizot's heart are the "légistes" which reveals how different his attitude is to that of the "economic liberals". Such a belief is virtually in complete contradiction to "industrialism". Yet it is very much in accordance with Guizot's political beliefs.

By studying the works of Thierry and Guizot, it is possible to distinguish between a "doctrinaire" history and an economic liberal history. In some cases, the distinction might appear to be a fine one and, of course, Guizot just as Thierry has been called a historian of the bourgeoisie.<sup>39</sup> Yet, in certain respects, the distinction is fundamental since Guizot has quite a different social and political outlook from Thierry. Guizot is concerned with the history of a political idea not the history of an economic class. For him, the upholders of the idea can vary over the centuries and are not restricted to any

<sup>38</sup> Pouthas, Note 14, Chapter IV, p. 331

<sup>39</sup> For instance, see Engels, 'Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy,' in Marx/Engels, Selected Works, Moscow, 1962 Vol. II. There is a general tendency to class Thierry, Guizot, Mignet and Thiers in one category.

particular economic section of the community. In this way, for Guizot, the bourgeoisie is rather those who carry forward the political ideas of liberalism and not any specific class.<sup>40</sup> According to him, although the original supporters were to be found in the medieval towns, the later fighters for these ideas were the royal officials and the "légistes". Therefore, instead of a class originating in the Middle Ages, inventing a new means of production, and thereby a new way to end exploitation of man by man, and therefore a new society based on the freedom of all, we have, with Guizot, the rise of an idea of representative government, at first achieved in the towns, then decaying there to pass to the king and his royal officials and then to the légistes and the lawyers and the Members of the Parlements so eventually to achieve success in 1789.

These historical ideas of Guizot, of course, accord with his political convictions, in particular his aristocratic conception of the idea of the true government upheld by an élite distilled from the people, created by a long process, representing centuries of endeavour and

<sup>40</sup> It is strange that Marx's use of the term "bourgeoisie" has a vague similarity to Guizot's use. For instance, in reading "The Communist Manifesto", one is often tempted to wonder if the bourgeoisie does not represent an idea or ideal taken up and carried on by various economic classes over the centuries.

striving to overcome the cruder principles of domination and oppression. Moreover, this truly noble élite is not one characterized by such traits as industriousness, inventiveness and economic ability but rather by rational insight, noble mindedness and attitude of culture produced by leisure pursuits.

It is also interesting to note that in many ways Guizot appears to have aroused the ire of Saint-Simon and the theories of Saint-Simon often seem to have been conceived as a refutation of the ideas of Guizot, for example, when Saint-Simon seeks to show that the "légistes" are nothing but bastard representatives of feudalism. In general, it is my opinion that Guizot should be considered as an opponent of the new "industrialism" and that his system of ideas must be clearly distinguished from both the political liberals of the left and the economic liberals. In this way, a deeper understanding of the period 1830-1848 can be obtained.

CHAPTER VIIInterpreters of the French Revolution

It was not the liberals who started the history of the French Revolution but the émigrés. Primarily interested in knowing why it happened, they produced various theories to explain this. Apart from the primitive plot theory, they developed several influential lines of thought, such as the theory on the role of the "philosophes", and the Providence theory whereby it was the result of some grand movement of ups and downs or the hand of God sent to punish them.<sup>1</sup> For instance, de Bonald saw it as a cyclic movement, part of the growing corruption of society, due to rise of commerce. The greed for money had become the dominant interest destroying the conserving principles of societies.<sup>2</sup> This was the liberal idea in reverse. Undoubtedly these conservative thinkers had exercised an influence on the liberals.

<sup>1</sup> See Fernand Baldensperger, Le Mouvement des Idées dans l'émigration française 1789-1815 Vol. II

<sup>2</sup> "Le soif d'or a remplacé la fureur des conquêtes et la fièvre dévorante qu'il allume est devenue le principe de l'existence des républiques ... Entraînées par ce délire universel, les administrations les plus sage n'ont vu de puissance que le commerce, de richesses de l'argent, de prospérité que le luxe; et l'égoïsme, les besoins factices et immodérés, l'extrême inégalité des fortunes .. ont attaqué les principes conservateur des sociétés". De Bonald, Oeuvres complètes, Paris 186, Vol. I, Théorie du Pouvoir, p. 355.

For some time, however, the Revolution was an embarrassment to the liberals. They both admired and feared it. Like some huge upheaval which brought both good and evil, it was difficult to fit into any simple pattern of thought. Convinced it was good in principle, they had no difficulty in explaining how it came about - that was the march of progress. The difficult part to rationalize was its course. Why did this revolution, the progressive result of centuries, have such a wretched outcome, first in the Terror and then in despotism of Bonaparte? Most liberals tended to suggest that there was one Good Revolution which went wrong.<sup>3</sup> According to this view, the first part of the Revolution was the true revolution whilst the rest was a mistake, a distortion, often enough due to the plots of the émigrés or the wars or both. For instance, Constant saw the Revolution as the light of reason, as the struggle against oppression but distorted by the insolence of the aristocrats, the plots of the émigrés so that it degenerated into a struggle between two parties.<sup>4</sup> In this way, the first half was digested into the scheme of history, the second

3

Or, with Guizot, two Revolutions - liberal and Jacobin, see Pouthas, Note 14, Chapter IV, p.181

4

Constant, Mémoires sur les Cent Jours, Paris 1822 pp. 168 - 169.

left to chance. Not many were prepared to go as far as Saint-Simon who eventually condemned the whole Revolution although for most it has something unsatisfactory and unnerving about it.<sup>5</sup>

Yet it was their revolution, defective though it was, seen either as the triumph of reason and liberty, the start of the reign of industrialism, the political rise to power of the people or bourgeoisie, the embodiment of representative government, or of economic freedom, or of national sovereignty, to be found in the Charte, in the Constitution of 1791, in Republicanism, in Napoleon. There was as yet no advance beyond that but even so the Revolution was offering something to all shades of liberal opinion.

The first liberal study of the French Revolution was written by Madamede Stael and she initiated the lines to be taken by the political liberals, i.e. those who viewed progress in terms of the attainment of civil and political liberty. Untouched by the economic interpretation, she represents the Rational school whereby all benefits flow from liberty, itself attained by the enlightenment of man

5

The tendency to see the Terror as due to the "people" was of course a great barrier to the spread of democratic ideas and constantly put the liberals in an awkward situation.

and in turn affecting all men.<sup>6</sup> The light of Reason first appeared in the Renaissance, it was increased by the invention of printing, the Reformation, the discoveries, the progress of commerce, yet in a way all making towards the realisation of Christianity.<sup>7</sup> In some respects, for Madame de Stael, it is not only reason, but the soul and passion of the true man, as a noble and ennobling virtue. Moreover, her stages of history are political: feudalism, despotism, and representative government. The French Revolution (and the English Revolution) was the achievement of the final stage "vers lequel l'esprit humain s'avance de toutes parts".<sup>8</sup> The Third Estate embodied this principle yet reason and philosophy had so advanced that no enlightened person could justify privilege and therefore all those with knowledge and talent were for the revolution.<sup>9</sup> For Madame de Stael, then, the division of the nation is between those who are enlightened and

<sup>6</sup> Contrast this with the "economists" whereby commerce etc. creates insight and knowledge, e.g. Destutt de Tracy, Commentaire sur l'esprit des lois, Paris 1822, passim.

<sup>7</sup> Mme. la Baronne de Stael, Oeuvres Complètes, Paris 1820, Considérations sur les principaux événemens de la Révolution française, Vol. 14. Christianity was the start but "tout à coup la Providence a permis que l'Angleterre ait résolu le problème des monarchies constitutionnelles" pp. 352 - 353.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid, Vol. 12, pp. 22-23

<sup>9</sup> Ibid, Considérations .. Vol. 12, pp. 2007 ff.

those who are ignorant and the danger comes from the masses who are untouched by enlightenment.<sup>10</sup>

Now, in her account, the true Revolution was completed in 1789,<sup>11</sup> and after that it was a search for equality, with the inferior and ignorant class taking precedence over those called upon to govern owing to their intellectual superiority. Instead of establishing a constitutional monarchy on the English pattern with the rule of law, it steadily degenerated into the destruction of liberty and thereby of law itself. As for the Terror that was, apart from the conduct of the war, only "un mélange de grossièreté et de férocité, dans lequel on ne peut découvrir aucun plan, hors celui de faire massacrer la moitié de la nation par l'autre".<sup>12</sup> All this could only be explained by the corruption of the habits of the

10  
Ibid, p. 208

11  
Ibid, p. 249

12  
Ibid, Considérations.. Vol. 13, p. 123

French people due to a long period of repression.<sup>13</sup> Accordingly, she might well be said to speak for the majority of political liberals of her time although this view of the French Revolution was destined to be soon replaced by that of the liberal economists and later, of course, that of the Socialists so that it appears now to have only curiosity value.<sup>14</sup> It is important to realise, however, there was a school which did not see the French Revolution in terms of economics but in terms of enlightenment.

Mignet was the first historian of the French Revolution to treat it in terms of economic classes. Accordingly, he is often classed along with Thierry as the historian of the "bourgeois" class. Yet in certain respects, the theory of Mignet is a confused mixture of class notions which suggests that Mignet did not have a definite theory of classes. His chief contribution was his concept of "determinism" whereby he pictured the

<sup>13</sup> Ibid, Considérations Vol. 14, "Mais, dira-t-on, les Français, pendant la révolution, n'ont pas cessé d'errer entre les folies et les forfaits. S'il en étoit ainsi, il faudroit s'en prendre, je ne saurois trop le répéter, à leurs anciennes institutions politiques; car ce sont elles qui avoient formé la nation; et si elles étoient de nature à n'éclairer qu'une classe d'hommes, et à dépraver la masse, elles ne valoient assurément rien". p. 158

<sup>14</sup> It is strange how this truly liberal view of the French Revolution should have suffered such a remarkable decline.

Revolution as the triumph of the new social forces, the new nation of the Third Estate and wrote: "Such is the course of all rising powers; they watch over it from without, before they are admitted into the government .. The epoch at which the Third Estate was to share the sway had at last arrived".<sup>15</sup> On the basis of this, Mignet has been classed as a "fatalist" or determinist.<sup>16</sup> Certainly, in this respect, he is in accordance with the liberal historians of the economic school.

Moreover, he divides the revolution into class-stages. The Revolution of July 14th was the triumph of the middle class,<sup>17</sup> and the constitution of 1791 was their constitution. Parties are also made to accord with classes - the Feuillants represent the middle class, and the Jacobins the people whilst the Girondins, having no class of their own, sit in between and are therefore doomed to failure

<sup>15</sup> F.A.M. Mignet, The History of the French Revolution, Everyman Edition, London 1926, p. 6.

<sup>16</sup> Chateaubriand called Mignet a fatalist and the fatalist "regarde la société comme soumise a certaines lois irrésistible, de manière que chaque chose arrive comme elle devait inévitablement arriver". Etudes Historiques, Oeuvres, Vol. 7 Paris 1840, pp. 51 and 58. Petit in Francois Mignet, Paris 1889 and Flint Note 21, Chapter VI, p. 355, both deny that Mignet was a fatalist. Of course, with Mignet, not everything was subjected to pre-ordained laws but he does represent the trend to get away from "moralism" by suggesting some inevitable law of economic progress.

<sup>17</sup> Mignet, Note 15, p. 52

from the outset..."they only formed half a party, which was soon overthrown, because it had no root."<sup>18</sup> By some law, revolutions automatically move from right to left and Mignet wrote this rather amazing statement: "The French revolution, which had destroyed the old government, and thoroughly overturned the old society, had two wholly distinct objects; that of a free constitution, and that of a more perfect state of civilisation. The six years we have just gone over were the search for government by each of the classes which composed the French nation. The privileged classes wished to establish their regime against the court and the bourgeoisie, by preserving the social orders and the states-general; the bourgeoisie sought to establish its regime against the privileged classes and the multitude, by the constitution of 1791; and the multitude wished to establish its regime against all the others, by the constitution of 1793. Not one of these governments could become consolidated, because they were all exclusive. But during their attempts, each class, in power for a time, destroyed of the higher classes all that was intolerant or calculated to oppose the progress of the new civilization".<sup>19</sup> At first sight, this appears to have come from the pen of a Marx rather than a liberal.

<sup>18</sup> Mignet, Note 15, p. 150

<sup>19</sup> Mignet, Note 15, p. 279

There is the automatic equalization of parties to classes, the presumption that revolutions always run from right to left, and further the notion that the French revolution embodied at least two revolutions - the "bourgeois" revolution and the revolution of the people. All this would put Mignet beyond the liberals into the then non-existent socialist camp!

Plechanow might then well say: "With complete understanding, he (Mignet) shows that the struggle of the political parties during the revolution was only the expression of the contradiction of class interests".<sup>20</sup> However, it would be wrong to read too much into Mignet. For instance, the passage quoted above was not advocating class rule but showing how the new principle of the new civilisation - that is, a liberal constitution and economic system - was born out of the struggle of classes. Moreover, Mignet is by no means consistent in his use of the term "bourgeoisie". Sometimes he suggests it covers the whole of society. At other times he sharply

20

Plechanow, Note 6 Chapter VI, pp. 280-1  
 Cunow considers Mignet to have a much clearer class concept than Saint-Simon, see Cunow, Die Marxsche Geschichts-, Gesellschafts-, u. Staatstheorie, Berlin 1923, p. 167. Also Cunow, "Saint-Simon als Geschichtstheoretiker", Neue Zeit, XXXVIII, 1919, pp. 281-289

distinguishes it from the people.<sup>21</sup> The fact is that Mignet never identifies the terms and therefore presumably has no social theory defining the respective places of the "bourgeoisie" and the "people". To my mind, he has consciously asserted the liberal principle of the historical progress of a class but at the same time unconsciously accepted the old opposition between "bourgeoisie" and "people" so that apparently he opposes the "bourgeoisie" to the people - a thing no liberal would really do and this gives his account of the French revolution a very modern air. The apparent march from the bourgeoisie to the people, however, raises interesting possibilities. It certainly foreshadows the Republican interpretation of the Revolution of 1789 which was to become so influential after 1830. For the first time, in fact, there is a suggestion that there are three stages

21

For instance, as regards the 1791 constitution, he writes, Note 15, p. 99: "When it (the predominant force) belongs to one alone, it is despotism; when to several, it is privilege, when to all, it is right". But on page 100, he says "Placed between the aristocracy and the multitude, it (1791 constitution) was attacked by the one and invaded by the other. The latter would not have become sovereign, had not civil war and the foreign coalition called for its intervention and aid. To defend the country, it became necessary that it should govern it; then it effected its revolution, as the middle class had effected its own. It had its 14th of July in the 10th of August: its constituent assembly, the convention; its government, which was the committee of public safety".

in society - nobles, bourgeoisie, and people - and not the liberal two.

As a friend of Mignet, Thiers also adopted a similar scheme. In his work there is the same distinction of "bourgeoisie" from people or multitude, the same concept of revolution progressing from right to left, yet being a work of more detail and less of theory, it has a rather different emphasis. It is much more a history of the events of the French Revolution than a history of its stages, it is more colourful and passionate and in general adds little to what Mignet has to say as regards the class structure and the concept of revolutions. Moreover, since the work is extended over several volumes, it lacks the striking character of Mignet where everything is so compressed that the bare bones of the theory appear immediately. Certainly, however, he goes on to strengthen this concept of the Revolution in three stages - nobles, bourgeoisie and people.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>22</sup> The following passage reveals Thiers' idea of classes. "Complètement asservis, ils dorment longtemps. Le réveil a lieu d'abord dans les classes les plus éclairées, qui se soulèvent et recouvrent une partie du pouvoir. Le réveil est successif, l'ambition l'est aussi, et gagne jusqu'aux dernières classes et la masse entière se trouve ainsi en mouvement. Bientôt, satisfaites de ce qu'elles ont obtenu, les classes éclairées veulent s'arrêter, mais elles ne le peuvent plus ... celles qui s'arrêtent, fussent elles les avant-dernières, sont pour les dernières une aristocrate; et dans cette lutte des classes se roulant les unes sur les autres, le simple bourgeois finit par être appelé aristocrate par le manouvrier.." Thiers, Histoire de la Révolution Française, Paris 1846, Vol. II, p. 6.

CHAPTER VIIISaint-Simon - an Economic Liberal?

Throughout the writings of Saint-Simon from 1817 to 1825, there are certain constant reiterations which class him as a follower of the "Liberal Economist" school or "industrialism". Just as they, he believed that from the enfranchisement of the communes a new class had progressed to power via a new form of production, industry, "la classe industrielle",<sup>1</sup> and this class will eventually form the whole of society for, since it is the only useful class and the one constantly growing, it will finally become the sole class.<sup>2</sup> It does not seek power but only peace and security; therefore it will bring a completely new era for mankind, the end of domination and force, the establishment of peaceful association for all members of society; its interest is the interest of all.<sup>3</sup> There are only two ways to exist - "en volant ou en produisant" and thus there are only two social organisations.<sup>4</sup> Once this new class takes over,

<sup>1</sup> See Oeuvres de St.-Simon, ed. Rodrigues, 1832  
'Catéchisme Politique des Industriels', p. 1 ff.

<sup>2</sup> See Oeuvres de Saint-Simon and Enfantin, Vol. XIX  
p. 74 (L'Industrie 1818)

<sup>3</sup> See Du Système Industriel, Oeuvres de St.-Simon et Enfantin, Vol. XXI, p. 68, also and Vol. XX, p.150  
(L'Organisateur)

<sup>4</sup> Oeuvres, Vol. XXIII, p. 81 (DuSystème Industriel)

there will be no inequality except that of capacity and talents - "chacun obtient un degré d'importance et des bénéfices proportionnels à sa capacité et à sa mise" <sup>5</sup> Misery, idleness and ignorance will disappear. This vast industrial class comprises 24/25th of society and ranges from the intellectuals (savants) and directors of industrial undertakings down to the simple workmen. Their interests are one, and in the new society all shall be as brothers. <sup>6</sup> It follows then at the present time, there are only two parties or classes "des parasites d'un côté, et la masse des producteurs de l'autre". <sup>7</sup>

This system, according to Saint-Simon, is based on the march of civilisation and has two aims, to replace the old spiritual power (papal and theological) by the spiritual power of the "savants" and to replace the old temporal power (feudal and military) with the new temporal power of the industrials. In the attainment of this latter end, Saint-Simon suggests that the "chambre des communes" must be composed of members of the "communes", i.e. the industrials. The new system should take political form as "une société organisée pour le but

<sup>5</sup> O. XX p. 151 (L'Organisateur).

<sup>6</sup> Ibid, pp. 159 ff.

<sup>7</sup> Oeuvres Choiesies, Bruxelles 1859, Vol. 3, p. 60 (A son excellence M. le Garde des Sceaux).

positif de travailler à sa prospérité par les sciences, les beaux-arts et les arts et métiers.." <sup>8</sup> There must then be a party of producers to organise this new power. <sup>9</sup> Another suggestion he has is the formation of a Council of Industrials to prepare the budget. <sup>10</sup> Now only one man can effect this change peaceably - the king. He must realise that the industrial class should occupy the premier rank because it is the superior class. You cannot have an industrial nation with a feudal government. <sup>11</sup> The king has then only to give the order and the industrial regime can be formed and all the misery of the human race ended. <sup>12</sup> It is a system which has been prepared over centuries, culminating in the works of Smith and Say, its chief propagators. <sup>13</sup> Say was especially important because he formed the scientific basis of the new system - the science

<sup>8</sup> Ibid, Vol. II, p. 374 (L'Organisateur)

<sup>9</sup> Ibid, Vol. II, p. 449 (Suite à la Brochure des Bourbons et des Stuarts 1822)

<sup>10</sup> Ibid, Vol. 3, p. 47 (Du Système Industriel) & p.86

<sup>11</sup> S.-Simon, Noté 1, p. 37 (Catéchisme Politique des Industriels) Also O. XXII, pp. 82 ff. (Du S.I.)

<sup>12</sup> As he wrote in 'Du Système Industriel' 1821, "il faut que le Roi des Français devienne le premier industriel", O. XXIII p. 56. Men like Delessert, Lafitte, Ternaux, Périer should be put in charge. O. XXI p.118. (Du S.I.)

<sup>13</sup> O XIX, p. 143 (L'Industrie).

of organising nations, the science of production which in fact is the new politics, the sole duty of the government.<sup>14</sup>

Analysed in this way, Saint-Simon might well fit into the school of "Le Censeur Européen" with its doctrines based on the works of Smith, Say, and Destutt de Tracy. The concept of two classes - productive and non-productive, the belief in the completely new role of this class in economics, politics and morals, the dislike of the old system of government and the desire to replace it by one based on production.<sup>15</sup> Of course, if this had been all he had said, it is unlikely he would be so famous to-day. Although the above condensation of his ideas represents the burning interest of Saint-Simon, it certainly occupied only a relatively small part of his writings. It was his absorbing interest, but he had a still more absorbing worry. Why had the system not yet been achieved? What had happened after 1789 to prevent the establishment of this wonderful new order? All had been ripe, all was coming but something went wrong. In trying to answer these questions, Saint-Simon developed his own scheme, a scheme which isolated him even from the

<sup>14</sup> O. XVIII p. 188 (L'Industrie). In 'Du Système Industriel', Saint-Simon also praised Ch. Comte and Dunoyer, O. XXIII, p. 27

<sup>15</sup> O. XX p. 117 (L'Organisateur).

Economic Liberals. Yet only in means not in aims. It should never be forgotten that he did want the industrialism of Smith and Say. He firmly believed that the industrial class comprised all "workers" from the highest to the lowest, and he asserted to his death that there were only two possible systems - the warring, oppressive type and the peaceful, industrial one. The basic aims remained then "liberal".<sup>16</sup>

In answering the question of what went wrong, Saint-Simon developed various ideas over the period 1817 to 1825 and I propose to sketch out the progressive development of his thoughts over this period in order to see what exactly were his views on the "bourgeoisie".

The problem was this: Here are the industrials who have been progressing ever since the enfranchisement of the communes towards a complete revolution of society, embracing all its aspects, yet they have still not attained it.

In 1817, Saint-Simon still believed that the liberals had prepared and made the Revolution based on the economic and political principles of the "industrials". Yet wars and troubles distorted it so "la class ignorante" got power and the liberals had to fight Robespierre, the

16

For question of whether Saint-Simon was a liberal, see below, note 4a.

Directory and Napoleon. As a result, although the liberals had been able to destroy feudalism, privilege and the religious system, they were not successful in establishing a new system of their own. This appears in some ways to have been their own fault because in 1789 they were not fully prepared. Instead of taking over power themselves, they confined their cause to the "avocats" and this body distorted the course of the revolution -- "C'est le défaut d'idées générales qui nous a perdus".<sup>17</sup> Another word for the body of false helpers was "légistes". They were the allies of the "militaire", completely opposed to the interests of the industrials although they were supposed to represent them. The "légistes" had originally been agents of the Franks, then of the king, and finally branched off on their own - in the shape of the Girondins and the Jacobins (Robespierre was a "légiste"). All they wanted was power. They served Bonaparte whilst the industrials suffered.<sup>18</sup> So far Saint-Simon was not too greatly out of step with the Economic Liberals. He still considers himself a liberal,

<sup>17</sup> Q. XVIII p. 213 (L'Industrie)

<sup>18</sup> Q. XIX, p. 162 ff. (L'Industrie)

he still sees some good in the French Revolution.<sup>19</sup>

Only like they, he puts the blame for the false outcome of the Revolution on the false ideas of the time, and of course they were with him in disliking the Bonaparte regime.<sup>20</sup>

From 1819 to 1820, Saint-Simon continues to develop this theme. The "légistes" are now seen to be a new aristocracy, formed by Bonaparte, and always opposed to the Bourbons. Accordingly, the struggle in the Chambers was only one between two different aristocracies, one on the left and one on the right, both completely ignoring the interests of the industrials. "La guerre terrible que les communes françaises eurent à soutenir contre la féodalité européenne .. necessita une longue prépondérance de l'action militaire sur les travaux pacifiques; des

<sup>19</sup> For instance in 1817 he wrote "Ce sont les libéraux qui ont préparé la révolution, en dévoilant dans leurs écrits les vices de l'ancien gouvernement.. Ce sont eux ... qui ont proclamé les principes généraux que l'Assemblée Constituante a déclarés devoir servir de base à la politique .." ibid XVIII p. 175. At this time Saint-Simon appears to think the Revolution went wrong with the appearance of the Girondins.

<sup>20</sup> In 1819 Saint-Simon has still two parties - the national and the anti-national although the third category of anti-nationals is a rather curious one "tous ceux qui professent des principes politiques dont les application nuisent à la production". Q. XIX p. 195 (Le Politique)

habitudes guerrières furent contractées par les membres les plus actifs des communes, et le résultat .. fut l'établissement d'une nouvelle aristocratie créée par Bonaparte".<sup>21</sup> This new aristocracy wants to return to power, it wants a revolution to put a king of its own on the throne.<sup>22</sup> Unfortunately, the "communes" have always allowed themselves to be dominated by this feudalism of Bonaparte and worse still the party called liberal was itself dominated by it.<sup>23</sup> As we have seen, this indeed was true and something which the liberal economists also objected to although it was not altogether wise at that

<sup>21</sup> O. Choisis Note 7, Vol. II, p. 422. (Lettres de Henri Saint-Simon à messieurs les jurés, L'Organisateur).

<sup>22</sup> Ibid, p. 424. Saint-Simon was the interesting prediction. "Je vois d'abord, et peut-être très prochainement une première révolution analogue à celle du 20 mars. mais plus durable. La nouvelle aristocratie ne croira son existence assurée que lorsqu'elle aura mis sur le trône un roi sorti de son sein. Ainsi, elle tend de toutes ses forces au renversement de la dynastie des Bourbons.". Of course, it did not need much prophetic vision to realise this yet when Saint-Simon came to be regarded as a prophet, such statements are important in judging the 1830 revolution.

<sup>23</sup> O. XX. p. 234 (L'Organisateur). "La parti appelé libéral est évidemment dominé par la féodalité de Bonaparte. Or les communes se sont montrées bien peu soigneuses pour leurs intérêts en se laissant diriger par ce parti, qui est leur plus dangereux ennemi".  
This period marks his turning away from the liberals and political liberalism.

time to say so.

Still bitter but with a touch of resignation, Saint-Simon decides in 1820 that industrialism cannot come without some period of transition, some intermediary system formed of a class derived from the old system yet in some way independent of it, a sort of transitional aristocracy which provides the necessary critical force although it is in itself unable to organise the new industrial and scientific system. This class was vital in breaking up the old system but in taking the lead during the French Revolution and then remaining in power under Bonaparte, it appears that it over-reached itself. Quite mistakenly, it imagines it can itself create a new system based on the doctrines of the "légistes et métaphysiciens". Here it is quite wrong - there are only two systems and it must necessarily be part of the old system, to be swept away by the new. Yet now it still clings to its old ideas and moreover dominates every political party.<sup>24</sup> In a confused way, then, Saint-Simon both tries to explain it as a necessary transition and as a bad thing. He is impatient for the new system and these aristocrats new and old are simply blocking the way. The revolution cannot be finished until the whole ancient system goes and government passes into the hands of the "cultivateurs, des négociants

<sup>24</sup> See O. XXI Du Système Industriel passim.

et des manufacturiers".<sup>25</sup> Moreover, another strange feature of these "légistes" is that though their function is transitory, they have not even a notion of how to fulfill their true role. They should really have established the English constitution.<sup>26</sup> In fact, they are the villains of the piece. "Les légistes sont en majorité dans le ministère ainsi que dans le conseil d'état; ce sont eux qui ont fourni des chefs aux trois partis existants, ce sont eux qui dirigent les ultras, ce sont eux qui combinent les plans des libéraux ainsi que ceux des ministériels...J'ai donc eu raison de dire que la prépondérance des légistes .. était une des maladies sociales que la France éprouvait dans ce moment".<sup>27</sup> Of course, the new system is coming, it is the march of progress but why should these "légistes" delay it? They talk of the revolution, they call themselves liberals when they are nothing but the pupils of Robespierre and Bonaparte - the most illiberal of all. Their system is a bastard one. They should make way for the new system ordained by God. "Quand Dieu a prescrit aux hommes une fraternité universelle et un amour mutuel, il leur a

<sup>26</sup> See O. XX pp. 39 ff. (L'Organisateur). O. Vol. XXI p. 182 (Du Système Industriel).

<sup>27</sup> O. Choisis, Vol. 3, pp. 15-16 (Du S.I.)

ordonné, de la manière la plus claire, de retirer aux guerriers et aux théologiens la direction de la société, aussitôt que l'état de la civilisation le permettrait, puisque les guerres et les abstractions théologiques sont les causes les plus actives de haines, pour la confier aux industriels, aux artistes et aux savants, les seuls hommes essentiellement pacifiques".<sup>28</sup>

At this time, 1821, he decides that there were three classes in the Old Régime, the first were the nobles and clergy, the second were "les propriétaires oisifs qui n'étaient pas nobles, ainsi que les militaire d'origine roturière; elle renfermait aussi tous les citoyens qui étaient attachés à l'ordre judiciaire, et tous ceux qui exerçaient d'autres professions réputées honorables". The third class consisted of "tous ceux qui exerçaient des professions dégradantes, telles que celles de manufacturiers, de négociants, de banquiers etc. en un mot toute l'industrie.."<sup>29</sup> Now in the revolution, class 2 with the aid of class 3 abolished class 1 but immediately class 2 formed itself into a new nobility. At the present time it calls itself liberal but it is nothing but the party of Bonapartists with the old aim of getting rid of

28

Q. Vol. XXII, p. 231 ff., (Du. S. I.)

29

Q. Vol. XXIII, p. 18 and pp. 66-67

the Bourbons to take over power.<sup>30</sup> How did this second class originate? Firstly, the nobles impoverished from the crusades and luxury sold some of their lands to non-nobles who then took the title "bourgeois". Secondly, the invention of gunpowder necessitated a new type of soldier - the engineers and artillery soldiers of non-noble origin. Thirdly, the barons to save themselves the trouble of holding their courts themselves created a judicial order now at the head of this second class "On peut dire .. que les légistes ont pris naissance entre les jambes des barons".<sup>31</sup> From this, it is obvious that being derived from the feudal order they are themselves feudalists with the sole aim of establishing a new feudalism by "la dynastie bourgeoisie" and new nobles.<sup>32</sup> As there are only two systems, they necessarily belong to the military and oppressive type. They are "la classe des désœuvrés subalternes, à laquelle on a donné le nom de bourgeois, qui, de même que les nobles, doivent être envisagés comme des sangsues du peuple, puisque .. ils s'efforcent d'obtenir des places pour eux et pour leurs enfants, afin de vivre aux dépens de la Nation".<sup>33</sup>

<sup>30</sup> According to Saint-Simon, the "liberals" truly liberal in the good sense were Constant, Courier, Dunoyer and Ch. Comte, together with "industrials" as Laffitte. O. Vol. XXIII p. 27, Oeuvres de S.S. ed. Rodrigues, p. 196 (C.P. des I)

<sup>31</sup> O. XXIII, p. 67 ff. (Du. S. I.)

<sup>32</sup> ibid., p. 70 ff.

<sup>33</sup> ibid., p. 93

Finally in the "Catéchisme Politique des Industriels" these three pre-1789 classes receive the names: "les nobles, les bourgeois et les industriels". It was the bourgeois who made the revolution and abolished the nobles so that now there are only two classes, class 2 formed as usual from the bourgeois landowners, soldiers and "légistes" (i.e. "les militaire, les légistes et les rentiers").<sup>34</sup> This class then recreates the feudal system for its own profit. Furthermore it now directs the liberals - "le parti libéral a toujours eu et aura toujours pour directeurs les classes intermédiaires. Or ces classes, ayant été engendrées par la class féodale, tiennent de la nature de la féodalité; ainsi elles doivent nécessairement tendre à réorganiser la féodalité à leur profit".<sup>35</sup> In fact, it is all a sort of neo-feudalism formed by a combination of this bourgeoisie and the old aristocracy with a life only as long as the old aristocracy - "ils n'ont de force réelle qu'en se combinant avec l'ancienne nobless, dont ils sont une émanation; il n'ont point de caractère politique qui leur soit propre, ils sont dans la réalité une nobless, des petit pieds".<sup>36</sup>

Now it appears that he sees two contradictory groups of liberals, one revolutionary 'the bourgeois' and one peaceful (industrials) but the industrials should break

<sup>34</sup> Oeuvres de S.-S. ed. Rodrigues, p. 7 ff. (C.P. des I)

<sup>35</sup> Ibid, p. 61

<sup>36</sup> Ibid. pp. 145-6

with the term "liberal" for "l'esprit révolutionnaire.. est directement contraire au bien public; aujourd'hui une désignation qui n'indique point un esprit absolument contraire à l'esprit révolutionnaire, ne peut pas convenir aux hommes éclairés et bien intentionnés." <sup>37</sup> Only the organic and constructive class can achieve a new system and realise the public good and only under their natural leaders, i.e. the directors of industrial works; for they alone can lead the workers to their true benefits and prevent their seduction by intriguers who want to make revolutions to get power.<sup>38</sup> In this way, we end on the old note of the liberal economists although, in answering the question what went wrong, Saint-Simon has gone a long way.

This summary of Saint-Simon's ideas developed over the period 1817 to 1825 shows that the "bourgeois" class was nothing but a growth from the old feudal tree, a new branch indeed but rootless as the tree on which it grows. It is a class of ex-soldiers, lawyers, or functionaries and idle non-noble landowners - not truly an economic class at all but just a group of administrators and idlers forming a kind of bastard feudalism. It took its growth in the critical or transitory epoch and is transitory itself. After the Revolution it usurped a false leadership

<sup>37</sup> Ibid, p. 208 ff.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid, p. 221

and it was because the liberal party was dominated by these neo-feudalists that Saint-Simon turned against it, i.e. not because he is not a true liberal but because they are not, but have so corrupted the word "liberal" that Saint-Simon prefers not to use it, except to designate this feudalism of Bonaparte.

Saint-Simon might then be said to be seeking not "socialism" but a pure economic form of liberalism freed completely from political liberalism. As Cunow says, the economic views of Saint-Simon should not lead one to presume that he had a deeper insight into the class formations of his time than most of his contemporaries. In fact, Cunow suggests that Saint-Simon was behind Mignet in this respect.<sup>39</sup> Certainly, Mignet has three economic classes and Saint-Simon only two or even only one for by 1820 it seems that the industrial class was the sole economic class, in fact the class which will alter society by making it purely economical and industrial. For Saint-Simon, it is certainly not a question of several economic classes based on different forms of production but various classes, administrative, military and spiritual, composing society as a unit. The great and unique revolution is whereby a whole new society rises up with its own spiritual and administrative class to replace another society. Of course, this revolution will be economic in

<sup>39</sup> Cunow, Note 25, Chapter VII, p. 167

outlook because it is industrial and scientific. However, it is unique in this respect. The problem then is to push away the old spiritual and administrative classes - first of the nobles and clergy and then the bastard branch of "légistes et métaphysiciens" - the bourgeoisie - to achieve this new society.<sup>40</sup>

The importance of Saint-Simon lies firstly in the fact that he pushed the original premises of the "liberal

<sup>40</sup> There have been some strange ideas about Saint-Simon's class theory. Leroy, Maxime, Histoire des idées Sociales en France, Paris 1946, Vol. 2, p. 219, writes "Ce qui demeure commun aux deux penseurs, (Marx and S.-Simon), c'est que les producteurs ou travailleurs constituent, à eux seuls, toute la société et que, seuls, ils doivent être appelés à la régir". Since S.-Simon was simply repeating the ideas of Say, then Marx is clearly a liberal! Michel says Saint-Simon was the first to revive the idea of classes after the Revolution in the opposition of "la classe industrielle" to "la classe féodale", see Michel, L'Idée de l'Etat, Paris 1896 p. 190, Note 2 - Has he not read Destutt de Tracy? Bernstein, "Saint Simon's Philosophy of History" in Science and Society, XII, 1941, pp. 82 - 96, seems to suggest that Saint-Simon foresaw three distinct economic stages, the feudal, the bourgeoisie and the industrialists, and by isolating Saint-Simon's ideas from his liberal forerunners gives him a special "socialist" position. Whilst Barth in Die Philosophie der Geschichte als Sociologie in attempting to suggest Saint Simon had two lines of thought "economic" and "ideological" overlooks to my mind that fact that for Saint-Simon the new ideology was economic, for it was based on a new system of production as a unique fact. As regards Manuel, "The New World of Henri Saint-Simon", I certainly think Saint-Simon would not have liked the idea that he was ever a pamphleteer of the "bourgeois".

economists" to their extreme conclusions so that all present political forms are outdated - it is no longer a question of a change of parties, increased suffrage, declarations of rights, representative government; the whole political question is irrelevant; it is something deeper than all that.<sup>41</sup> In this way, he comes to the point where to achieve his new society of industrialism based on "liberal economics", it is necessary to abolish "political liberalism". The two are completely separated. Politics is the domain of reaction, the game of governed and governors, oppressors and oppressed. Of course, this is a very extreme position when it is considered that for many the only liberalism was political liberalism. With Saint-Simon, we are getting to the point when a political revolution is not enough, there must be a social revolution. Certainly, this is one theme of "socialism".<sup>42</sup> After all, the original aim was the "happiness of the largest number" including of course the happiness of the

<sup>41</sup> See Barth, Note 40, p. 23, and Grossman, Henryk, "Evolutionist Revolt against Classical Economics", p. 390 Journal of Political Economy, Vol. LI, Feb. - Dec. 1943.

<sup>42</sup> What is clearly missing from Saint-Simon in the "socialist" direction, is the idea already mentioned in Adam Smith and expanded upon by Sismondi of the divergent interests between workers and manufacturers and this surely must be taken as a criterion for "socialism" - the separation of the "industrial class" into two warring groups.

poorest and more numerous class.<sup>43</sup> Obviously Saint-Simon still believes in the virtues of the Smith-Say industrialism for achieving this happiness.<sup>44</sup> In this respect, he does not appear to be a socialist but is he a liberal?<sup>45</sup>

Secondly, his importance lies in his special use of the term "bourgeoisie". So far we have had the extended meaning of the word - the equation of "bourgeoisie" to "la classelaborieuse" (Barnave) or the "la classe industrielle" (Thierry); the Robespierre definition of an aristocracy of the rich; the Guizot idea of a reasonable élite of the educated yet at one with the people; the middle class of Mignet situated between the nobles and the people. Only the Robespierre definition was definitely derogatory. Now we have a completely new definition yet

<sup>43</sup> It often appears to be forgotten that liberal economics was to make everyone happy and not one class and that many of the upholders of this doctrine in the early days were just as wildly enthusiastic about their Utopia as the Socialists were later to be about theirs.

<sup>44</sup> He was still maintaining it in "Nouveau Christianisme". See also "Opinions: Littéraires, philosophiques et industrielles", 1825, O. Choisis, Vol. 3, pp. 241 ff.

<sup>45</sup> The mass of literature on this theme all assessing Saint-Simon in different ways suggests that Saint-Simon is something of a problem. He refuses to be categorized which perhaps in turn suggests our categories are wrong. For the literature on this, see the Bibliography.

also derogatory. It is a three-pronged class of bourgeois landowners, "militaire" and "légistes", a feudal offshoot from the old tree. We have said enough to show that it is not an economic class in its own right with its own system of government and morality. At the most it is the transitory and intermediate class spanning one system with another. Accordingly, the "bourgeoisie" far from being the industrial class are its worst enemies. It definitely falls into the old class of idlers, the non-productive wasters, the old warriors living off the productive class, untouched by the new spirit of "industrialism". Constantly striving for power, whatever revolution it makes, that revolution will only be a "bourgeois" one, i.e. the old system under a new name, a political change-over unaffecting social conditions. All this was going to be important when the Saint-Simonists took up these ideas.

### Conclusion

In closing this Section, it might be useful to summarize the position reached. Clearly the period from 1815 to 1830 was one of the most important ones in the history of the term "bourgeoisie" and its development into a category of social thought. In fact, it was during this period that the word was actually first used as such a term - not only in one theory but in several so that its ability - noted in the French Revolution - of varying its

meaning on demand continues throughout this period.

Our first confusion arises with the Doctrinaires, in particular, in the works of Guizot. Guizot's use of the term "bourgeoisie" is not clear as we have seen and his attempt to combine élite notions with the new industrialism can very easily give rise to the charge that the new bourgeois or industrial class is nothing but a new form of aristocracy - a charge frequently to be heard after 1830 and deriving at least some substance from Guizot's confused use of the term.

Also, during this period, the new economic theory of liberalism was widely popularized. Moreover, due to the work of Thierry, the industrial class was equated to the bourgeoisie, a direct connection being drawn from the burghesses of the Medieval towns to the industrials of the 19th century and, in this way, the system of Say was provided with its historical foundation. The bourgeois class had thus a past as well as a future. So popular did this theory become that it gradually displaced the old Rationalist scheme although the Doctrinaires did their best to maintain it. The concept of a leisured middle class as the true representative of the nation - deriving ultimately from Aristotle - finally makes way for the concept of the industrial class composed of all who work - the creators of the new society based on the new method of production, sweeping away the old social and political forms. In

itself, this scheme of thought need not be related to political liberalism although, in actual fact, such an alliance was generally made. In any case, this new image of the bourgeoisie was clearly the work of the economic liberals.

However, a second confusion was soon to arise. Saint-Simon, wrestling with the problem of why the new industrialism did not come sooner, found himself at loggerheads with the old school of liberalism. He wanted the industrial class to triumph and he saw the enemy not only in the old nobles but in the old liberals, i.e. the bourgeois landowners, officials, lawyers (and, of course, the military element) whom he chose to regard as a bastard branch of the old feudalism. In any case, this group was designated by him the bourgeois class and almost on the heels of the formulation of the equation bourgeois class = industrial class = the nation, we have the creation of almost its opposite, using the same word, that is, the bourgeois class = the bourgeois feudal idlers = a small minority depriving the nation of its true rights. The term "bourgeoisie" is again given a dual look to reinforce the ambiguity originating during the French Revolution.

It is in the interpretation of the French Revolution itself that the confusion is the thickest. All appear united in believing that this was in some way the work of the "bourgeoisie". But who was the bourgeoisie? For

Guizot, it was apparently a refined essence from the people composed of those capable of comprehending the idea of liberal government. For Mignet, it was <sup>a</sup> class somewhere between nobles and the rest. For Saint-Simon, it was a group of pseudo-nobles - a sort of parody of Guizot's bourgeoisie - to be strictly separated from the industrial class whose real revolution was yet to come.

This period was then a very fruitful one for the development of French political ideas but also saw the origin of much confused thinking. Several opposed concepts of society and politics were in conflict and the meaning of words could vary according to the theories upheld without any one standard definition ever being accepted. Therefore, it is particularly necessary to examine with care what exactly each writer meant when he used the terms "bourgeois" and "bourgeoisie".

S E C T I O N III

CHAPTER IX

Early Criticisms of Liberal Economics  
(up to 1830)

CHAPTER X

The Revolution of 1830 and the Saint-Simonists

CHAPTER XI

General Trends of the 1830's

CHAPTER XII

Social Moralists of the 1830's

CHAPTER XIII

The Fourierists and Louis Blanc

CHAPTER XIV

Communism and Socialism after 1839

---oOo---

CHAPTER IXEarly Criticisms of  
Liberal Economics (up to 1830)

In this Section, I propose to trace out the development of the criticisms of the economic liberals into independent theories of society. The most notable line of attack on the liberal theory was the one which maintained that the new "industrialism", far from ending classes, was designed to perpetuate them and in fact only abolished one exploiting class to replace it by another. The roots for this argument can be traced back into the 18th century and the French Revolution, if we consider what was then the moral attitude towards money-making and wealth, i.e. the disapproval expressed in this respect. However, although this outlook often formed the ethical basis, critics of "liberal economics" aimed also at showing that its means were completely opposed to its aims so that instead of establishing the happiness of all, it was merely establishing the happiness of a small élite.

In addition, there is another line of criticism initiated by the Saint-Simonists. They have nothing against industrialism as such; what they attack is the perversion of industrialism exercised by a bastard feudal élite which is still upholding the old exploiter mentality in the new era. This group is the bourgeoisie. I would like to consider the Saint-Simonists in some detail for they are

especially important for the development of the term "bourgeoisie". In fact, it was the Saint-Simonists who, by their propaganda, virtually made the 1830 revolution a "bourgeois" one.

However, after their decline in 1832, there is a return to the moral element. This, of course, does not prevent the term "bourgeoisie" acquiring a more definite economic accent, as for instance in the case of Buchez as we shall see, but it does mean the chief interest is on the moral conflict and the chief emphasis on the necessity of a moral regeneration. The second great movement of the 1830's was Fourierism and this movement is of importance since it developed a theory of progress and a definition of the word "bourgeoisie" quite different to that of the Saint Simonists. This again leads to complications and confusion as, for instance, with Louis Blanc.

Finally, there are the Communists and Socialists of the 1840's. Pursuing the general moral line, the Communists regard the source of disharmony and evil in society to be the institution of property and once it is abolished, the true brotherhood of man can be attained. A small section of the Communist go further and imagine the abolition of the property-owning class. Contrary to the liberal scheme, they reject all industrialism and see harmony in communist frugality. The other group of "socialist" although

severely critical of industrialism tend to divide it into capitalism and socialism, i.e. the industrial system of the bourgeoisie and the industrial system of the proletariat.

The first of our critics of the school of liberal economics - Fourier - obviously derives his ideological tradition from the earlier "moralism" of the 18th century and in part no doubt from the anti-commercial spirit of the Revolution.<sup>1</sup> In general, Fourier's language is reminiscent of the terms used during the French Revolution coupled, of course, with his hatred of merchants and commerce, stock-jobbing and monopolising together with the tendency to study the question from the angle of consumption<sup>2</sup> and to conceive the question in terms of a struggle between rich and poor. In fact, whilst many of these ideas were to be revived in the 1830's, it seems Fourier never gave them up at all and firmly maintained the old attitudes in the midst of the new economism. Certainly he remained completely uninfluenced by the industrialism of the Smith-Say school and from the start

<sup>1</sup> Fourier wrote: "C'est en vain que les Jean-Jacques et les Mably ont défendu courageusement l'honneur de la Grèce et de Rome. Vainement ont-ils représenté aux nations les vérités éternelles de la Morale .. Oeuvres Complètes de Fourier, Paris MDCCCXLI, Vol. I, Théorie des Quatre Mouvements, p.224.

<sup>2</sup> See Bouglé, Socialismes français, Paris 1932, p.115.

criticised it in terms of the earlier moral concepts. What then, according to Fourier was wrong with this new economic system?

Firstly, he charged it with the crime of egoism, i.e. he strongly opposed the idea that self interest can be equated to the general interest.<sup>3</sup> In his eyes, it was merely the greedy fight of every man against the other<sup>4</sup> - a form of economic anarchy leading not to the equality of wealth but to the monopoly of wealth by the rich<sup>5</sup>, with the mass of the people enduring the same old system of exploitation by a small minority.<sup>6</sup> The aim then - wealth for all - can never be achieved by these means. The old system of moralism with Spartan austerity might be wrong but equally so is the new system for it effects only the domination of the rich over the poor and the formation of a class of wealthy parasites, a class of monopolists,

<sup>3</sup> See Hubert Bourgin, Fourier, Contribution à l'Etude du Socialisme Français, Paris 1905, p. 177.

<sup>4</sup> Interesting that Fourier calls in Hobbes to support him - "aussi avez-vous de concert étouffé la voix de quelques hommes qui inclinaient à la sincérité, tels que Hobbes et J.J. Rousseau, qui entrevoyaient dans la Civilisation un renversement des vices de la Nature, un développement méthodique de tous les vices".. Note 1, p. 284

<sup>5</sup> The results of civilisation will be of course to exterminate all differences except poverty and wealth, i.e. the whole middle section will be depressed into the poor class. See Pechan, Lous Blancals Wegbereiter des modernen Sozialismus, Jena, 1929, p. 42.

<sup>6</sup> See Bourgin, Note 3, p. 130 ff.

extending their vicious influence over the whole of the industrial system; in short it is "la féodalité commerciale". Why is this so? Because the new system is based on all the vices of commerce. Had not Smith praised "l'accaparement comme une opération utile au bien général"? <sup>7</sup> Here, Fourier unites his criticism of the new economics with his favourite aversion - commerce.

The Age of Civilisation sees the triumph of Commerce;<sup>8</sup> it has conquered moralism, it has proclaimed the virtue of riches, it has made a god of commerce and that is just what is wrong with it. "Le Commerce, tout en paraissant servir l'Industrie, ne tend qu'à la spolier en tout sens..<sup>9</sup> In fact, it distorts the benefits of industry, it corrupts the habits of the people.<sup>10</sup> In giving free reign to greed, it allows commercial profiteers and business men to amass

<sup>7</sup> Fourier, Note 1, p. 239

<sup>8</sup> Fourier's scheme of progress for Civilisation was:

<u>Enfance</u>	: germe	Monogamie
	pivot	Droits Civil de L'Epouse
<u>Accroissement</u>	: germe	Féodalité nobilaire
	pivot	Affranchiss. des industriels
<u>Décroissement</u>	: germe	Esprit mercantile
	pivot	Monopole maritime
<u>Caducité</u>	: germe	Maîtrises exclusives
	pivot	Féodalité commerciale

O.C. Vol. III, p. 207

<sup>9</sup> Fourier, Note 1, p. 253

<sup>10</sup> Fourier O.C. Vol. III, Théorie de l'Unité Universelle, p. 217 .. "Le commerçant est un corsaire industriel, vivant aux dépens du manufacturier ou producteur".

all power, thereby reducing the small man to commercial vassalage, because they are forced to sell to the monopolists, and creating a new serfdom, now in commercial form.<sup>11</sup> The class struggle, then, far from being ended, only reappears in a new form. There is a new war of the rich and the poor whereby the latter is ever crushed down into increasing misery under the burden of this exploitation of the rich.<sup>12</sup>

Political life is likewise corrupted by this spirit of commerce. The liberals might want to achieve the happiness of all but they never can with the means they use - they have been seduced by the false commercialism and thereby can never fulfil the aims of true liberalism, that is, to enrich all the classes of citizens without the deprivation of any.<sup>13</sup> The economic principles of liberalism are wrong and the idea that they can be used as a base for political liberalism is futile - man must first have economic security before they can appreciate political rights.<sup>14</sup> There must be a complete social and economic change before true liberty, the real liberation of man can be attained. It is coming, of course, Fourier

<sup>11</sup> Fourier, Note 1, p. 266

<sup>12</sup> See Bourgin, Note 3, p. 154, Pechau, Note 5, p. 43 Fourier in *Théorie de l'Unité Universelle*, O.C. Vol. IV, gives a list of all the non-productive categories.

<sup>13</sup> Fourier, Note 10, p. 367

<sup>14</sup> Fourier, Note 10, p. 367 ff.

foresees this with his stage theory - Civilisation will pass into Guaranteeism and then into Harmony when all class conflict ends.

Fourier is interesting because in the midst of economism and the union of interests, he maintains the older notion of conflict between rich and poor, denying that the Smith-Say system can ever end this struggle. Moreover, he puts liberal economics into his progress theory as one stage prior to the coming of the true harmony. Beyond industrialism comes Fourierism. Admittedly, he still regards this liberal era as a kind of feudalism suggesting that all types of feudalism are related in principle. Yet Fourier also views it as a definite economic stage in which the rich will always get richer and the poor poorer, so that in the end society will be composed of a huge mass of economic slaves dominated by a very small group of idle exploiters, business men, commercial monopolists, merchants etc. The evil element does not lie in industry but in the system of exchange viewed as a parasitic growth on the industrious society throttling the productive majority in its grasping hands. The industrial class is not then divided in itself only Fourier chops off the commercial element and turns that into the new oppressive class, thereby creating an economic category separate from the industrials in a manner different from the liberal economists who regard

exchange as a necessary part of production. Fourier's ideas create in many ways a very depressing picture of society with its mass of miserable slaves dominated by grasping monopolists - very different indeed from the rosy picture of the liberal economists. Moreover, Fourier's criticism of liberalism differs from that of the economists and industrialists such as Saint-Simon. Saint-Simon regards political liberalism as a relic of the old feudal administration and wants its removal so that economic liberalism can assert itself. Fourier criticises political liberalism because it has associated itself with economic liberalism and therefore can never realise political freedom - for how can economic slaves be free?

From this we can see that Fourier firstly points the way for all later criticisms of the liberals by reviving the moral notions on the evil of riches. He seeks in fact to show that there can be no class harmony and fraternity on the basis of liberal ethics. The class struggle goes on. He challenges in this way the liberal notion that the bourgeoisie will grow bigger and bigger to embrace the whole of society. On the contrary he says the bourgeoisie - whereby he includes the prosperous craftsman, landowning peasants, industrialists on a small scale<sup>14</sup> - will be exterminated so that in the end society

<sup>14</sup> See Fourier, *Théorie de l'Unité Universelle Oeuvres Complètes*, Vol. 5, pp. 388 ff.

will be divided into the financial aristocracy - a small elite - and the huge mass of workers.

Secondly, Fourier bases his ideas on a definite scheme of progress so that for the first time, we have a prediction foreseeing the end of liberalism, its transformation into neo-feudalism and finally the achievement of a completely new form of production. It is interesting to note that, in the face of the liberal concept of history, Fourier was the only thinker to offer a rival scheme of economic progress until Marx. For our purpose, he is of vital importance in defining the bourgeoisie as the extensive middle section of the community and then showing how this bourgeoisie was due to disappear.

Whilst, Fourier was almost unknown at this period, Sismondi had already acquired a reputation. His criticism of liberal economics was therefore much more influential in the 1820's. Moreover, his remarks were more effective since they were derived from a study of the new economics itself. Sismondi was, of course, a conservative; he was fundamentally suspicious of this new system, he preferred agriculture and small undertakings. Yet he did not reject the system as such but picked out its weak spots and suggested modifications.

Sismondi's basic criticism (and in fact the fundamental principle for all criticism of the economic school) is that the free play of individual interests does

not automatically lead to the wealth and happiness of everyone. In this respect he criticises unrestrained competition and unrestrained production.<sup>15</sup> Unrestrained production leads not to the wealth of all but to the wealth of the few for the more goods are produced beyond consumption, the more they must be absorbed by luxury. The progress of industry then increases inequality. In addition to this, industrialisation concentrates capital in a few hands and results in the dependence of the lower classes on the capitalists. Furthermore, unlike agriculture, the excessive production of goods leads not to the happiness and the ease of all but to crises of over-production whereby the lower classes are the chief sufferers.<sup>16</sup> Concentrated in big workshops under the direction of big capitalists, the poor are in a very unfavourable position for they no longer have any power over distribution and are dependent on forces outside their control. A further result of the march of industry and capital concentration is that the small man is

<sup>15</sup> Sismondi quite rightly perceives that the system of laissez faire is not a natural one and that the opposition of interests between capital and labour "est la conséquence de l'organisation artificielle que nous avons donnée à la société humaine". J.C.L. Simonde de Sismondi, "Nouveaux Principes d'Economie Politique", Paris 1827, 2nd ed. Vol. II, p. 347.

<sup>16</sup> Sismondi, Note 15, Vol. I, p. 409 ff.

squeezed out so that society tends to fall into two classes, the small class of capitalists and the large mass of wage-earners.

As well as the evils of industrialisation and over-production, there are the evils of free competition. If the aim is general happiness, free competition is definitely not the means as Adam Smith had taught. For one thing it results in a class struggle between masters and workers. The desire to sell cheap causes the master to reduce wages whilst on the other hand the workers desire to increase them. Since the masters are in a much stronger position, the workers are forced to put up with an existence wage, the result being an intensification of the tendency of wealth to concentrate in a few hands, whilst the masses are reduced to a mere subsistence level. "Les maîtres et les ouvriers sont, il est vrai, réciproquement nécessaires les uns aux autres; mais cette nécessité presse chaque jour l'ouvrier, elle donne du dépit au fabricant; le premier doit travailler pour vivre, le second peut attendre et vivre encore sans faire travailler".<sup>17</sup> In this way riches go to the rich.<sup>18</sup> But it is an artificial division for indeed both capital and labour need each other. Still the evils of competition

<sup>17</sup> Sismondi, Note 15, p. 377, Vol. I

<sup>18</sup> Sismondi, Note 15, p. 336, Vol. II

between manufacturers cause the capitalists to realise their profits not from the price of the goods but from the price of labour.<sup>19</sup> These are the anti-social results of the reign of unrestrained production and free competition.<sup>20</sup>

All this clearly opens up the line of "socialist" criticisms of "industrialism", i.e. its means are in contradiction with its aims. It wants to achieve the happiness of all, it is achieving the excessive wealth of a few and the misery of the masses. In fact, according to Sismondi, the belief in individual interest equalling the social or general interest and the faith in industry achieving the happiness of all are both wrong. Industry itself can improve conditions if controlled but if left to itself, i.e. to the play of interests, it can lead to

19 "dans la production de chaque marchandie<sup>s</sup>, au lieu de comparer simplement les frais de production à ceux de consommation, pour voir s'il convenait ou non de faire la chose demandée, le capitaliste a été appelé à calculer s'il ne pourrait point trouver sur les ouvriers producteurs le profit que ne lui offraient pas les consommateurs". S., Note 15, Vol. II, p. 359.

20 "faire reposer toute l'économie politique sur le principe d'une concurrence sans bornes, c'est autoriser les efforts de chacun contre la société, et sacrifier l'intérêt de l'humanité à l'action simultanée de toutes les cupidités individuelles. S. Note 15, Vol. II, p. 368.

the utmost misery of nearly the whole of society. The masses or the "prolétaires" will be crushed down to wage slaves dependent on a few capitalists who alone benefit. In general, Sismondi is pessimistic in outlook and disapproves of all this large-scale production, reverting rather to the earlier system of the small craftsman with many little workshops providing a chance for everyone to rise up to the master rank and, of course, all under state direction.<sup>21</sup>

He was, however, the first to express clearly the idea that the industrial class really combines two classes - the capitalists and the "prolétaires", each struggling against the other with the old war of the rich and the poor entering a new and more bitter stage because even the middle classes are going to be ground down to join the poor at the misery level so that the small capitalist group will face a huge mass of "prolétaires" - but these "prolétaires" are different from Babeuf's notion of them since Sismondi's class is the product of the new industrialism about which Babeuf knew nothing<sup>22</sup> for Sismondi's "prolétaire" are

<sup>21</sup> S. Note 15, passim

<sup>22</sup> Leroy writes: "Sismondi a decouvert le prolétaire; c'est depuis qu'il a écrit que celui-ce ne peut plus être considéré comme un simple pauvre. Une class nouvelle naît avec le mot". Leroy, Histoire des Idées Sociales en France, Paris, 1946, Vol. II p. 319, and following for difference between Sismondi and Babeuf. Leroy incidentally likens Sismondi to Saint-Simon both being desirous to regulate production. However, whilst S.-Simon wanted power to the industrials to achieve industrialism, Sismondi surely was striving for just the opposite.

derived directly from the new capitalist system of production whilst Babeuf's "prolétaire" can be equated to the poor in general.

Of course, in all this, Sismondi is not a determinist. This stage need never arrive if the state will intervene and prevent abuses thereby reconciling the two classes whose interests are the same in the long run. Yet Sismondi's analysis throws a pessimistic light on the hopes of the "industrialists" and must have been immensely influential in causing many to revise their ideas. In particular, the influence of Sismondi on the Saint Simonists is very noticeable.

The next most influential critics of the liberal system before 1830 were the Saint-Simonists. They were the disciples of Saint-Simon and they considered it their duty to spread the teachings of the master - or at least their version of his teachings - throughout France, Europe and the world. The two most famous members at this time were Barthelemy-Prosper Enfantin and Saint-Amand Bazard, and under their influence, the Saint-Simonists established a doctrine of their own, quite distinct from the ideas of Saint-Simon himself.

In order to show the distinctiveness of this doctrine both from the teachings of Saint-Simon and the liberals and to reveal at the same time the common liberal root, let us first consider their concepts on historical progress.

History according to them is divided into progressive stages each with a critical and an organic phase or destructive-constructive cycles. The second critical stage started in the 15th century from the time of Luther and extends up to the present day.<sup>23</sup> All history is also the history of conflict, the conflict between association and antagonism, e.g. the association of family, city, state and class, has been in antagonism to other families, cities, states, classes. Moreover, there has been a constant exploitation of the weak by the strong, of man by man. These various stages of exploitation have been anthropophagy, slavery, serfdom, and the exploitation of the "prolétaire", all dominated by the principles of war, conquest and force.<sup>24</sup> However, there has been a gradual movement towards complete emancipation, the forms of oppression become less severe and the critical stage now existing is the final one before the true emancipation of man. Since the 15th century a new class has been evolving, the industrial class. With the enfranchisement of the communes, it acquired political freedom yet it is still held in economic subjection for

<sup>23</sup> Oeuvres de Saint-Simon et D'Enfantin, Vol. XLI  
Doctrines Saint Simonienne, Exposition par Bazard,  
première année 1828/29, p. 87 ff. Also Vol. XLII,  
Exposition, deuxième année, p. 157 ff.

<sup>24</sup> Q. Note 23, Vol. XLI, p. 185 ff., p. 389 ff. Vol. XLII

"le fonds de la production materielle" remains the property of the old oppressors so that, by invoking the right of property - which is nothing but the right of conquest - they still hold the producers<sup>25</sup> at ransom<sup>26</sup>. Society is then still divided into exploiters and exploited. The great mass of "prolétaires" are exploited by the idle property owners.. "les chefs de l'industrie subissent eux-mêmes cette exploitation dans leurs rapports avec les propriétaires".<sup>27</sup> This exploiting class has a monopoly of riches .. "la faculté de disposer à son gré, et même dans l'oisiveté, des instruments de travail".<sup>28</sup> The old servitude is then still present due to the survival of old concepts, in particular due to the idea of property and its transmission by inheritance.<sup>29</sup>

However, the oppressed class grows daily stronger and the critical epoch will soon come to an end. There will

<sup>25</sup> Enfantin preferred the term "producteur" for, as he wrote, "nous croyons aussi que les savants et les artistes sont des producteurs, et que la part des uns et des autres n'est pas moins importante dans la marche progressive des améliorations de l'espèce humaine que celle des industriels". O. Vol. XXIV. Correspondance Inédite d'Enfantin p. 73, 26 Nov. 1825.

<sup>26</sup> Note 23, Vol. XLII, p. 392

<sup>27</sup> Note 23, Vol. XLI, p. 226

<sup>28</sup> Note 23, Vol. XLI, p. 226

<sup>29</sup> Note 23, Vol. XLI, pp. 226 ff.

then be no force nor oppression, only work and association when capacity shall determine superiority, for inheritance shall be abolished and with it the idlers. The vices of the critical age will disappear too - egoism, competition, greed and private interest.<sup>30</sup> Production will be controlled so as to accord with consumption. The political forms of the critical age will also pass away. These forms are typified in the ideas of the liberals; their doctrines are based on individualism and this must be replaced by a social morality for in the new age it will not be a question of individual liberties or limits on power, but a question of remaking power on a new basis. This, of course, the liberals cannot do for they are the critical age, the egoists. In religion, the critical form is Protestantism; in industry, competition; in morality, personal interest; in science, analysis of facts; in literature, Romanticism.<sup>31</sup> Nothing it can do will ever regenerate society.

From the scheme given above, it is clear that the Saint-Simonists can hardly be ranged under the term liberal since they criticise it both economically and politically. Followers of Sismondi, they were well aware that free competition and free interests were corroding the bright

<sup>30</sup> Note 23 Vol. XLI, p.101 "Dans l'industrie comme dans la science, nous ne trouvons que des efforts isolés; le seul sentiment qui domine toutes les pensées, c'est l'égoïsme"..

<sup>31</sup> O. Vol. XXVII. Correspondance inedite d'Enfantin p. 28, (January 1830).

prospects of "industrialism". Like Sismondi, they found their remedy in control, and of course a greater control than Sismondi ever envisaged with the state organising the whole of production. They hoped in this way to establish the complete association of all workers and to end the divisions which had appeared due to the false ideas of the critical age. Only the new society could realise the harmony of interests between all industrials or producers.

Completely opposed to this solid class of workers are the remnants of the old dominant class. They are typified by the fact that they do not work but live off others in idleness; they are in fact "la classe oisive".<sup>32</sup> They control part of the capital and funds of production, lending it out at interest or rent, and this system is backed up by their own legislation based on the rights of conquest.<sup>33</sup> In fact, they live on the surplus production of the workers.<sup>34</sup> By controlling capital and the instruments of labour, they control industry, exploit the workers for their benefit. However, they are the last exploiters ;.. "Le rapport du maître avec le salarié est

<sup>32</sup> The term of course is prior to the Saint-Simonists being originally formulated by the economic liberals.

<sup>33</sup> O.Vol. XLI, p. 225 f. and Vol. XLII, p. 162

<sup>34</sup> O.Vol. XXV. C. inedite d'Enfantin, January 1828, p.28.

la dernière transformation qu'a subie l'esclavage." <sup>35</sup>

The final stage in the history of exploitation is then present for .. "la croissance continue de l'importance de l'industrie; de l'autre, la nécessité qui devient à chaque instant plus impérieuse pour les descendants des anciennes classes privilégiées qui ne sont plus aujourd'hui que des classes oisives, de travailler pour vivre.." <sup>36</sup> It will necessarily be the last stage because owing to the new system of production and the new outlook, there will be no more exploitation.

In some respects, the Saint-Simonists here touch on the liberal economists position for they regard the privileged class as the relic of the old conquering class with its oppressor mentality, surviving even in industry. Like the liberals too, the Saint-Simonists believed in the liberating influence of industry with the old top class gradually losing power as progress moves along its determined path. However, unlike the liberals, the Saint-Simonists reject the concept of laissez-faire or utilitarianism as the principle capable of overcoming the old system. In this respect, liberal economics are just a part of the critical age as was liberal politics. Moreover, it has brought about discord in the whole of

<sup>35</sup> O. Vol. XLI, p. 224

<sup>36</sup> O. Vol. XLII, p. 398

society. In addition, the industrial or productive class of the Saint-Simonists is restricted to workers of every kind and therefore excludes idle capitalists.

With respect to this industrial class, the Saint-Simonists are well aware that there are two groups within it.<sup>37</sup> Of course, their definition includes all kinds of workers yet there are signs that they are conscious of distinction in the grades of workers as, for instance, when Allier in *Le Producteur* distinguished between industrials and workers.<sup>38</sup> Further, Bazard in the "Exposition" said "aujourd'hui la masse entière des travailleurs est exploitée par les hommes dont elle utilise la propriété; les chefs de l'industrie subissent eux-mêmes cette exploitation dans leurs rapports avec les propriétaires, mais à un degré incomparablement plus faible; et à leur tour ils participent aux privilèges de l'exploitation qui retombe de tout son poids sur la classe ouvrière, c'est-à-dire sur l'immense majorité des

37

See, for instance, Pechan, p. 36

38

Quoted in Cuvillier "Les Antagonismes des Classes.." International Review of Social History, Vol. I p. 1956, p. 447. Allier wrote .. "le travailleur est celui qui, de gré ou de force, pour son compte ou pour le compte d'autrui, remplit une tâche quelconque, dont le résultat peut, à sa connaissance, être fructueux et stérile.. L'industriel, au contraire, est celui qui travaille librement, en qualité de chef ou d'ouvrier, dans l'agriculture, les manufactures, le commerce ou la banque, à une chose qui, dans sa pensée, doit lui être utile directement parce qu'il restera propriétaire du fruit de son travail".

travailleurs".<sup>39</sup> Here a definite distinction is made between "la class ouvrière" as a special category and the "travailleurs" as the general concept. However, any separation of the categories in the productive class as differences in interest (not differences in the grade of exploitation) is not in accordance with the Saint-Simonists' general line of thought.<sup>40</sup> Indeed, their concept of association is specifically designed to assert the harmony of all workers.<sup>41</sup> Any division in the ranks is only due to the critical mentality and the fact that the instruments of labour are in the hands of the idlers. The Saint-Simonists want association, the organisation of labour, the free rise of capacities, and the doctrine of love, to destroy the false divisions created by liberalism. They do not doubt that in their society there will be inequalities, there will be superior talents and inferior talents but the vital point in their eyes is that there

<sup>39</sup> Note 23, Vol. XLI, p. 225 ff. As Spühler points out "Bazard gelangt nicht zu einer klaren Oppositions-stellung zwischen Unternehmer und Arbeiter, sie bedeuten nur verschiedene Grade gleichgerichteter produktiver Tätigkeit".. p.92 Der Saint-Simonismus Lehre u. Leben v. St-Amand Bazard, Zurich 1926. There does seem, however, to be a certain conflict between the Saint-Simonists on this issue - some preferring to emphasise one point, some the other. In this respect, a study of the various Saint-Simonists would be useful.

<sup>40</sup> See, e.g. Cuvillier, Note 38, and Pechan Note 37

<sup>41</sup> For instance, see Henry René D'Allegemagne, Les Saint-Simoniens 1827-1837, Paris 1930, p. 52 ff.

will be no exploitation. <sup>42</sup>

The aim of the Saint-Simonists is the aim of Saint-Simon and the liberal economists "à améliorer constamment le sort de la classe la plus pauvre". <sup>43</sup> Only the means are different. Of course, many of the Saint-Simonists were once liberals and their doctrine could be regarded as an attempt to revise the teachings of the liberal economists in order to attain the dream of the liberal economists: "industrialism". In attempting to realise this, Saint-Simon had rejected political liberalism as the domain of the neo-feudalists. The Saint-Simonists go a step further and dispose of economic liberalism as the domain of neo-feudalists in the shape of capitalists attempting to perpetuate their ill-gotten gains. Only the end remains: the dream of an industrial heaven on earth, Christianity materialised. <sup>44</sup> Yet if all the means are changed, the class line-up is very similar; idlers on the one side, workers on the other. Admittedly, the doubtful capitalist-rentier class has now definitely taken its position in the ranks of the non-producers. Although this may in the light of the later hardening of liberal

<sup>42</sup> Q. Vol. XLI, p. 243 ff. See also Sebastien Charléty, Histoire du Saint-Simonisme, Paris 1896, p. 42 ff.

<sup>43</sup> Q. Vol. XXIV, p. 70

<sup>44</sup> As Enfantin wrote in October 1829: "Dieu, satisfait de ses progrès, la jugeant bientôt prête à réaliser son règne de la terre comme dans le ciel". Q. Vol. XXVI, p. 133.

economics appear to be a revolutionary step, it had in fact been proposed by liberals such as Destutt de Tracy. Moreover the origin of this idle class - from the feudal warriors and conquerors - is also similar.<sup>45</sup> It is true that the idlers are assuming more and more of an economic aspect compared to, say, Saint-Simon, yet it is still problematic in to which category the Saint-Simonists should be classified.<sup>46</sup>

How do the bourgeoisie fit in here? Being presumably followers of Saint-Simon (which occasionally appears doubtful), we might expect the bourgeoisie to be anything but industrials. In fact, for a long time the Saint-Simonists were strangely reticent in using this term at all.<sup>47</sup> Perhaps they were reserving it for the 1830's when of course it became the term. However, Transon in his

<sup>45</sup> See references to Destutt de Tracy in earlier section on the "Liberals".

<sup>46</sup> Are the Saint-Simonists socialists or if not what are they? Since the Saint-Simonists have only two classes, only two stages - feudalism and industrialism, this usually debars them from socialism (See Pechan, Cuvillier, Charléty, Leroy, Isambert). Cole sums up the pros and cons for including the S.-Simonists in the socialist category. (Socialist Thought: The Forerunners: Vol. I, London 1953, p. 60ff). Iggers in The Political Philosophy of S.-Simon, The Hague, 1958, makes them the theorists of the modern totalitarian state - rather a formidable charge! Probably they were liberals evolving into socialists!

<sup>47</sup> See Bazard: Doctrine de Saint-Simon: Exposition première année; Nouvelle Edition ed. Bouglé et Halévy, Paris 1824, p. 416, Note 286.

lectures to the pupils of the Ecole Polytechnique delivered early in 1830, gives a suggestion of what the Saint-Simonists were going to mean by it. Transon starts by stating there are no longer masters and seigneurs but there are still bourgeois. Who are they?

"Possesseur des terres et des capitaux, le bourgeois en dispose à son gré, et ne les met aux mains des travailleurs qu'à la condition de recevoir sur le prix de leur travail, une prime qui doit le nourrir, lui et les siens. Héritier direct des hommes de la conquête, ou bien fils émancipé de la roture, cette diversité d'origine s'efface en lui sous le caractère commun que je viens de signaler; seulement, dans le premier cas, le titre de sa possession est basé sur un fait désormais réprouvé, le travail du sabre; dans le second cas, l'origine est plus honorable, c'est le travail de l'industrie; mais toujours ce titre est illégitime et sans valeur, en présence de l'avenir, puisqu'il livre à la merci d'une classe privilégiée tous ceux à qui leurs pères n'ont pas transmis des instrumens de production".<sup>48</sup>

It can be seen from this the old conqueror idea fades away into the economic pattern. The bourgeoisie has two groups within it - the old conquerors and the ex-industrials who have entered the idle class due to the evil of inheritance.

"Aujourd'hui, les travailleurs doivent comprendre que leurs intérêts sont tout-à-fait distincts de ceux des oisifs .. Peu importe que L'OISIVETE ne s'appelle plus marquis, comte, baron, GENTILHOMME, s'il faut la saluer encore des noms de rentier, capitaliste, propriétaire, BOURGEOIS".<sup>49</sup> Here, signalled in capital letters, we

<sup>48</sup> De la Religion Saint-Simonienne aux élèves de l'école - polytechnique, published in Paris 1830, p.49. On these lectures see also D'Allemagne, Note 41, p. 87 ff.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid, pp. 50 ff.

approach what might well be called the age of the bourgeoisie for the term now really comes into its own. In a sense, of course, Transon is using the Saint-Simon definition but it has now a much greater economic emphasis and compass - the bourgeoisie is now the idler class personified since the old feudal lords have disappeared to be replaced by the bourgeois exploiters. In Saint-Simon's definition, it was rather a political and administrative category interposed between the old feudalism and the new industrialism. For Transon it is clearly an economic class - the totality of idlers, parasites controlling the instruments of production.<sup>50</sup> Naturally, entrepreneurs and their like are still in the productive class but, what is startlingly obvious, the bourgeoisie is not the industrial class as the liberal historians in particular asserted in their definition of the term: they have in fact turned into the opposite class, the oppressors. Taking the vague start from Saint-Simon, the Saint-Simonists then succeed in completely reversing the meaning of a concept. It has not yet its final definition but it is approaching it. The Saint-Simonists retain the liberal idea of only two classes but the oppressor group has changed its name and, in changing its name, changes its

<sup>50</sup> He criticises also the Say concept of "producteur" ibid, p. 54

face. It is not a question of the old warrior and noble oppressors, nor even of "légistes" and "métaphysiciens"; it is a question of all economic exploiters. The Saint-Simonists change then the face of industrialism - often in fact unintentionally, and often in conflict with some of their own ideas, yet it was a profoundly influential step especially for later thinkers.

From these early criticisms of economic liberalism, it is possible to see the two lines of approach. Firstly, there is the Fourierist ideas based on a moral condemnation of the new commercialism since its principles are greed and egoism and therefore can only deprave society and never improve it. Sismondi could also be fitted in this category. Secondly, there is the Saint-Simonist ideas. They believe still in the virtues of the new economic system and have no regrets for the lost world of the small craftsman and peasant. Although this latter approach is of supreme importance, yet during the 1830's and 1840's it was never developed to any great extent, rather it was overlaid by social moralism as we shall see.

CHAPTER XThe Revolution of 1830 and  
the Saint-Simonists

The Revolution of 1830 can be regarded as the fruit of liberalism; at least certain groups such as the "National" group of Thiers and Mignet strove for a 1688 to complete the 1789 Revolution, i.e. a change of dynasty to reassert the power of parliament. Not all of course were willing to go so far, yet the political problem of executive power and legislative power had to be solved one way or the other and the liberals were determined to solve it in their way. However, France in 1830 was not England in 1688. Behind the liberals were to appear other groups, not interested at all in 1688 but rather in 1791 and 1793, that is, they were not concerned about king and parliament but about popular sovereignty and the rights of the people founded in a Republic - not for the "Charte" but for the end of the "Charte" and the establishment of democracy. Behind them were still other groups demanding neither political reform nor political revolution but social regeneration, the end of misery, the economic rehabilitation of the poor, in other words a social revolution. The latter were not very strong in 1830, probaly<sup>b</sup> weaker than the weak Republicans who in spite of all their talk later had simply not enough support in

July to turn events in their favour.<sup>1</sup>

However, our concern is not with the actual revolution but what it became ideologically. For no sooner did it end than it began to live again as a symbol of the unachieved so that from 1830 to 1848 there is a continuous agitation to achieve what was then not achieved.<sup>2</sup> It is a period of multitudinous opposition groups combining in all manners of ways the political aims derived from the earlier Revolution and social aims derived primarily from the Saint-Simonists.<sup>3</sup> It is a confused period both in action and ideas. Yet it was important in creating new ideas of society opposed to the liberal one and at this time too the concept of the "bourgeoisie" achieved virtually its final form to become the term known and developed by Marx.

Without any doubt, the Saint-Simonists are the great influence of the period as regards social ideas; they created the new concept of society with a whole new terminology to go with it so that many who had never been Saint-Simonists were indirectly influenced by them and in adopting their terms tended likewise to adopt their concepts. It is then quite impossible to understand this

<sup>1</sup> See Paul Thureau-Dangin, Le Parti Libéral sous la Restauration, Paris 1888, p. 512

<sup>2</sup> See Paul Thureau-Dangin, Histoire de la Monarchie de Juillet, Paris, 1897, Vol. I, pp. 589 ff.

<sup>3</sup> See Tchernoff, Le parti républicain sous la Monarchie de Juillet, pp. 53 ff.

period without first considering this group and giving them the primacy they indeed deserve.<sup>4</sup>

From the very start of the Revolution, they were the only ones who already knew exactly what it was, for had not Saint-Simon already predicted it? It was the liberal-bourgeois bid for power, the revived struggle of the two aristocracies; it was, of course, not the Saint-Simonists' Revolution. They must wait for the seeds to ripen. But it is very hard to resist a revolution once it is there and there were many revolutionary and republican spirits in their midst who were not content to stand aside. Laurent, Chevalier and Transon were associated with Cavaignac, Armand and Marrast in attempting a Republican settlement.<sup>5</sup> Already by August 1st, they had established one "myth" of 1830 - they were asserting what was to become a very popular idea that the people or "prolétaires" (both the same)<sup>6</sup> had made the revolution, had achieved the victory not for themselves but "pour ses éligibles et ses

<sup>4</sup> See Thureau-Dangin, Note 2, Vol. I, p. 281  
Also Gide and Rist, A History of Economic Doctrines, London 1915, pp. 227-8, where they write "The more one examines the doctrines of the Saint-Simoniens the more conscious does one become of the remarkable character of these anticipations and of the injustice of the oblivion which has since befallen them".

<sup>5</sup> See D'Allemagne, Les Saint-Simoniens, pp. 110 ff

<sup>6</sup> As Leroy points out (Histoire des idées sociales en France) p. 405 Vol. II, the word "peuple" is taking on the definition of workers, poor, "prolétaires" - a very similar meaning in fact to that propagated by the Jacobins.

électeurs, pour ses journalistes et députés, pour ses bourgeois et contribuables, pour ses chefs d'ateliers et propriétaires", in fact for everyone but themselves.<sup>7</sup> The people naturally could gain nothing from it for only the Saint-Simonist solution could help them. The Revolution was simply the last consequence of the French Revolution (Saint-Simon!), the work of the aristocratic bourgeoisie (Robespierre!) born in the ruins of feudalism. These "bourgeois" needed the people to help them but once they had achieved their object, they immediately called in the Orléans to help check the populace - "La Gironde nouvelle pâlisait devant une nouvelle Montagne.." <sup>8</sup> Yet the people had no leaders and therefore the bourgeois could sleep in peace. Still another revolution would come - between the bourgeois and the people, and only the Saint-Simonists could prevent a frightful outcome; the future was with them. This revolt had altered nothing but it was a sign of hope for it was at least the last stand of the old order. <sup>9</sup> It had cleared the air, shown where the struggle really was, no longer against priests and nobles but against the bourgeoisie. The next revolution would be a social one, the start of a new era. All domination

<sup>7</sup> L'Organisateur, 1st Aug. 1830 in O. de S.-S. et D'E, Vol. II, p. 202

<sup>8</sup> Ibid, p. 205

<sup>9</sup> Ibid, p. 212

by idlers would cease.<sup>10</sup> It would mean a complete change in the relations of man to man with the complete amelioration of the most numerous class. Political changes would effect nothing; they only continued the old struggles under new forms:

"Nous disions que l'industrie, affranchie de ses chaînes, allait être appelée enfin à prendre place dans l'Etat, à devenir une puissance politique et à substituer l'action régulière, la pacifique influence de ses chefs, aux turbulentes intrigues des représentants abâtardis de la féodalité".<sup>11</sup>

and moreover:

"la classe ouvrière, la classe qui forme l'immense majorité de la population, ces hommes enfin que nos doctrinaires libéraux ont scientifiquement condamnés à un éternel ilotisme, sous le titre insolent de prolétaire, viennent d'être les maîtres l'opulente capitale de la France".<sup>12</sup>

This is very strong language.

Under this battery of very virulent criticism one could almost feel sorry for the liberals. Their revolution had not even been finished before they were being assailed as bourgeois, idlers, even as "hommes d'état" and "gens de loi" as if 1793 were at hand, and of course also as oppressors and selfish egoists living off the workers. Well might they have regretted ever thinking up industrialism.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid, p. 223 ff. ("Jugement de la doctrine de S.-Simon sur les derniers événements")

<sup>11</sup> Ibid, p. 241

<sup>12</sup> Ibid, p. 242

Certainly from July onwards right through until the end of 1831, there is a constant repetition of certain primitive ideas - the people fought the revolution, they won it but the liberal bourgeois robbed them of the fruits, the revolution was not a true revolution but a tail end of the critical era; the workers, the people or the prolétaires will not get any benefit from it, political changes are useless so long as the liberal-bourgeois in the shape of idlers control industry. We clearly notice, of course, the invariable equation of political form to economic form. Constantly, too, we see "bourgeois" opposed to "prolétaire". For the first time these two concepts stand in opposition.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, there is also the continual opposing of political revolution to social revolution; the social revolution has not yet been achieved; the bourgeois revolution is a false one. The Saint-Simonists are very remarkable in all this for they were convinced that they alone understood the 1830 Revolution. It could almost be said they had condemned it before it arrived. From their scheme of history, this must be the final fling of feudalism and certainly they succeeded in making this idea popular so that their words

<sup>13</sup> See Cuvillier, "Les Antagonismes de Classes", International Review of Social History, Vol. I 1956, p. 445.  
Spühler, Der Saint-Simonismus, p. 90 ff.  
Leroy, Note 6, Vol. II, p. 376

and ideas became part of the daily language.<sup>14</sup> In fact, the Saint-Simonists were great propagandists - from 1830 they held their lectures in the Rue Taitbout, from 1831 they controlled the daily paper the "Globe". They started a campaign to proselytise the workers.<sup>15</sup> Admittedly in terms of numbers, their influence was small yet indirectly it must have been very extensive - indeed many of the thinkers of this period passed through the Saint-Simonist school or had at least absorbed its basic ideas.

The most striking point about the Saint-Simonists was the violence of their language filled often with a ferocious bitterness contrasting strangely with the doctrine of love and reconciliation they also preached. This is especially noticeable in their speeches and writings on the two classes so that it is impossible to avoid the idea of a class war. For instance, "les classes laborieuse! Voilà donc les conquérants nouveaux qui doivent s'établir sur les ruines du monde féodal".<sup>16</sup> Or "Vous le voyez, face à face se trouvent la bourgeoisie et le peuple".<sup>17</sup> And talk of the struggle between these two "plus longs, plus profonds encore que ceux qui

<sup>14</sup> See for instance, Chateaubriand, Sections III and IV Memoires d'outre-tombe.

<sup>15</sup> See Octave Festy, Le Mouvement Ouvrier au début de la monarchie de Juillet 1830-34, Paris 1908, pp.81 ff.

<sup>16</sup> Prédications - Laurant O. Vol. 43, p. 179.

<sup>17</sup> Prédications - Barrault, O. Vol. 44, p. 383.

signalèrent la lutte de la bourgeoisie et de la féodalité".<sup>18</sup> In fact, "le terrible signal d'une guerre dont les déchirements se feraient sentir jusqu'aux entrailles de la société: la guerre de ceux qui n'ont rien contre ceux qui possèdent".<sup>19</sup> Daily the "Globe" preached this idea of a war between the poor and rich, haves and have-nots.<sup>20</sup> There is a tendency in all this to make the term "bourgeoisie" a designation of all evil, a centre for hate.<sup>21</sup> Repeatedly the picture is painted as black as possible even with occasional tendencies to suggest all for the "prolétaires".<sup>22</sup> Of course, there is no doubt whatsoever that this was not the aim of the Saint-Simonists. The idea of preaching this dark picture was apparently to rouse up the consciences, to show what would happen if the Saint-Simonist solution were not accepted. The violence of language and the burning hatred for the bourgeoisie was not designed to preach class war but strangely enough to prevent it. Individual Saint-Simonists had their own emphasis of course, yet none wanted a war of the workers against the bourgeoisie. Typically in their propaganda to the workers they stress unity - as in the scene they staged with a noble

<sup>18</sup> Rapport de Stéphane Flachet, O. Vol. III, p. 59

<sup>19</sup> Ibid, p. 70

<sup>20</sup> See Charléty, Histoire du Saint-Simonisme, p.125 ff.

<sup>21</sup> They are the idlers, the egoists, the privileged, the oppressors.

<sup>22</sup> See Note 12 for an instance of this.

fraternising with a worker.<sup>23</sup> Or as Flachet said "Aux bourgeois nous disons: NOUS SOMMES LA VOIX DU PEUPLE, réclamant pour lui sa part de l'association .. Au peuple, nous répétons tous les jours: NOUS SOMMES LA VOIX DE LA BOURGEOISIE: vous tous qui souffrez, vous réclamez l'association universelle, vous l'obtiendrez .. Mais elle ne vous sera donnée que si vous la réclamez PACIFIQUEMENT et GRADUELLEMENT." <sup>24</sup> In fact, they interpose themselves between what they regard as a class struggle and offer a solution to it. On the one side they preach patiente, on the other they preach action. Their system will benefit both parties, the poor and the privileged for the latter can only be freed from the torment of class war by adopting the doctrines of the Saint-Simonists.<sup>25</sup> It can, however, be seen from this that they presume if not preach a class struggle and therefore might be said to further the notion.

There are, it is true, certain contradictions within the Saint-Simonists themselves. Should, in fact, they cultivate the harmony of love or should they stress the evils of bourgeois rule? By the end of 1831, some were feeling that they had gone too far in the latter direction as, for instance, when in December 1831, D'Eichthal

<sup>23</sup> D'Allemagne, Note 5, p. 120 ff.

<sup>24</sup> Flachet, Note 18, p. 71

<sup>25</sup> Prédications - Barrault, Q. Vol. IV, p. 231 ff.

criticised the tendency to emphasise the term "ouvriers" instead of "industriels" and said, "Je crois que lorsque nous aurons bien fait sentir que notre POLITIQUE est loin d'être fondée sur l'hostilité des classes tous les bruits que l'on fait courir contre nous dans le monde tomberont..<sup>26</sup>" In fact, it was decided to revert to the doctrine of emphasising peaceful association. As Charléty writes, "Du coup, la politique du Globe se modifia; de belliqueuse, elle se fit pacifique".<sup>27</sup> It was a step not always in harmony with some of the more fiery spirits.

During the trial of the Saint-Simonists in 1832, of course it was to their interest to show that class war had never been their aim - in fact it was said they had no wish to distinguish between "bourgeois" and "prolétaire" at all. Their attack was not on classes but on the system.<sup>28</sup> Yet, it becomes increasingly obvious that the Saint-Simonists themselves are not sure what they are attacking. For instance, what do they really mean by the term "bourgeoisie"? There is much to show that they intended the term to apply

<sup>26</sup> O. Vol. XVI, p. 138 ff.

<sup>27</sup> Charléty, Note 20, p. 194

<sup>28</sup> See Rodrigues at the trial O. XLVII p. 180 Baud, a witness, said: "Rodrigues nous disait qu'il fallait continuellement ôter du peuple l'idée blessante de classe, qu'il ne fallait plus dire bourgeois et prolétaires, mais seulement les distinguer par ces mots: les Saint-Simoniens et ceux qui ne le sont pas". ibid, p. 178.

to all idlers, any one was an idler who did not perform some kind of productive work and any one who did, be he capitalist or labourer, entrepreneur or peasant, was a worker. Yet did the Saint-Simonists always use it in this sense? Clearly, on occasions, they used the term to refer to "masters" in the sense of owners of workshops. This is clear during the Lyons uprising of 1831 when the Saint-Simonists use the terms "bourgeois-maîtres",<sup>29</sup> referring to the working employer. Furthermore, in the following piece, they clearly refer to working employers as "bourgeoisie".

"Dites à la bourgeoisie .. Excitez les par le tableau des misères des ouvriers... Ils reconnaîtront sous peine combien ils seraient tranquilles et heureux si leurs ouvriers les aimaient et les respectaient comme des pères. Les liens commerciaux ont été les premiers liens pacifiques: les négociants sont naturellement amis de la paix".<sup>30</sup>

Clearly it is not here the Saint-Simonist aim to sow discord and division yet the use of the term "bourgeoisie" in these isolated instances reveals a very dangerous tendency for the whole Saint-Simonist concepts. It was, in fact, about to comprise the élite of their system and propagating this conflict of bourgeois v. "prolétaire" and then blurring

<sup>29</sup> See Trial, Q. XLVII p. 221 for quotation from the "Instructions adressés à Peiffer, chef de l'église de Lyon". See also Festy, Note 15, for an account of the organisation of the silk industry in Lyons, p. 92, Note 1

<sup>30</sup> Q. XLVII pp. 224-5.

their own definition of the word bourgeoisie, they come near to asserting a very different division of society than their original one. After 1831, the Saint-Simonists did tone down their language but likewise too their influence diminished. The mass of ideas they had violently broadcast from 1830 were eagerly picked up and distorted. For the first time, they had established the bourgeoisie as a class of economic oppressors but had rather left it open as to who these oppressors exactly were. Others were soon to draw the conclusions which the Saint-Simonists were unwilling to perceive.

CHAPTER XIGeneral Trends in the 1830's

From 1830 onwards, the vocabulary of the Saint-Simonists quickly permeates both social and political movements, yet equally there is another very strong influence - in fact influencing the Saint-Simonists themselves, the ideas and terminology of the French Revolution after 1792, particularly Jacobinism. Had not the Saint-Simonists called the liberals of 1830 the Girondins and referred to the bourgeois aristocracy? The time had, it seemed, become ripe for a revival of the obscured Jacobin-Robespierre period and its concept of the bourgeoisie, blending in with the Saint-Simonist version.<sup>1</sup>

Actually the two definitions appear to have quite fundamentally different origins but at this time fine distinctions were not drawn and many appear to have absorbed the terms of both lines of thought without perceiving any basic divergency - indeed, of course, the Saint-Simonists were not altogether free of this confusion and blurred the "industrial" line of Saint-Simon. In fact, the interest shown during this period in the French

<sup>1</sup> For instance, the Saint-Simonist Laurant had already in 1828 written a defence of Robespierre in his book "Réfutation de l'histoire de France de l'Abbé de Montgaillard".

Revolution reflects a change of emphasis. The Saint-Simonists stand at the turning point, still preaching "industrialism" but at the same time reasserting "moralism". By some see-saw action, the moral question now takes precedence. What for 15 years had been considered the wonder of the world was rejected as selfish egoism, materialism, individualism to be rejected outright for altruism, idealism, communalism, "socialism", the love of money should be replaced by the love of man, "economism" was anti-morality and "industrialism" was anti-humanity.<sup>2</sup> Industrial enterprise ceased to be virtuous and whilst indeed it remained the characteristic of the bourgeoisie, that bourgeoisie now ceased to be the mass of the nation but the greedy upper layer, in fact the vile money-makers, the commercial cheats.

To meet this mood, like some spectre stretching out from long past times, appeared Buonarroti's book on the Conspiracy of the Equals, reviving with some immediacy the history of that forgotten period as if, in fact, nothing had happened in the intervening years. Well might one say of Buonarroti what was said of the Ultras of the Restoration,

<sup>2</sup> H. J. Hunt, Le Socialisme et Le Romantisme en France, Oxford, 1935, where he points out as regards the Saint-Simonists "comment une doctrine d'économie politique développée par des bourgeois a implanté dans le coeur de ses propagateurs ce mépris du bourgeois qui est un des traits particuliers de l'école romantique elle-même". Though this is outside our scope, it is interesting to see that the Saint-Simonists also originate the literary "Anti-Bourgeois" movement, p. 58.

he had learned nothing and forgotten nothing. To him, the French Revolution appears solely in the light of a moral conflict between the vice of riches and the virtues of poverty, between Smithianism and Rousseauism, between greed and modest frugality or aristocracy versus equality - for it was all one.<sup>3</sup> It was not then a struggle against feudalism but a struggle against evil riches, in fact against that class dominated by "l'amour du luxe, la soif de l'or et le desir de briller et de dominer".<sup>4</sup> The true Republic must be built on virtue, it presupposes a moral revolution. Accordingly, this revolution never appeared until 1793 - the earlier stages were just the struggles of aristocratic groups striving to gain or regain power. The aim of the true revolution was communism based on frugality necessitating the end of big towns and big capitalists, the establishment of the reign of equality based on agriculture and the small craftsman. The latter doctrine was not much considered in the 1830's but Buonarroti's complete rehabilitation of the Robespierre

<sup>3</sup> See Garaudy, Les sources françaises du socialisme Scientifique, Paris 1949. He says "Certes la doctrine de Buonarroti portait la marque d'une étape dépassée" p. 157 ff. See also Arthur Lehning: "Buonarroti's Ideas on Communism and Dictatorship", Internat. Review of Social History, 1957, Vol. 2

<sup>4</sup> Buonarroti, Conspiration pour l'égalité dite de Babeuf, Les Classiques du Peuple, Paris 1957, Vol. I, p. 35.

episode appears to have met with a sympathetic hearing. How often indeed did the Left of the 1830's put themselves in the position of the Mountain - the liberals, of course, were the Girondins, as also were the right-wing Republicans often enough. In fact, the left-wing opinion hardened around 1793 and as Heine said as regards the members of the society: "Les Amis du Peuple", "Robespierre's last speech of the 8th Thermidor is their Gospel".<sup>5</sup> Few advanced to 1795. Robespierre not Babeuf remained the favourite hero in spite of Buonarroti.<sup>6</sup>

As regards a Republican party, there appears to be general agreement that in July 1830 there was very little sign of any such party yet within the course of a year one was rapidly formed.<sup>7</sup> It seems it was not the Republicans which made the Revolution but the Revolution which made the Republicans, in particular during the rather anarchical period before Périer took office in 1831. The Saint-Simonists had, of course, been ready from the first so that

<sup>5</sup> Heine, Französische Zustände, 1832, written 10th February 1832.

<sup>6</sup> See, Tchneroff, Le Parti Républicain, p. 82 ff; Georges Sencier, Le Babouvisme après Babeuf, Paris 1912. According to Sencier, Babeuvism began to take roots about 1835 in the underground movements. Cabet said that the idea of communism first appeared amongst the prisoners after the 1834 risings. Sencier, p. 147. See also: Robiquet, Paul, Buonarroti et la Secte des Egaux, Paris 1910, p.211 Note 2.

<sup>7</sup> See Georges Weill, Histoire du parti républicain en France 1814-1870, Paris 1928; Tchneroff, Le parti républicain sous la monarchie de Juillet; Gisquet, Mémoires, Paris 1840.

the idea of a social revolution almost precedes that of a Republican one. Yet for a short period the political solution existed quite independently of social considerations, i.e. universal suffrage was desired, but not a social upheaval.<sup>8</sup> In fact, the Republicans were deriving their ideas from the earlier revolution in pressing for another revolution or in expecting that the July revolution would automatically pass into a 1792 revolution.<sup>9</sup> All political opposition groups appeared united in these ideas until 1831 although there were indeed various concepts of the actual political solution - the moderates such as Lafayette and Carrel, the Robespierrists such as Cavaignac. The real revolutionary violence, however, appeared in 1831 when it became clear that the Revolution of July could not be pushed to the left. More violent and at the same time more social ideas asserted themselves. For instance, the "Société des Droits de l'Homme" passed at this time into a more radical stage.<sup>10</sup> Its left wing joined Saint-Simonism to democratic political aims,

<sup>8</sup> See Charléty, La Monarchie de Juillet, Vol. 5 of Histoire de France Contemporaine ed. Lavissee, Paris 1921, pp. 6 ff.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid, p. 39 ff

<sup>10</sup> For the various stages see for instance, Hermann Pechan, Louis Blanc als Wegbereiter des modernen Sozialismus, Jena, 1929, p. 9.

creating something resembling "social democracy".<sup>11</sup> For instance, Cavaignac said "La révolution, c'est la nation tout entière, moins ceux qui l'exploitent".<sup>12</sup> That is, the political aims remained but it was increasingly felt that the political revolution must also achieve the necessary social changes. For the most part, they regarded themselves Jacobins of the 1793 position but they tended also to quote Saint-Simonist phrases with a resultant confusion of aims - political democracy to achieve social reform or social reform to achieve political democracy.<sup>13</sup>

In the general confusing mixture, one rock stands fast. Whatever their disputes, their incoherence, their contradictions, it is a fact that for all on the Left,<sup>14</sup> the bourgeoisie is the enemy - the cause of all evil, politically, economically, socially, morally - "extirper jusque dans ses fondements même, l'aristocratie qui s'est reformée sous la dénomination de bourgeoisie" might well be their motto.<sup>15</sup> In the resurgence of moralism, this

<sup>11</sup> See Tchnernoff, Note 1, p. 75

<sup>12</sup> Quoted in Weill, Note 1, page 39

<sup>13</sup> See Tchernoff, Note 1, p. 262

<sup>14</sup> Not including though the right-wing Republicans such as Carrel who strongly deplored the use of the term "bourgeois" in the aristocratic sense.

<sup>15</sup> A quotation from publications of "Société des Droits de l'Homme" reproduced by Paul Thureau-Dangin in Histoire de la Monarchie de Juillet, Vol. II, Paris 1897, p. 221, Note 1.

See also the mass of material in Gisquet, Note 1, also Georges Sencier, Le Babouvisme après Babeuf, Paris 1912.

class tends to be condemned as the personification of evil "les vices de la canaille aristocratique". Again appears the tendency so noticeable in the earlier Revolution to divide society into a mass of hopeless oppressed, crushed down by a small top layer of rich dominators. "Sur trente-deux millions d'habitans, la France renferme cinq cent mille sybarites, un million d'esclaves heureux, et trente-un millions d'ilotes, de parias .." <sup>16</sup> This top layer is no longer composed of nobles and clergy but of the bourgeois who have arrogated to themselves the old title of nobility. Hence the term "bourgeoisie" becomes current usage in the combined Saint-Simonist-Jacobin sense. Naturally the liberals valiantly maintained the definition they had formed during the 1815- 1830 period. As Gisquet indignantly wrote: "tout le monde comprend ce qu'est la bourgeoisie; elle représente l'immense majorité de la population.." <sup>17</sup> Yet to a certain extent the revivification of the small élite concept was due to the behaviour of the right wing "liberals" of the Guizot school. They persisted in holding on to the "aristocratic" concept and thereby prevented

<sup>16</sup> Quoted from a pamphlet of the "Société des Droits de l'Homme" by Gisquet, Note 1, p. 73, Vol. III

<sup>17</sup> Gisquet, Note 1, Vol. I, p. 247

liberalism asserting itself even politically as the representative of the mass of the people. Hence the Republicans were correct in believing that an élite ruled and that an élite prevented the legal extension of political rights and since Guizot and his followers persisted in asserting they were the "bourgeoisie", it is small wonder that the wider concept tended to suffer an eclipse. Moreover this obviously aristocratic rule resulted in the destruction of a legal opposition, the intensification of bitterness and the rise of extremist groups so that, in time, the idea of a social revolution gained ground. Certainly from about 1833, the Republican split widens, the right wing become "Fayettistes" whilst the left turn to social remedies and seek support from the masses or the workers<sup>18</sup> dominated for the most part by a peculiar mixture of Jacobin and Saint-Simonist turns of phrase: "A bas tous les privilèges, même ceux de la naissance! A bas le monopole des richesses. A bas l'exploitation de l'homme par l'homme! .. A bas cette infâme organisation où de nombreux parasites se donnent la peine de naître pour vivre largement dans l'oisiveté du travail de leurs malheureux frères".<sup>19</sup> With the lack of any clear system, there is also a tendency towards the

<sup>18</sup> Festy, Le Mouvement Ouvrier, Paris 1908, pp. 203 ff

<sup>19</sup> Letter of Vignerte quoted in Gisquet, p. 206, Vol.III

formation of splinter groups of all descriptions so the left wing for instance develops its own left wing,<sup>20</sup> seeking remedies in violence, in agitation amongst the people, in the exploitation of industrial discontent for revolutionary ends. Yet if they sought to involve the workers by showing that their miseries could not end without a political change, the workers likewise involved them by showing that political propaganda was no avail without some social emphasis.

As regards the workers themselves, for the first time there are signs of independent activity on their part, due to the industrial discontent often caused by the introduction of machinery, and in part also due to the Saint-Simon propaganda. For instance, during the Lyons rising of 1831, the workers' paper "L'Echo de la Fabrique" was full of Saint-Simon ideas with especial emphasis on the notion that the workers had made the 1830 revolution but had been denied its fruits: "Le financier et le commerçant, arrivés au pouvoir, ne se souvinrent plus de ces hommes laborieux qui les avaient élevés sur le pavois".<sup>21</sup> Moreover, again in the Saint-Simon manner, they opposed

<sup>20</sup> For instance, the "Société des Droits de l'Homme" had two committees - the "girondin" and the "mountain". See Festy, Note 11, p. 203 ff.

<sup>21</sup> "L'Echo de la Fabrique" 20th November 1831, quoted by Festy, p. 107.

"prolétaires" to "oisifs".<sup>22</sup> The appearance of a workers' movement tends further to give the term "bourgeoisie" a capitalist emphasis. Of course, the workers were not always opposed to their "masters",<sup>23</sup> yet as industrial activity extends, the workers seek remedies outside capitalist influence with the word "capitalist" often referring to the factory owners or the workshop masters. With the extension of the idea that the workers' interest is separate from the "capitalists" interest and with the Saint-Simonist constant use of the term "prolétaire", the concept takes root of a class of "prolétaires" uniting all workers in a conscious opposition to the capitalists and then, under the influence of the left wing propaganda, the capitalist and bourgeois state. In this way, the workers in part accept the notion of themselves as a social class with their own interests and their own state.<sup>24</sup> Doubtlessly the prime influence in all this was the Saint-Simonists yet it is clear that the Saint-Simonist solution was not very appealing since it gave control to those very agents of industrialism the workers were resisting.

<sup>22</sup> On August 28th 1832, "L'Echo de la Fabrique" wrote on "la reconnaissance que nous leur devons (aux Saint-Simoniens) pour avoir tourné les idées du siècle vers les besoins et l'amélioration de la classe prolétaire", see Festy, p. 158.

<sup>23</sup> As Festy points out even in 1833 the new ideas concerning opposition between masters and workers were not held by all, see p. 207.

<sup>24</sup> See Festy, p. 330.

Of course, the influence of the workers was very small at this time. The radical Republicans were far in advance of their supposed allies and the 1834 attempt to unite political aims with industrial discontent was a hopeless failure. The Republicans were completely crushed, the leaders all imprisoned and the rest compelled to go underground to play with ideas of plots and putsches under the control of violent and sometimes anarchical elements. This was an unfortunate development in many ways for it prevented a free and open discussion of ideas so that in many cases action comes before concepts. There was an excessive reliance on old catchwords from the French Revolution with a spattering of social ideas derived from the Saint-Simonists and the Fourierists without much attempt to clarify terms and to establish a regular system of social and political concepts. Moreover, it furthered the growth of small groups each the rival of the rest.

Summarising the general trends over this period, it could be said that there was a constant belief that the government represented the interest of the privileged, a new aristocracy, that of the rich, the idlers, "les hommes d'argent, banquiers, fournisseurs, monopoleurs, gros propriétaires, agioteurs, en un mot tous les exploiters qui s'engraissent aux dépens du peuple", <sup>25</sup>

<sup>25</sup> Answer to the question "Quels sont aujourd'hui les aristocrates"? in the initiation questions of the "Société des Familles" 1836, quoted in Gisquet, Vol. IV, p. 185.

(a true mixture of Jacobinism, Saint-Simonism and Fourierism!) These are the "bourgeoisie", a small group of egoists, maintaining their interests at the expense of the people, i.e. the prolétaires or workers, in other words the vast majority of the nation. These are treated like slaves or serfs living in misery owing to economic exploitation by the rich - a situation made still worse owing to the fact that the latter control the state and make the laws. The aim is equality, a new social and political revolution must establish it and "point d'espérance hors du prolétaire. Loin de nous, comme ennemis, comme rebelles à la voix de la nature, ceux qui ne vivent pas du produit de leur travail".<sup>26</sup> It is a moral claim, it is the re-establishment of the reign of Virtue, the Robespierre dream to be realised. Everyone will be united in the association of love, the Saint-Simonist dream to be realised. Naturally the "prolétaires" are the vast mass,<sup>27</sup> face to face with the small "bourgeoisie". Exactly who the latter are is not always clear. We shall see the various definitions offered in the next section yet we should remember no one was interested in sociological analysis at that time - the divisions were to be a basis for revolutionary action, not

<sup>26</sup> Pamphlet of the "Légions révolutionnaires" quoted in Gisquet, Vol. IV, p. 195

<sup>27</sup> See Samuel Bernstein, "Le Neo-Babouvisme d'après la Presse (1837-1848)" in Babeuf et les Problèmes du Babouvisme, Colloque International de Stockholm, Paris 1963, p. 251 ff. The proletariat is variously estimated at 22,000,000 to 30,000,000.

studious reflection. One point, however, clearly stands out - the language is invariably violent, the remedies offered are invariably mild. The left, for the most part, desired no class war, in general it was as yet even unwilling to contemplate any complete abolition of property. In this respect, I feel it is quite wrong to regard these revolutionaries in any way as neo-babouvists.<sup>28</sup> Taking the lead from Jacobinism, they are moralists. If they want a political and a social revolution, it is because they desire most of all a moral revolution. In their eyes, society is filled with injustice because it has wrong principles - the evils of "industrialism" are nothing but the evils of "utilitarianism". If only their principles were adopted, everyone could live harmoniously together - even the "bourgeoisie" and the "prolétaires".

28

Taking as the criterion of Babeuvism, class war and the abolition of property. Even a communist like Cabet could not, in my opinion, be regarded as a neo-babeuvist.

CHAPTER XIISocial Moralists of the 1830's<sup>1</sup>

In this Chapter, I would like to consider how class concepts were developed by certain notable social "moralists" of the 1830's. One of the most interesting in terms of our theme was Buchez. He was an ex-liberal, a former member of the Carbonari, a Saint-Simonist who left the movement in 1830 to develop his own ideas based, as he believed, on the true teachings of Saint-Simon, freed of the distortions introduced by the Saint-Simonists.<sup>2</sup> These ideas he found in the Saint-Simon view that the end of society was the realisation of the true Christianity. History had been the gradual unveiling of this aim and the stage had now been reached when a final settlement can be reached between the two opposing forces, "il faut, en un mot, opter entre la voie où tout se fait par dévouement et avec liberté, et celle où tout se fait par nécessité et par force, entre la voie de l'intelligence

<sup>1</sup> In using the term "moralism" to express this trend of ideas opposed to "economism", I wish to make clear that in all the writers under consideration here the basis of their line of criticism is moral. That is, they cannot accept the morality of "utilitarianism" because to them it is anti-moral and therefore can never achieve the aim of happiness for all but only lead to egoism, greed and exploitation. For them, morality is strictly Rousseauan, i.e. it involves the concept of a moral triumph of the true man over his baser nature.

<sup>2</sup> See in general Armand Cuvillier, Hommes et Idéologies de 1840, Paris 1956.

et celle de la fatalité, entre la voie du bien et celle du mal".<sup>3</sup> There is then a moral issue to be decided and Buchez further reveals a religious and idealist preoccupation when he traces the French Revolution from the teachings of the Bible.<sup>4</sup> It is part of a Divine plan of which men are the free instruments.

In realising this plan, Buchez works out a scheme different from the Saint-Simonists. Starting from the Saint-Simon aim "le but de la société doit être d'améliorer le plus promptement et le plus complètement possible le sort de la classe la plus nombreuse et la plus pauvre", Buchez believed this could only be attained if there was a completely free type of association based on a truly democratic system with none superior. He opposed the Saint-Simonist hierarchy, the power they bestowed on the state and their concept of a virtual domination of one section over the rest.

Proceeding along these lines, Buchez reached several original conclusions. In 1829, he wrote that the owners of the instruments of labour (land and capital) must be divided into two classes: the ones who did not work at all, the idlers and those who directed the exploitation

<sup>3</sup> P. J. B. Buchez, Introduction à la Science de l'Histoire, Paris, 1842, 2nd ed. Vol. II, p. 506

<sup>4</sup> Buchez et Roux, Histoire Parlementaire de la Révolution Française, Paris 1834, Vol. I, p. 1.

of the idlers' capital. The latter resemble the barons of the 12th century in that they use men as instruments for their own interests. Yet they performed a useful function, compared to the real idlers.<sup>5</sup> However, this intermediate class continued to trouble Buchez. By 1833, he pictures society as divided into two classes, the one owning all the instruments of labour, land, works, buildings, capital; the other working for them. This is similar to the old feudalism for the possessing class have the right to impose dues on the workers in the form of rent and interest so that they can live idly. The "chefs d'industrie" are the servants of this class of idle rich (idlers = bourgeoisie) - they help to make their land and capital productive and eventually will be in a position to step into the idler class themselves. They are opposed on the one hand to the idlers, but also to the workers for they are the exploiters' servants and they themselves act as exploiters .. "les chefs d'industrie..sont les instrumens de l'oisiveté des propriétaires; et eux-mêmes exploitant directement les salariés".<sup>6</sup> In this way they, too, are parasites, living on those they exploit<sup>7</sup>, i.e. the vast

<sup>5</sup> Buchez, Letter to Curie of August 30th, 1829 quoted in Cuvillier, "Les Antagonismes de Classes .." in International Review of Social History, 1956.

<sup>6</sup> Buchez, Note 3, p. ~~272~~ 21.

<sup>7</sup> See Cuvillier, Un journal d'ouvriers "L'Atelier", Paris, 1954, pp. 100 ff.

mass of the people. The Buchez solution lies in the formation of free associations of workers liberated from all exploiters.

From this, it can be seen that Buchez asserts the incompatibility of interests between entrepreneurs and workers, whereby the former now enter the idle or bourgeois class. This might at first appear to be a slight modification of Saint-Simonism, yet of course it is a very vital step, for it opens a gap between "industrials" and suggests not merely the abolition of inheritance and interest but the complete re-formation of industry. Moreover who exactly are these "chefs d'industrie"? Buchez does not appear to be sure on this point. If the "prolétaires" are the huge masses,<sup>8</sup> then this entrepreneur group cannot be very extensive, it could presumably be only the big factory managers and the like. Yet it is clear from the following quotation that something more extensive can be meant:

"L'entrepreneur, quel qu'il soit, doit être considéré comme un être parasite vivant aux dépens de ceux qu'il exploite ... il ne sert que de lien entre les travailleurs et les consommateurs; pour cela, il a la meilleure part du profit, et il est maître commandant à ses ouvriers".<sup>9</sup>

If all masters are to be included, a considerable section

<sup>8</sup> Buchez wrote "les salariés forment la masse de la population européenne.. En Angleterre, ils en composent les trois quarts, et en France davantage encore", Note 3, p. 23, Vol. I.

<sup>9</sup> "L'Européen", June 30th, 1832, quoted in Cuvillier, Note 7, p. 101.

of the French population would be comprised - almost in fact the extensive "bourgeoisie" of the liberal concept. Moreover, there is no longer any fixed criterion for determining the division. Who are the idlers? A working master with one employee perhaps? From hence forward, it is in fact impossible to determine the categories. Often in the same texts, the bourgeoisie expand and contract alarmingly, dependent on whether society is viewed as one huge factory direct by a few bourgeois capitalists and entrepreneurs or whether it is viewed in terms of small workshops with masters and craftsman very commonly termed bourgeois. Certainly with Buchez we approach the final stage in the evolution of the concept "bourgeoisie", when it becomes very difficult to define it in any exact sense at all. Of course, Buchez has no idea of a class war resulting in class domination, nor is there anything deterministic in his approach to history, at least economically. The whole struggle for him is a spiritual one. Yet he was an influential thinker especially amongst the workers and he founded with them the first labour associations<sup>10</sup> so that in the 1840's the most famous journal of and for the workers, "L'Atelier," followed the Buchez doctrine and contributed in spreading the Buchez

<sup>10</sup> Cuvillier writes, "Il ne nous paraît donc pas exagéré de dire que la conception buchézienne se trouve à l'origine de toute la tradition française de l'association de production"..  
Note 2, p. 57.

notion of the capitalist class. Moreover, Buchez was politically active, a member of the "Société des Amis du Peuple", involved in all the revolutionary agitation of the day.

Another interesting figure of the 1830's was Pierre Leroux. Like Buchez, he was an ex-liberal and an ex-Saint-Simonist and like Buchez he was a democrat with a religious bent and just like Buchez too admired Saint-Simon's "Nouveau Christianisme" but little else of that writer's works. Both his idea of economics and history are based on spiritual principles, progress being the eventual realisation of the brotherhood or solidarity of man, the end of all castes. According to Leroux, there are three stages in history: the end of the primitive castes based on the family (as India, Persia and Egypt), representing the triumph of liberty, the end of the caste based on the city (Greece and Rome), representing the triumph of fraternity, the end of the third caste of feudalism and property (Europe) representing the triumph of equality. This final stage is also the end of every kind of slavery, the realisation of Christianity - for Jesus Christ was the destroyer of castes. History is the triumph then of a moral principle, human equality, the realisation of true humanity.<sup>11</sup> Similar again to Buchez,

<sup>11</sup> Pierre Leroux, De L'Egalité, Boussac 1848, p. 254 ff.

the French Revolution is the embodiment of this final principle, the equality of man .. "l'égalité est une loi divine, une loi antérieure à toutes les lois, et dont toutes les lois doivent dériver".<sup>12</sup>

Of interest to us are Leroux's ideas on the stage of feudalism and property - both united together. This stage involves a limitation on the realisation of true humanity due to the false emphasis given to property -

"L'homme du Moyen Age vous montrera sa forteresse, et vous conduira jusqu'aux limites de sa terre. Cette terre lui appartient mais il appartient à cette terre.. De même le bourgeois aujourd'hui vous montre le capital dont il dispose; c'est son château féodal, à lui. Sa puissance est dans son or, mais réciproquement sa vie est enchaînée et limitée à son or ... il devient serf de l'industrie, de tyran qu'il était".<sup>13</sup>

Due to a false path taken by the French Revolution, a new aristocracy arose up from the Third Estate, "la bourgeoisie". This class controls all the instruments of work, reducing the mass of the people to industrial serfs - they are master "de la terre, et des machines et de toutes les sources de production".<sup>14</sup> Beneath these are two classes; that whose income does not equal subsistence level and that whose revenue equals subsistence - comprising together about 34 million (30 million of the former that is the "prolétaires" and four million of the latter). The middle

<sup>12</sup> Ibid, p. 253

<sup>13</sup> Ibid, p. 266

class of Leroux is then relatively small whilst, of course, the capitalist class or plutocrats varies, it seems, from 98,000 to 196,000 - whether perhaps the class "entrepreneur" are included in one and not the other is a question, for Leroux makes no mention of them. In any case, the general picture was a thin rich top layer, a mediumly thin layer of those who have "à peu près de quoi subsister" and the rest who have absolutely nothing, the big lower layer. "La France est en réalité une maison de commerce dirigée par 196,000 patrons, employant 30 millions d'ouvriers.." <sup>14</sup> The bourgeois or the capitalists represent the spirit of egoism, individualism, "l'esprit juif" embodied in "industrialism". Saint-Simon can, in fact, only be redeemed for his error in making a cult of this vice in that he wrote "Nouveau Christianisme". For indeed, in Leroux's eyes, the spirit of industrialism is just another form of the spirit of conquest - feudalism and industrialism are merely two aspects of the same evil "L'industrie, le régime capitaliste, la concurrence économique, c'est encore la guerre. Qui dit concurrent, dit conquérant". <sup>15</sup>

14

Pierre Leroux, De la Ploutocratie, quoted in Leroy, Les Précurseurs Français du Socialisme, Paris 1948.

15

Pierre Leroux, Malthus et les Economistes, quoted, Leroy, Note 14.

Industrialism is then rejected. Making wealth and all it involves are vices which can only lead to evil and suffering. He does not picture the mass of the people industriously working their way to riches and happiness, and then to power and influence - the bourgeoisie. He sees only a small group of greedy capitalists distorting the true spiritual and moral forces of Christianity, oppressing the mass of the people (prolétaires) in monopolising all the sources of wealth and the instruments of labour - the bourgeoisie. Leroux cannot comprehend how the principles of "industrialism" can lead to true happiness or virtue for how can greedy materialism lead to spiritual perfection? So different are the moral principles involved that no reconciliation appears to be possible. Leroux is striving for a form of moral socialism,<sup>16</sup> the end being equality; the solidarity of man and liberty within the whole community of mankind. Accordingly, from this angle, one-time virtues become vices and accordingly the one-time virtuous class shrinks to a vicious elite. Presumably it would be too depressing to regard the majority as greedy egoists.

Very similar to Leroux, is Lamennais. He, too, is a social democrat basing his doctrine of equality on moral principles - in this case those of Christianity. These

<sup>16</sup> Probably it was Leroux who first formulated the word. Any way he said, "C'est moi, qui le premier, me suis servi du mot "socialisme", qui était inemployé alors; je forgeai ce mot par opposition à "individualisme". See Leroy, Note 14, p. 317

principles by a Divine law of progress are gradually being realised in this world. "Dans la cité de Dieu, chacun possède sans crainte ce qui est à lui, et ne desire rien de plus, parce que ce qui est à chacun est à tous".<sup>17</sup> His theory of progress is an interesting variation on that of the economic liberals - although of course "spiritualised". During the Middle Ages a class was formed based on industry and it conquered for itself political liberty in the form of the Communes. But these Communes are the European counterparts of the antique city, i.e. they were not formed for the benefit of all but for the benefit of the "bourgeoisie", i.e. an aristocracy who have obtained liberty only for themselves.<sup>18</sup> The rest are excluded from the city, as were the plebians in Rome. They are the people, i.e. the "prolétaires" or "La plèbe". However, this is a step forward, part of the gradual progress of Christianity. The struggle continued until after 1800 years of struggle against the right of brute force, the Christian idea of right - equality, liberty and fraternity - triumphed in the French Revolution with the extinction of legal distinctions. Unfortunately, although civil rights were won and the principle achieved, it could not find material expression

17

F. de Lamennais, Divers Ecrits pour le Peuple, Editions Lutetia, Paris, o.d., Paroles d'un Croquant, p. 99

18

ibid, Du Passé et de l'Avenir du Peuple, p. 294 ff.

owing to the presence of an aristocracy of the rich controlling economic and political power.<sup>19</sup> The people or the proletariat is still suppressed in this new feudalism of wealth, for, having only their labour, they are forced into dependence on the capitalists.. "Le capitaliste et le prolétaire sont donc entre eux, de fait, à peu près dans les mêmes relations que le maître et l'esclave des sociétés antiques".<sup>20</sup> The people are then still slaves, 33 million subjected to 200,000 privileged, in their power both economically and politically, for, in controlling the state, they control the laws. Accordingly the proletariat is virtually everyone in the state - "laboureurs, artisans, producteurs de toute sorte, navigateurs, marchands",<sup>21</sup> which suggests a Saint-Simonist outlook. Whilst as regards to the bourgeoisie they are in the words of Lamennais' friend, Gerbet, "une autre féodalité, la féodalité de la richesse".<sup>22</sup> This new

<sup>19</sup> "On déclare le peuple libre et il végète, asservi et souffrant, sous la dure dépendance des hommes et des choses; des hommes, par la concentration du pouvoir dans les mains de quelques privilégiés; des choses, par la concentration de la richesse dans les mêmes mains". Ibid, p. 315

<sup>20</sup> Ibid, De l'Esclavage Moderne, p. 361

<sup>21</sup> Ibid, Du Passé et de l'Avenir du Peuple, p. 258

<sup>22</sup> Jean-Rene Derré, Lamennais, Ses Amis et le Mouvement des Idées à l'Epoque Romantique, Paris 1962, p. 451.

feudalism is, however, based on an inner inconsistency since to win power it asserted the principle of liberty for all.<sup>23</sup> The true liberty and equality will soon be realised. All privilege will go, capital will be freely distributed and the instruments of work made available to all. In fact everyone will be proprietors.<sup>24</sup>

Like Leroux, Lamennais equates capitalists to the bourgeois class and the bourgeois class to a small capital-monopolising group forming the privileged class or the new feudality. Like Leroux, Lamennais does not approve of industrialism; he sets no store on economic progress, only moral progress. However, Lamennais makes one interesting point. Although the reign of the bourgeoisie is termed a new feudalism, he regards it as a positive step forward towards the eventual establishment of true equality. Something has been achieved, civil liberty and equality. It is then only necessary to remove the last contradiction before the true morality is attained. Lamennais then makes an effort to "rationalise" the bourgeois era, to fit it into a scheme of progress and not just to regard it as an irritating distortion of what should be. Of course, this progress is not economic. He does not add a third stage on to the "economic liberals". Nor is

<sup>23</sup> Ibid

<sup>24</sup> See Paroles d'un Croyant and Du Passé et de l'Avenir du Peuple

there any suggestion of class struggle - it is rather a struggle of principles with good triumphing in the end. 25

Finally, let us consider the ideas in the 1830's of a famous figure - Louis Auguste Blanqui. He was a very typical representative of the Left at this time, such as were to be found in the clubs and societies of the opposition. He combines the old mixture of Jacobin moralism with Saint-Simonism to form a very potent anti-bourgeois brew. Of course, the resulting concoction has also the typical Blanqui element, that of struggle, opposition, and a touch of negativism. Yet, primarily,

25

Cole in Socialist Thought: The Forerunners, Vol. I P. 199 - 200, said re "De l'Esclavage Moderne", "it is certainly one of the great documents in the history of the idea of the class struggle. It forms an important link between Saint-Simon, who had the idea of historical evolution but none of the conflict between capitalists and labourers and Marx". For one thing this is to ignore the many intermediate stages from Saint-Simon to Lamennais whereby Lamennais had nothing new to say re the composition of capitalists and proletariat; moreover the struggle is not between economic classes but between principles "cette contradiction entre le fait et le droit.. est la cause réelle du malaise, du trouble.." In addition, Lamennais is never clear what he means by the terms "bourgeoisie" and "prolétaires". It is nothing unusual at this time but why, for instance, does he in "De l'Esclavage Moderne" say (a) "nous entendons par peuple les prolétaires", (b) "Et ce peuple esclave, de qui compose-t-il? Non plus seulement des prolétaires.. mais de la nation entière, à l'exception de deux cent mille privilégiés".

Blanqui is an idealist opposed to materialism with a strong sense of moral justice, as when he opposes virtue to vile interests. The struggle for him is clearly one of principles although as usual at this time principles tend to get attached to classes.<sup>26</sup> Moreover, history is not economically determined but is a struggle of these spiritual principles with the good gradually gaining ground.<sup>27</sup> In fact, he believes Jesus Christ is on his side. He does not then in this respect differ from the Saint-Simonists or Leroux<sup>28</sup>, although with Blanqui there is an intensification of the feeling of moral indignation not resolved in prospects of harmony and love in the future but issuing rather in a desire to fight for social justice with considerable emphasis on the fight. No more than any other of the thinkers at this time can he be pinned down to one system although, of course, the ingredients are always remarkably similar.<sup>29</sup> In any case,

<sup>26</sup> Blanqui appears to have seen history as the duel between two principles - equality and privilege embodied in the duel of the people and the aristocracy, see Le Libérateur No. 1, quoted in Maurice Dommanget, Les Idées Politiques et Sociales d'Auguste Blanqui, Paris, 1957, p. 128

<sup>27</sup> See Alan B. Spitzer, The Revolutionary Theories of Louis Auguste Blanqui, Columbia U.P., New York, 1957, p. 65 ff.

<sup>28</sup> As Tchernoff points out, Blanqui appears to be influenced especially by Leroux, Tchernoff, Le Parti Républicain,.. p. 355

<sup>29</sup> As in all the earlier writers, the babouvist element is almost completely absent. On this see, for instance, Tchernoff, ibid, p. 349

Blanqui was not interested in systems nor desirous of establishing one. He believed in action. However, he is interesting in presenting a picture of the class ideas held by the left wing revolutionaries and showing the principles on which they founded their opposition. As regards Blanqui's class concepts, it has sometimes been questioned whether Blanqui had an economic conception of classes at all and whether he ever opposed one economic class to another in the true Marxist sense.<sup>30</sup> At this time, it would have been very remarkable if Blanqui had done this, considering the amazing confusion of categories - Blanqui could choose between Jacobin moral categories - wicked rich, good poor; Saint-Simon economic-administrative classes; Saint-Simonist economic-administrative-moral classes. However, let us consider what his ideas actually were.

The greatest influence on Blanqui was obviously Saint-Simonism at this time, although of course he is also affected by Jacobinism. For instance, in 1831, when he speaks of the bourgeoisie reaping the fruits of the July Revolution, he is obviously referring to the Saint-Simonist term for that was exactly what the Saint-Simonist were saying at the time. When in 1832, he speaks of himself as a "proléttaire", it is again in the Saint-Simon's sense of

workers opposed to idlers, which is especially obvious when he goes on to oppose the "prolétaires" to the privileged "vivent grassement de la sueur d~~e~~ proletaire" - a favourite Saint-Simonist phrase.<sup>31</sup> Moreover, he defines the privileged as idlers and oppressors since they derive their living from the huge mass of the people or "prolétaires". "Et les possesseurs que la société entière doit couvrir de sa puissance, ce sont deux ou trois cent mille oisifs qui dévorent paisiblement les milliards payés par les voleurs".<sup>32</sup> In a typical Saint-Simonist manner, he also attacks the army of fonctionnaires,<sup>33</sup> and the exploitation of the poor by the rich, a class which also controls the state. In contrast, however to the Saint-Simonists, Blanqui seeks a political solution, that is in the establishment of democracy on the 1793 pattern which he believes was the true aim of the July revolution. He seeks then to combine democracy with social reform.<sup>34</sup>

In 1832 Blanqui in a speech given to the "Société des Amis du Peuple" said that there had been three interests in France, "celui de la classe dite très élevée, celui de la classe moyenne ou bourgeoise, enfin celui du

<sup>31</sup> Le Procès des Quinze: Défense du Citoyen Louis-Auguste Blanqui devant la cour d'assises, in Blanqui, Textes Choisis, Les Classiques du Peuple, Paris, 1955, p.73.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid, the language sounds similar to Leroux.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid, p. 74

<sup>34</sup> See V.P. Volguine, Blanqui, Textes Choisis, Note 31 Preface, p. 12.

peuple".<sup>35</sup> During the Restoration the first and the second class ruled together, excluding the people. Charles X then declared war on the second class and the struggle endured from 1825 to 1830 with the people passive spectators. But in July 1830, the people suddenly appear on the scene and make the Revolution and he asks "Par quelle fatalité, cette révolution faite par le peuple seul et qui devait marquer la fin du régime exclusif de la bourgeoisie..n'a-t-elle eu d'autre résultat que d'établir le despotisme de la classe moyenne?"<sup>36</sup> The people had no programme and leaders with the result that, with the first class gone, the middle class reaps the fruit and the people get nothing so that the struggle has now to be renewed between these two. For indeed the bourgeoisie has nothing to offer but the same old policy used for the past 400 years, the idea of legitimacy opposed to the other principle, the sovereignty of the people which rallies all the men of the future (including a small number of the bourgeoisie themselves)<sup>37</sup> The choice is strictly between these two ideas - the white flag of aristocracy and the tricolour of the people, "Il

<sup>35</sup> Rapport sur la situation intérieure et extérieure de la France depuis la Révolution de Juillet (Discours prononcé à la séance du 2 février 1832 de ~~et~~ la société des amis du peuple), Blanqui, Note 31, p. 85

<sup>36</sup> Ibid, p. 89.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid, p. 95.

n'y a pas de troisième drapeau, de terme moyen".<sup>38</sup> Apart from the political question, this class analysis is remarkably similar to the Saint-Simonists for the bourgeoisie are seen as a sort of neo-aristocracy with no principles of their own - there is no third flag, in other words, the conflict has always been the same - privilege versus liberty and equality. The bourgeois stage is feudalism continued.

This view is reiterated in 1834 although this time Blanqui provides a better insight into the composition of the ~~three~~ bourgeois oppressors. They are the idlers controlling the instruments of labour; they have acquired these rights by conquest, part of the old system of vanquished and victors, the old exploitation of man by man. "La transmission héréditaire du sol et des capitaux place les citoyens sous le joug des propriétaires".<sup>39</sup> He criticises further the view that capitalists and workers have a solidarity of interest. "Point de société sans travail! partant point d'oisifs qui n'aient besoin des travailleurs. Mais quel besoin les travailleurs ont-ils des oisifs? Le capital n'est-il productif entre leurs mains.." <sup>40</sup> It is, in fact, "le duel à mort entre le

<sup>38</sup> Ibid, p. 94

<sup>39</sup> Auguste Blanqui, Critique Sociale, Paris 1885  
Vol. II, Qui fait la Soupe doit la manger, p. 120

<sup>40</sup> Ibid, p. 124

revenue et le salaire".<sup>41</sup> The solution for Blanqui lies in association "substituée à la propriété individuelle, fondera seule le règne de la justice par l'égalité".<sup>42</sup> It is also political for the Republic will effect the social changes and establish this equality.<sup>43</sup>

From this it seems clear that for Blanqui the "prolétaire" equals the people equals the great mass of every kind of worker in the general meaning of the term advanced by the Saint-Simonists, that is, the productive class. The bourgeoisie are the neo-feudal oppressors controlling the instruments of production and since 1830 have replaced the old noble class but still maintain the old system of conquerors and conquered.<sup>44</sup> As for the entrepreneurs in this, their position is not clear. There are certain instances when Blanqui, of course, confuses "bourgeoisie" and "bourgeoisie". For instance, he says

<sup>41</sup> Ibid, p. 124

<sup>42</sup> Ibid, p. 126

<sup>43</sup> See No. 1 Le Libérateur 2nd Feb. 1834, quoted in Dommanget, Note 26

<sup>44</sup> By a peculiar comparison of Blanqui's figures, Dommanget arrives at the conclusion that Blanqui had three classes - a top layer, a thin middle layer and the prolétaires, Dommanget, Note 26, p. 253. Yet it is clear that numbers mean nothing to writers of this time - they frequently add on a million or two at times and, moreover, Blanqui distinctly said that in 1830 "la haute classe est écrasée". Note 35, p. 91, and constantly opposes one class to another. Surely in the Saint-Simon manner, Blanqui considers that prior to 1830 there were two rival aristocracies and that in 1830 the lower one "the bourgeoisie" triumphed.

"La minorité de cette classe (middle class or bourgeoisie), formée des professions intellectuelles et du petit nombre de bourgeois qui aiment le drapeau tricolore... prendra parti pour la souveraineté du peuple",<sup>45</sup> whereby it seems the old term "bourgeoisie" is getting confused with the Saint-Simonist definition. As regards the "entrepreneurs", Dommanget writes "Il faut donc croire que Blanqui, subissant l'influence saint-simonienne les considère comme des producteurs et se refuse à les classer parmi les oisifs".<sup>46</sup> Likely enough, Blanqui had no interest in refining his concepts (he was not the only one): his primary endeavour appears to be clearing the way for revolutionary action in defining the struggle between a small idler elite and a large mass of workers. At this time, he was certainly no economist.

In general, his class concepts do not advance much beyond the Saint-Simonist stage and appear less extreme than those of Leroux and Buchez who did, in fact, exclude the entrepreneurs from the workers. His chief contribution lies in the notion of struggle between the classes whereby he appears to foresee the triumph of one over the other - there is no common interest between the two. "Les faits

<sup>45</sup> Blanqui, Note 35, p. 95. Blanqui, of course, here falls into the usual pitfall - common to most writers. They can, in fact, never believe their own definition. Intellectuals should not be included in the "idler" class at all but they might fall under the common term "bourgeois".

<sup>46</sup> Dommanget, Note 26, p. 234.

demontrant qu'il y a lutte et que dans cette lutte, l'un des partis doit succomber; car il ne saurait y avoir de fusion entre deux principes contraires".<sup>47</sup> However, at this time, Blanqui supported democracy and universal suffrage so that the struggle could be resolved by the rule of the majority over the minority - convinced as he was presumably that the majority was with him.<sup>48</sup> The revolution was still political although it would effect social reforms. Nor is there any idea of class domination.<sup>49</sup>

To my mind, just as the Liberals, Saint-Simon and the Saint-Simonists, Blanqui did have some concept of a class struggle much more in fact than later writers in some cases, for the Saint-Simonist definition gives a very clear criterion of a small idler layer which will go and must go. It was in fact vital for this definition that the "prolétaires", workers or people are the vast majority,

47 Blanqui manuscript dating from beginning of July monarchy, quoted in Dommanget, p. 251 ff.

48 Dommanget, p. 255.

49 See, for instance, Volquine, Note 34, p. 20. Blanqui, of course, does come to believe in revolutionary leadership to obtain power but this is not class leadership. Tchernoff suggests this notion was also derived from Saint-Simonism, "n'y a-t-il pas là un retour vers la conception saint-simonienne qui confère une dictature provisoire au pouvoir spirituel des savants?" Tchernoff, Le parti republicain, p. 358.

9/10ths of the nation against 1/10th idlers<sup>50</sup>, for then indeed it is clear that the idlers are doomed. As soon as workers are divided from workers as by Buchez and others the idea of a struggle and a conflict becomes much less precise. Of course, economically speaking, Blanqui is behind the economic liberals for he does not imagine any new class arising based on a new form of production, i.e. he is certainly not interested in creating an economic history, and in any case he is far too much of a Jacobin to admire the virtues of wealth and making money.<sup>51</sup> Just as for the other thinkers, he is a man of

<sup>50</sup> The argument on this question of Blanqui's classes appears to be that Blanqui did not have a proper economic concept of the "prolétaires" since he equates them to the people - that is anyone who does any work, and not just the "proletariat" in the Marxian sense. Surely, however, Blanqui like the Saint-Simonist has an economic conception only a different one. As Pechan says, the Saint-Simonist divided classes "auf Grund der Stellung der Einzelnen im Produktionsprozess und der Art der Einkommensgewinnung", Pechan, p. 108, i.e. productive class v. the non-productive class - the non-productive class living off the workers via rent and interest, monopolising in this way land and capital. In this sense, the "prolétaires" is a much wider concept than the Marxist one. We have seen, however, how the writers of this time are whittling it away into the Marxist term. However, Blanqui clearly did not do this at this time. See Dommanget, Note 26, pp. 332 ff. and Spitzer, Note 27, pp. 96 ff.

<sup>51</sup> For instance, Blanqui talks of "un matérialisme ignoble et brutal" and says "le peuple est toujours grand et généreux; il n'obéit point à des vils intérêts d'argent, mais aux plus nobles passions de l'âme, aux inspiration d'une moralité élevée". Textes choisis, p. 75 and p. 93.

moral principles which he has no interest in concealing behind economic forms. Of course, this position is weaker than the Liberals for it rejects any systemization and therefore is far less compelling in the long run.<sup>52</sup>

52

Speaking of the 1830's, Plechanow says "Solche Anschauungen der socialistischen Utopisten bilden theoretisch wie praktisch einen grossen Rückschritt im Vergleich mit den oben dargelegten Anschauungen der Ideologen der revolutionären Bourgeoisie". See Plechanow "Über die Anfänge der Lehre vom Klassenkampf", p. 296, Die Neue Zeit 1902 - 3

CHAPTER XIIIThe Fourierists and Louis Blanc

In the midst of the Saint-Simonist success, Fourier remained as obscure and neglected as in the 1820's. Yet his fortunes were soon to alter for the internal dissensions and divisions in the Saint-Simonist movement after 1831 led to a sudden rise in the popularity of his ideas. The disappointed ex-Saint-Simonists such as Transon, Pecqueur, Lechevalier, in search of a new doctrine, seized on Fourierism and by devoting their proselytizing energy to that school soon made it as famous if not more so than the Saint-Simonist movement. What Fourier had been obscurely preaching for 25 years achieved virtually overnight popularity under the skilful direction of his followers, the most notable one being Victor Considerant.<sup>1</sup>

In June 1832, the journal "Le Phalanstère" appeared and lectures and courses on the doctrine of Fourier were started, the workers in particular being sought out for conversion.<sup>2</sup> Considerant with his facile style began to make comprehensible what had been so obscure so that, generally speaking, the ideas of Fourier became known not from his own tortuous writings but from the popularizations

<sup>1</sup> Victor Considerant, of course, was never a Saint-Simonist.

<sup>2</sup> See Hubert Bourgin, Fourier, Paris 1905, pp. 345 ff.

of his disciples.<sup>3</sup> A good deal of the Saint-Simonist phrases such as "travailleurs", idlers, association, organisation of labour, and "bourgeoisie" were used although, of course, the basic doctrine was developed long before the Saint-Simonists were ever heard of - in fact, suggestions were made that the Saint-Simonists had themselves been influenced by Fourier - as for instance the assertion that Enfantin was a secret reader of his works.<sup>4</sup>

The Fourierist doctrine as expounded by Considerant commences with the moral criticism of industrialism. Ever since 1789, when the bourgeoisie fought their last heroic fight against the feudalism of landowners, there has been, apart from a few political benefits, nothing but a growth of disorder due to the principle of laissez-faire, the principle in fact of economic anarchism. As a result "malgré l'égalité constitutionnelle des citoyens devant la loi et les fonctions publiques..l'Ordre social actuel n'est encore qu'un ordre aristocratique .. les classes se perpétuent par la naissance dans leur état

<sup>3</sup> Ibid

<sup>4</sup> The Fourierists raged a bitter war against the Saint-Simonists. Considerant in Destinée Sociale, Paris 1835, asserted in contrast to the Fourierists that the Saint-Simonists were subversive, putting wrong thoughts into people's heads so that the working people now go around saying "Sème le champ, Prolétaire, C'est l'Oisif qui récoltera", Vol. II, p. xxxviii.

d'infériorité et de supériorité relatives".<sup>5</sup> The mercantile spirit permeates the whole of society with corruption and egoism.<sup>6</sup> The original spirit of liberalism - which appeared in the second stage of Civilisation - succumbs to it with the result that there is war and conflict everywhere, proprietor against proprietor; proprietor against worker; worker against worker; producer against consumer. In fact, Civilisation is in the anarchy of the third stage foreshadowing the coming decadence when the new feudalism forms.<sup>7</sup> For the Fourierists then the stage of liberalism leads to the stage of mercantilism and then to the stage of neo-feudalism as the false principles inherent in the whole of Civilisation work themselves out. The last stage is a form of industrial monopoly<sup>8</sup>. In fact, the success of the bourgeois principles was going to lead to the destruction of the bourgeoisie themselves. The result of free competition was to concentrate riches increasingly in the hands of the big capitalists - "la petite

<sup>5</sup> Considerant, Principe du Socialisme: Manifeste de la démocratie au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle, 2nd Ed. Paris, 1847, p. 5.

<sup>6</sup> See Considerant, Destinée Sociale, Vol. I, pp. 89-90

<sup>7</sup> Ibid, p. 192,

<sup>8</sup> Note 5, p. 8.

manufactures, la petite fabrique ne peuvent pas lutter contre la grande manufacture et la grande fabrique".<sup>9</sup> In addition, of course, the "prolétaires" would continue to be ground down to complete servitude. Society would then be composed of two classes - a small minority owning everything and the large masses having nothing "obligé de louer pour un salaire précaire et toujours décroissant, ses bras, ses talents et ses forces aux seigneurs féodaux de la société moderne".<sup>10</sup> This was not considered a prophetic utterance but a fact based on the analysis of the actual situation, for instance, as could already be seen from England.. "La Grande-Bretagne présente au plus haut degré ce phénomène de la concentration des capitaux entre les mains d'une aristocratie peu nombreuse, de l'amointrissement des classes moyennes, de la quasi-annihilation politique et sociale de la Bourgeoisie, d'un Proletariat et d'un Paupérisme envahissants".<sup>11</sup>

If the Saint-Simonists had uttered dire warnings as to what would happen if their system were not adopted, the Fourierists certainly went one better. Their picture of the final stage of civilisation is of such darkness that one must be inclined to grasp at any straw to avoid it. Actually, of course, it cannot be avoided, being the

<sup>9</sup> Note 6, p. 250

<sup>10</sup> Note 5, p. 11, see also Note 2, p. 130

<sup>11</sup> Note 5, p. 11

necessary stage before Guaranteeism although in these pseudo-deterministic systems, there is often an apparent loophole left open for human action. In any case, the last stage of civilisation presents society divided into what might well be described as a whole series of concentration camps, actually huge industrial and agricultural complexes worked by masses of wage slaves - for the peasants too are due to sink to wage earners working on monster farms.<sup>12</sup> Considerant presents, in fact, a most depressing picture which is hardly allayed by the suggestion that it is leading straight to Guaranteeism, since these work camps can so easily be turned into phalanges by state action.<sup>13</sup>

As might be expected, this stage of Civilisation with a small vulture class and a huge proletariat is going to the scene of an ardent class war - "la guerre de celui qui ne possède pas contre celui qui possède".<sup>14</sup> It is foolish to imagine political remedies can improve matters. How can that be when the power will be concentrated into the hands of a small minority, absorbing all the revenues?<sup>15</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Note 6, p. 203

<sup>13</sup> "Le gouvernement..aurait seulement à soumettre toute la machine à une impulsion unitaire..Il n'y aurait personne à déposséder par la violence, et toutes ces opérations marcheraient rapidement". Note 6, p. 206

<sup>14</sup> Note 6, p. 256

<sup>15</sup> Note 6, p. 230 ff, and Note 2, p. 167.

The State can buffet its head against them as long as it wants but it cannot shake the power of this new feudalism.<sup>16</sup> A new morality, a new concept of society is required to replace the false principles of Civilisation. Of course, the Fourierists alone have the true solution ready.<sup>17</sup>

The Fourierists then clearly introduce certain very important concepts of history and society of decided influence at that time. In particular, it is their account of three stages which is of especial interest to us - the rise of the bourgeoisie from the enfranchisement of the communes, resting on liberal principles and culminating in 1789, the decline of the bourgeoisie in its liberal impulse to be replaced by the principles of commerce and industry, individual greed and egoism corresponding to the appearance of a new aristocracy arising out of the bourgeoisie - "les hauts-industriels, hauts-commerçans, hauts-propriétaires bourgeois"<sup>18</sup> and finally the transposition of the new feudalism into the era of Guaranteeism leading to harmony when it seems all classes will unit again in craftsmen-peasant-bourgeois phalanges. Like all the systems of this period, we arrive after a terrifying description of social conditions with class slavery and war, mass misery, greedy monopolists, at a solution of astonishing tameness and

<sup>16</sup> Note 5, pp. 12 ff.

<sup>17</sup> Note 6, Vol. II, passim

<sup>18</sup> Note 6, Vol. I, p. 193

contradictory pacifity. In fact, it appears that the picture described must not be realised at all costs, the classes locked in a death struggle must be harmonised although it is something of a problem <sup>as</sup> to how ~~how~~ <sup>^</sup> these classes survived at all after the final feudal stage necessary in order to lay the foundations for these phalanges.

Yet apart from this, there is for us a further complication: the question of the rise and fall of the bourgeoisie, or how the bourgeoisie destroy the bourgeoisie. According to Fourier's doctrine, industrialism far from establishing the happiness and prosperity of the people by raising them all to the prosperous bourgeois position, does the very opposite, it crushes down the bourgeois and reduces them to the mass of poor or "prolétaires". The bourgeoisie then split into two sections, one rising up to a feudal élite; the other falling down into the proletariat so that in the last stage of Civilisation the extensive bourgeois middle of the liberals has completely disappeared. With this Fourierist scheme, however, we are approaching the problem when two concepts of "bourgeoisie" are used in conflicting senses in the same system. Admittedly, the usual definition of the bourgeoisie for the Fourierists is the middle class of society, those who have something but not much - the small and the medium proprietor, the craftsmen, the small manufacturer, the

independent peasant,<sup>19</sup> that is, a group somewhat resembling the liberal economists concept of the bourgeoisie. In creating its own aristocracy, it annihilates itself; in fact, a lesson in holding wrong principles - "La civilisation, qui a commencé par la FEODALITE NOBILAIRE, et dont le développement a affranchi les industriels des servitudes personnelles ou directes, aboutit donc aujourd'hui à la FEODALITE INDUSTRIELLE, qui opère les servitudes collectives ou indirectes des travailleurs".<sup>20</sup>

But who annihilates it? The Capitalists, the bankers, the big factory owners, the monopolists of industry and commerce, having a very remarkable similarity to the other concept of the "bourgeoisie". What stage then was France in the 1830's? The Fourierists seem to picture this new feudalism as coming but not yet there, that is, the two classes - small capitalist group and a huge "prolétaire" group have not yet been formed. The bourgeoisie pictured as this middle element are indeed in a sense being warned of what is in store for them with almost the concealed sense: it will not come if you reform. Yet sometimes the impression is created that the new feudalism is already there and the bourgeoisie are those capitalists now monopolising the instruments of production. As if in fact

<sup>19</sup> See Note 6, p. 250

<sup>20</sup> See Note 5, p. 8

1830 marks the turning point -

"En 89, tout en combattant pour ses propres intérêts, la bourgeoisie, imbue alors d'idées larges, de principes élevés et de nobles désirs, combattait aussi pour le peuple et pour l'humanité..Victorieuse en 1830, la bourgeoisie n'a plus trouvé debout chez elle que le sentiment étroit de ses intérêts égoïstes.. Depuis la victoire, il n'est plus question du peuple que pour le museler ou pour l'exploiter". 21

It was difficult not to employ the term "bourgeoisie" ambiguously since there was always a tendency to confuse the Fourierist definition with the very dominant definition originating with the Saint-Simonists.<sup>22</sup> The dangerous element of Fourierism is that the two concepts of the bourgeoisie start to be used indiscriminately so that sometimes it appears as a thin top layer of capitalists A and sometimes as the extensive middle layer of small men B; A bad and B harmless. Indeed the Fourierist solution appears in fact to be the restoration of B once they reject the false ideas of Civilisation.<sup>23</sup> It is true, there is

<sup>21</sup> La Situation Politique, La Phalange, Vol. VII cited in Leroy, Précurseurs Français, p. 256

<sup>22</sup> However, as far as I know, Considerant was always rather consistent in applying the term "bourgeoisie" to the middle classes, i.e. that section which was gradually to be eliminated, i.e. "la petite et la moyenne industrie, le petit et le moyen commerce", p. 9, Manifeste de la Démocratie. In this respect, it is interesting to see that Dommanget in Victor Considerant, Paris, 1929, finds it necessary to point out that Considerant "sous-entend par bourgeoisie la petite bourgeoisie (p. 81)".

<sup>23</sup> As Pechan says, the aims of Fourierism was "Verbürgeling der Arbeiter und Bewahrung der Kleinbürger vor dem Absinken in das Proletariat", Pechan, Louis Blanc, p. 46.

nothing logically wrong with the Fourierist scheme provided it is strictly maintained - Stage A = rising bourgeoisie - the artisans, etc., Stage B = a feudal industrial aristocracy of some bourgeois; Stage C = restoration of bourgeoisie. The problem arises when the term "bourgeoisie" is applied indiscriminately to Stages A and B, so that Class A destroys Class B and establishes the rule of Class A; a development surely due to the mixture of pure Fourierism with Saint-Simonist concepts.

Considering the attribute "forerunner of Marx" sometimes attributed to Pecqueur, it might be useful to consider briefly the class ideas of this ex-Saint-Simonist turned Fourierist. Pecqueur proceeds from the Saint-Simonist position in praising the virtues of industrialism - provided, of course, it is under the direction of the state. Again similar to the Saint-Simonists, he extols the virtues of the industrial class and, in the usual manner, sees the origins of this class in the Medieval towns. It is not, however, a homogeneous class because the more enterprising members become richer and therefore cease to be wage-earners whilst the others remain in this latter category. However, as industry grows, so will wealth and not only the wealth of the few but the prosperity of the whole nation. For instance,

Pecqueur cites the examples of England:

"une masse imposante d'ouvriers y ont acquis un développement intellectuel, une habileté.. qui ne permettent plus aux classes privilégiées de rétrograder dans la voie d'émancipation". 24

On the basis of these views, Pecqueur decries any attempt to make a rigid division between bourgeoisie and "prolétaires",<sup>25</sup> since there are no barriers between the two. In Pecqueur's eyes, the only vicious element is the Saint-Simonist class of idlers - "tous ceux qui vivent de l'intérêt, du revenu de leurs capitaux que d'autres font valoir".<sup>26</sup> In fact, quoting Rousseau, he says that all men who do not fulfill a useful function in society are immoral.

Of course, all this does not go beyond the Saint-Simonists. However, in addition, there is a certain Fourierist element in Pecqueur for he believed that, if the leaders of the industrial class pursued their own selfish interests instead of the interest of all, then "la class moyenne qui commençait à naître a été transformée en classe prolétaire.. une féodalité industrielle et commerciale surgit".<sup>27</sup> Occasionally the leaders in their

<sup>24</sup> Pecqueur, Des Améliorations Matérielles dans leurs rapports avec la liberté, Paris, 2nd ed. 1843, pp. 110-111

<sup>25</sup> Ibid, p. 185

<sup>26</sup> Pecqueur, Théorie Nouvelle d'Economie, Sociale et Politique, p. 508 quoted in Leroy, Précurseurs Français, p. 367

<sup>27</sup> Pecqueur, Note 24, p. 112

selfish aspect are termed "les Bourgeois" - "si les Bourgeois, s'immobilisent dans leurs avantages et leur droits acquis, refusaient aux bras prolétaires l'intervention féconde de leurs capitaux accumulés... c'est semer pour récolter".<sup>28</sup> However, Pecqueur did not consider this in any way inevitable nor even likely.<sup>29</sup> He seems to have considered it far more probable that the middle class would lead the masses to the new prosperity and that in the future the sole aristocracy would be "celle des grands industriels, des grands savants, des grands littérateurs et artistes".<sup>30</sup> This happy state could be realised by the principles of association and socialisation.

Pecqueur then can hardly be said to be a revolutionary in the class sense. His ideas are basically derived from the Saint-Simonists although some of his terminology is Fourierist. For him, the bourgeoisie is generally the industrious middle class, not the idler élite. Of course, the bourgeoisie could join hands with the idlers and

28

Ibid, p. 174

29

See Pecqueur, Economie Sociale des intérêts du Commerce, Paris, 1839, Vol. I, pp. 402 ff. where Pecqueur discusses the possibilities for and against the progressive elimination of the small owners and concludes "loin donc que nous pussions croire à une concentration féodale, nous sommes frappés de l'accélération avec laquelle tout le monde capitalise"..

30

Pecqueur, Note 24, p. 237.

thereby form a new oppressive group, but for Pecqueur this rests on a free moral decision and not on economic necessity. If man desires the brotherhood of man, he can achieve it - he has the means "industrialism"; it is solely a question of the aim.<sup>31</sup>

Louis Blanc provides an interesting example of the confusion resulting from the mixture of Fourierism and Saint-Simonism. It is true in his book "Histoire de Dix Ans", we meet for the first time with an author who at the outset provides us with a statement defining what he considers the bourgeoisie to be. Blanc writes:-

"Par bourgeoisie, j'entends l'ensemble des citoyens qui, possédant des instruments de travail ou du capital, travaillent avec des ressources qui leur sont propres, et ne dépendent d'autrui que dans une certaine mesure. Le peuple est l'ensemble des citoyens qui, ne possédant pas de capital, dépendent d'autrui complètement, et en ce qui touche aux premières nécessités de la vie". 32

<sup>31</sup> From the above, it should be clear that whatever may have been Pecqueur's contribution to Marxian theory, it was certainly not in his class concepts. Of course, it is possible, as Bourgin does (in "La Doctrine de Pecqueur", Revue Socialiste, 1907) to quote every Pecqueur use of words like "bourgeois" and "prolétaires" and not to ask what Pecqueur meant by these terms. In fact, Pecqueur did not go beyond the Saint-Simonists themselves who were also fond of talking about the bourgeoisie without however having as yet been called forerunners of Marx. Moreover, all the depressive features of Pecqueur have been derived from Fourier. Pecqueur also has no idea of a class struggle based on economics solely; he believed in moralism and class reconciliation. Contrary to Cole in Socialist Thought, Vol. 1, p.180, I cannot see that Pecqueur ever advanced these concepts in any way.

<sup>32</sup> Louis Blanc, Histoire de Dix Ans, 4th edition, Bruxelles, 1846, Vol. 1, p. 8, note 1.

It is not, however, a very good definition. Does he mean then by the bourgeoisie - craftsmen, independent peasants, the small men? And who are the people? Surely there are many professions such as doctors, teachers, managers, engineers etc. dependent on others to live. And where do those idlers come in? There is no mention of them at all. Moreover from Blanc's definition we get such diverse groups as a small independent worker lining up with a capitalist factory owner.<sup>33</sup> It is far more primitive and blurred than the Saint-Simon categories of productive and non-productive for at least there is then some criterion. Moreover, this definition clearly does not express what Blanc means at all. In fact, it could almost be said that he provides a definition and then generally proceeds to ignore it. Let us then see how he, in fact, does use the term and what he really imagines the bourgeoisie to be.

History has seen the rise of the bourgeoisie to power over the old feudal regime. This class attempted to seize power in 1789, it renewed the struggle in 1815, a struggle of course based on liberalism, i.e. individualism and materialism. Up to 1830, the fight was that of the old

<sup>33</sup> See Leo A. Loubère, "Louis Blanc's Philosophy of History; Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol. 17 1956 says re Blanc's classes: "there is no sociological difference between a clerk and a day labourer, nor between a petty craftsman who owns his shop and a great industrialist", p. 82.

aristocracy, that is, "des gentilshommes, des émigrés, des dignitaires de l'église" against the aspirations of the bourgeoisie, that is, "des fils de parlementaires, des banquiers, des manufacturiers, des commerçants, des acquéreurs de biens nationaux, des médecins, des avocats"<sup>34</sup> - a very mixed bag indeed. In addition, Blanc says, in discussing the election law of 1817 which formed a body of 90,878 electors, that it gave parliamentary power to the bourgeoisie, thereby limiting this concept very sharply, considering there were about 30,000,000 inhabitants in France. When it comes to the bourgeoisie of 1830, he mentions "banquiers, commerçants, manufacturiers, imprimeurs, hommes de robe, journalistes"..<sup>35</sup> Again a very odd mixture with no mention at all of the small man whilst surely journalists could hardly rank in his own definition of the bourgeoisie. Anyway, whoever they are, they triumph in 1830. They are "toute puissante dans l'ordre social par la propriété du sol, par la jouissance des capitaux, par le crédit".<sup>36</sup> Any divisions within them is just a political game. But the serious conflict is now to start, for after 1830, the people appear as combatants against the aim of the bourgeoisie to establish itself as a privileged group

<sup>34</sup> Blanc, Note 32, Vol. 1, p. 56

<sup>35</sup> Blanc, Vol. I, Note 32, p. 133

<sup>36</sup> Blanc, Vol. II, Note 32, p. 26

under its leaders "des banquiers, de grands capitalistes, des hommes d'affaires, des coureurs d'aventure commerciales".<sup>37</sup> By the election law of 1830 the bourgeoisie now in some way increase their ranks to 200,000, the class who have "accaparé la fortune de la France",<sup>38</sup> or "une oligarchie de financiers et de marchands".<sup>39</sup> They are the oppressors, sons of the oppressed who having won their property and their rights from the old aristocracy do not hesitate to act like the old nobility with regard to the proletariat. Now they possess all the instruments of labour - "ne trouvaient-ils en effet la bourgeoisie en possession de tous les instruments de travail, en possession du sol, du numéraire, du crédit".<sup>40</sup> In fact the term progressively sharpens so that bourgeoisie begin to appear as the feudal monopolists of Fourier or the bourgeois aristocrats of Robespierre who, having sequestered everything, leave the mass of the people to rot in misery, as mere wage slaves, having nothing and never any hope of getting anything - so that in Blanc's eyes, two distinct classes are formed.

The bourgeoisie is further typified by having a certain group of common ideas - "de même qu'en matière de

37 Ibid, p. 283

38 Ibid, Vol. IV, p. 62-63

39 Ibid, p. 65

40 Ibid, p. 84

politique et de religion, la bourgeoisie avait sacrifié presque complètement l'autorité à la liberté, la communauté des croyances à l'indépendance absolue de l'esprit, la fraternité à l'orgueil; de même, en matière d'industrie, elle sacrifia l'association à la concurrence .. et laisse mourir les pauvres dans l'abandon. Aussi avec la concurrence devaient se développer rapidement dans la bourgeoisie la soif immodérée des richesses, l'ardeur des spéculations, le matérialisme, en un mot, dans tout ce qu'il a de cruel et de grossier".<sup>41</sup> They are a tyranny of wealth and preach the anarchy whereby every man is opposed to his fellow, the principle of laissez-faire - "chacun est irrésistiblement poussé par elle (concurrence) à ruiner son voisin".<sup>42</sup> Blanc reveals like his hero, Robespierre, a certain moral distaste for riches and correspondingly the class which has them. Moreover, in the Fourier manner, their wrong principles are going to lead to their downfall. Competition will destroy the modest fortunes and create the class of big capitalists.<sup>43</sup> "Ainsi, les fabriques écrasant les métiers; les magasins somptueux absorbant les magasins modestes; l'artisan qui s'appartient remplacée par le

<sup>41</sup> Ibid, Vol. 1, p. 100

<sup>42</sup> Louis Blanc, Organisation du Travail, ed. J. A. R. Marriott, Oxford 1913, p. 193

<sup>43</sup> Blanc, Note 32, Vol. V, p. 335.

journalier qui ne s'appartient pas; l'exploitation par la charge<sup>44</sup> dominant l'exploitation par la bêche, et faisant passer le champ du pauvre sous la souveraineté honteuse de l'usurier".<sup>44</sup> Or another equally depressing picture - "les grandes exploitations ruinant les petites.. la nation marchant à la reconstitution de la propriété féodale par l'usure, et l'établissement d'une oligarchie financière par le crédit.." <sup>45</sup> We quote this to show that Blanc suddenly widens out his concept so that now the little man appears so noticeably absent from the other statements on the bourgeoisie, those monopolisers of the fortune of France. However, Blanc consoles himself "Pour que le progrès se réalise, peut-être est-il nécessaire que toutes les chances mauvaises soient épuisées". <sup>46</sup> In any case the struggle is going to lead to the end of the proletariat and the victory of the Gospel.<sup>47</sup> How? Blanc appears to presume that the bourgeoisie will never be so foolish as to encompass their own ruin; they are only temporarily blinded. In fact, they are the true leaders of the people - "si la bourgeoisie est noblement inspirée, elle peut tout pour la régénération de ce pays". For indeed what security

<sup>44</sup> Blanc, Note 42, p. 83

<sup>45</sup> Blanc, Note 32, Vol. III, p. 63-64

<sup>46</sup> Blanc, Note 32, Vol. I, ps. 103-104

<sup>47</sup> Blanc, Note 32, Vol. IV, p. 73

can they enjoy between the popular discontent and the oligarchical yoke slowly being formed around them? "Il faut donc qu'au lieu de se tenir séparée du peuple, elle s'unisse à lui d'une manière indissoluble".<sup>48</sup> On this very remarkable note, Blanc terminates his virulent campaign against the bourgeoisie.<sup>49</sup>

It is clear, I think, that Blanc has confused himself by juggling together two definitions of the bourgeoisie and two time elements. Sometimes he believes that the bourgeoisie in the sense of capitalist monopolists - the neo-feudalists gained power in 1830 after having failed in 1789. Sometimes he suggests this is only a future possibility. Moreover, all through his history of the bourgeoisie from 1789, it is clearly treated as a small élite, as might be seen from the references he makes to it, a small élite taking power in 1830. He clearly says they are the oligarchy of financiers and business men. Surely another élite is not going to arise from this? On the other hand, in his economic analysis, quite obviously, he pictures the bourgeoisie as a mass of small men, the

<sup>48</sup> Blanc, Note 32, Vol. V, p. 338

<sup>49</sup> Loubère, Note 33, sees this final harmony as illogical. "For while he held that a wall of hostility separated doctrines, the classes involved might become fused", p. 83. I think this conclusion of Blanc is due to the fact that he suddenly changes his view of the bourgeoisie and instead of feudal oligarchs, they become peaceable little men.

artisans, peasants, shopkeepers, workshop owners etc., who by no stretch of the imagination could have taken power in 1830. This bourgeois class (definition A) is due for annihilation since how could competition destroy the bourgeoisie (definition B) who are the bankers, the capitalists, owning all the land, the money and the instruments of production? In fact, Blanc is calmly suggesting that the bourgeoisie is going to destroy the bourgeoisie.

Obviously, Louis Blanc has not one concept of the bourgeoisie at all. It appears variously as the Saint-Simonist bourgeoisie, the Saint-Simonist entrepreneurs, the Fourierist neo-feudalists and the Fourierist middle class, the bourgeois aristocrats of Robespierre and the bourgeoisie of Barnave. By interchanging definitions, Blanc can make the bourgeoisie do very strange things including the mergence of periods 1789 and 1830 so that indeed it appears some times not only did the neo-feudalists take power in 1830, but they were the ones who tried to do it in 1789 - a thing Fourier would not have ever imagined since he does clearly distinguish different eras, one corresponding to his middle classes and the other to his commercial feudalism. Moreover, by suddenly switching from one concept to another, Blanc attempts even to reconcile the bourgeoisie with the proletariat in order to save themselves from themselves it seems. Blanc is,

in fact, responsible for many confused problems of the bourgeoisie by his own confusion of terms. From now on, there is this constant tendency to blur and mix the two concepts so that the bourgeoisie expand and contract at an alarming rate dependent on the mood of the writer.<sup>50</sup>

50

Thureau-Dangin, Histoire de la Monarchie de Juillet, Paris 1914, Vol. 6, p. 123, says on Blanc, "Il ne voit dans la société que le travail industriel, dans le travail industriel que le problème de la concurrence", and this is certainly a weakness when it comes to class concepts. Marx appears to have inherited much of the Blancian confusions.

CHAPTER XIVCommunism and Socialism after 1839

During the period 1839 to 1844, Communist ideas attained a certain popularity. There is no doubt, of course, that neo-babeuvist ideas had been propagated earlier in the secret societies but the rising of 1839, and the subsequent trial, appeared to have brought them to a wider audience. In 1839, the "Société Communiste" was founded and from then onwards the term Communist appears to denote those of the left who want to establish the community of goods.<sup>1</sup> The Communists, no more than any one else at this time, were not united under one system, nor is it possible to speak of Communism as a definite doctrine. There was, for instance, the great divide between the "religious" Communism of Cabet and his followers and the "materialist" Communism. As von Stein defined it, the religious Communism was "derjenige, welcher das Recht des Eigentums und der Familie im Namen der Religion der Liebe aufhebt, um die Gemeinschaft der in Gott Gleichen und von Gott zum Glucke Bestimmten an ihre Stelle zu setzen".<sup>2</sup> The other group of "materialist"

<sup>1</sup> See Lorenz von Stein, Geschichte der Sozialen Bewegung in Frankreich, Vol. II. Samuel Bernstein, Babeuf et les Problème des Babouvisme, Editions Sociales, Paris 1963, his contribution entitled "Le Neo-babouvisme d'après la Presse", p. 262 ff. Thureau-Dangin, Histoire de la Monarchie de Juillet, Paris 1914 Vol. 6, p.108 ff.

<sup>2</sup> von Stein, Note 1, p. 380.

Communists had also various nuances of opinion, such as the group centred on "L'Humanitaire" with an anarchistic emphasis possibly derived from Sylvain Maréchal and the strictly Babouvist groups as that centred on "L'Egalitaire".

It is to a certain extent questionable whether such a division into 'religious' and 'materialist' groups is really meaningful and whether, following up the idea of Morange, it might not be more useful to consider the division to run between the supporters of fraternity and the supporters of equality - or those who want class reconciliation as the chief aim and communism as the means and those who want communism as the chief aim and often suggest class struggle as a means. As a matter of fact, nearly all the French Communists of this period were in the first category.<sup>4</sup>

Cabet, of course, is the most famous representative of religious communism or fraternity. His ideas on class follow the usual pattern in so far as he sees history as

<sup>3</sup> See Bernstein, Note 1, and Sencier, Le Babouvisme après Babeuf, Paris 1912, pp. 174 ff. On this question, too, see Morange, Les Idées Communistes dans les Sociétés secrètes, p. 78 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Morange in Les Idées Communistes dans les Sociétés secrètes et dans la Presse sous la Monarchie de Juillet, Paris 1905, says, p. 90, "pour les fraternitaire l'égalité n'est considérée que comme un moyen d'arriver à la fraternité; car de fraternité il ne peut être question dans une société où les uns ont tout, et les autres rien. Pour les babouvistes, au contraire, l'égalité est le but immédiat".

the struggle of two classes - masters and slaves, oppressors and oppressed having their origins in force and conquest. The suppressed group "peuple" are the industrious section and by their own efforts and with the help of the rivalries between ruler and Aristocracy, they rise out of slavery and serfdom to create industry and commerce with the result that some acquire riches, forming the "bourgeoisie" whilst others are left behind to form the "peuple" or "prolétaires". However, the establishment of the Communes represents a forward step for, by this, trade, industry, science and general enlightenment were furthered. Moreover, the Communes took their place in the national assemblies preparing in this way for the eventual triumph of equality and fraternity. "La nature provoque continuellement l'humanité à s'insurger contre l'oppression".<sup>5</sup> There is then a continual forward movement. Unfortunately, society is still far from perfect, it has still within it the vice of the inequality of wealth, the division of rich and poor, a source of hatred, jealousy and envy. The prime reason for all this is property, a right derived solely from conquest and theft and designed to enable a small group to live idly and uselessly .. "nous allons voir, en effet, que la Monnaie, l'Inégalité de fortune et la Propriété étaient la CAUSE de tous les vices, de tous les crimes et de tous

<sup>5</sup> Cabet, Histoire populaire de la Révolution française, Paris, 1839, Vol. I, p. 147

les malheurs pour les Riches aussi bien que pour les Pauvres".<sup>6</sup> It results, moreover, in a division between Bourgeoisie and Peuple - the cause of much misfortune, "car leur intérêt mutuel est évidemment d'être uni et il n'est pas de sacrifice que l'un et l'autre ne doive faire pour fraterniser".<sup>7</sup>

In the revolution of 1789, the bourgeoisie, or a part of it,<sup>8</sup> tried to establish itself as an aristocracy. In fact, the Constituent Assembly "s'arrête à la Bourgeoisie" and "elle constitue.. une DEMOCRATIE bourgeoise ou une BOURGEOISIE démocrate vis-à-vis <sup>de</sup> l'ancienne Aristocratie et une ARISTOCRATIE bourgeoise ou une BOURGEOISIE aristocrate vis-à-vis du Peuple".<sup>9</sup> The people, in fact, got nothing. The Girondins had a similar outlook<sup>10</sup> so that the true revolution did not appear until 1793 and was embodied in the acts of the Committee of Public Safety. It is true, it did not establish Communism but it came close to it.

<sup>6</sup> Cabet, Voyage en Icarie, Paris, 1848, p. 313

<sup>7</sup> Cabet, Note 4,<sup>5</sup> p. 328

<sup>8</sup> Cabet writes that the fixing of electoral qualifications by the Constituent Assembly was not the work of all the bourgeoisie - only a part of it allied with the Aristocrats, see Note 5, p. 349

<sup>9</sup> Cabet, Note 5, Vol. II, p. 443

<sup>10</sup> Cabet, Révolution de 1830 et situation présente expliquées et éclairées par les Révolutions de 1789, 1792, 1799 et 1804 et par la Restauration 2nd Edition, Paris, 1833, Vol. I, p. 47.

However, the Mountain or the "démocratie populaire" which desired true equality was defeated by the "démocratie bourgeoise" which only wished a semi-equality. It is clear that Cabet's hero is Robespierre whilst equally obvious, his bête-noire is Babeuf. Cabet dislikes Babeuf on account of his violence, his desire to establish Communism by force and often enough Cabet's criticism seemed to be aimed at the neo-babeuvists of his time.

The old issues reappear with the revolution of 1830, the cause of which lay in the past "c'est le souvenir de notre glorieuse révolution de 1789, le désir de reconquérir les principes de notre immortelle constitution de 1791".<sup>11</sup> Unfortunately, the people are again unsuccessful and remain deprived of any advantage - "une aristocratie financière et bourgeoise.. semble vouloir lui refuser absolument tout".<sup>12</sup> However, later in his work "Voyage en Icarie", Cabet makes a distinction: the Aristocracy did not triumph in 1830 but the "bourgeoisie" in the form "La démocratie bourgeois" which is a great advance. "Et si l'émeute et le spectre de 93 ne la poursuivaient pas, vous verriez comme elle réclamerait elle-même des institutions démocratiques".<sup>13</sup> In fact, equality is bound to triumph for it is justice and

<sup>11</sup> Ibid, p. 122

<sup>12</sup> Ibid, p. 219

<sup>13</sup> Cabet, Note 6, p. 458

reason. There has been a steady progress towards this end starting from the rise of science and of industry, a revolution which in turn involves a revolution in society and political life.. "et quoique nous distinguions le commerce et l'industrie, l'industrie et la liberté, la liberté et l'égalité, tout cela n'est-il pas en réalité la même chose".<sup>14</sup> The aim must be to create one society; so long as there are rich and poor - and there always will be so long as there is property - so long will society be divided into conflicting societies of the rich and of the poor, united only by force and oppression since the society of the rich determines the law for all. The only answer to the achievement of true humanity and equality is Communism. Yet this must not come by force for the rich are human too and their vices are merely the result of false ideas and education. "Vous pouvez détester l'égoïsme et surtout sa cause; mais rien ne me paraît moins raisonnable, moins juste, et surtout plus maladroit que d'insulter et de menacer la nombreuse classe de marchands et des fabricants".<sup>15</sup>

In many ways, Cabet for all his Communism sounds strangely liberal as regards classes. For one thing, he sees industry and commerce as the means to freedom and

<sup>14</sup> Ibid, p. 468

<sup>15</sup> Ibid, pp. 562-3

happiness provided, of course, they are based on the right principles. Moreover, for him, the fundamental division of society is still between conquerors and peaceful industrials. "Ainsi dès le commencement du Genre humain, on peut distinguer deux classes . . : l'une, comprenant les hommes bons, actifs, industriels, tempérants, etc; l'autre comprenant les paresseux, les intempérants, les cruels etc; ce sont les premiers qui ont cultivé la terre, découvert les Arts et les Sciences, et crée les Propriétés et les richesses tandis que les seconds ne s'occupaient que de chasse et de guerre, de vol et de brigandage, consommant sans rien produire, ne connaissent d'autre moyen que la force".<sup>16</sup> This might very well have been written by any Liberal. In addition, his attitude to the "bourgeoisie" is not generally unfavourable. They do not appear to constitute even a separate class but rather a branch of the people gone astray. In some writings, Cabet does throw out the usual invectives such as "l'aristocratie de la banque, de la bourse et de l'agiotage"<sup>17</sup>, but in "Voyage en Icarie", the picture is considerably mellowed. The bourgeoisie have been led astray by false ideas, often enough by the Aristocracy who try to use them

<sup>16</sup> Ibid, p. 392

<sup>17</sup> Cabet, Note 10, p. 123

for their own ends.<sup>18</sup> For, in the end, the chief vice is property, and property is the instrument of Aristocracy, the result of conquest, force and violence, opposed to peaceful industry and trade. Therefore, the people and bourgeoisie have the same interests; there is no violent divergence between them. Abolish the corrupting influence of wealth and property and the false morality on which it is based, peaceful harmony can be established. Of course, Cabet reflects the invariable ambivalence in attitude to the bourgeoisie as the prosperous little man and the bourgeoisie as the capitalist aristocrats but he does not advance on other thinkers. He aims at the brotherhood of man as preached in the Gospel and although it was doubtlessly rather extravagant to view this in Communism, it could hardly be regarded as a subversive doctrine based on class war.<sup>19</sup>

The Communists united in 1839 soon split up with a bitter feud developing between Cabet and his followers on the one hand, and the upholders of what might be termed "materialist" Communism.<sup>20</sup> This was, of course, in general a form of babouvism present earlier in the secret societies as can be seen from this statement in a publication of the

<sup>18</sup> Cabet, Note 6, p. 460

<sup>19</sup> This attitude of Cabet, of course, aroused the anger of the other group of Communists, see Bernstein, Note 1, pp. 272 ff.

<sup>20</sup> The term is from von Stein.

## Société des Saisons:

"Guerre encore entre vous qui jouissez d'une insolente oisiveté et nous qui souffrons depuis si longtemps.. Ce que le riche possède n'est le plus souvent que le fruit de la rapine; la terre doit appartenir à tout le monde: ceux qui ne possèdent rien ont été volés par ceux qui possèdent.. Nous sommes 24 millions de pauvres et nos ennemis sont en petit nombre". 21

Laponneraye has been considered to represent this type of Babouvism of the 1830's. However, although undoubtedly, he was an admirer of Babeuf and a believer in communism, it would be difficult to call him either a babouvist or a materialist.<sup>22</sup> Admittedly, he saw the importance of the class struggle but he did not draw the final conclusion.<sup>23</sup> In fact, in accordance with the tendency of the times, Laponneraye was a moralist and the true conflict for him was that between tyranny and liberty.

21 From their journal "L'Homme libre" No. 4 quoted in Sencier, Le Babouvisme après Babeuf, Paris 1912, p. 108

22 The difficulty of classifying and summarising the ideas of writers of this time is well expressed by Morange in Idees Communistes.. p. 78: "Il est donc très malaisé de donner un résumé synthétique des conceptions philosophiques d'un Laponneraye, d'un Lahautière ou d'un Pillot, d'autant que pour rendre notre tâche plus difficile encore ces publicistes ne se sont jamais souciés de mettre un peu d'ordre dans leurs idées". However, one thing is certain, there is almost a complete lack of original ideas.

23 Lucien de la Hodde in Histoire des Sociétés secrètes et du parti républicain de 1830 à 1848, Paris 1850, says, p. 268 "MM. Laponneraye et Lahautière, dans le journal "L'Intelligence". commencent le mouvement communiste, mais sans y mettre cette hardiesse et ce grand dehors de conviction qui entraîne les masses".

In addition, he saw all evil springing from the materialist philosophy of the 18th century and looked forward to the ultimate establishment of the ideals of Christianity.<sup>24</sup>

Of course, again in accordance with his times, he associated moral principles with classes, for instance, the spirit of egoism is typified by the bourgeoisie, at least a section of it for according to Laponneraye it is divided into at least two parts - the bourgeois aristocracy which made the revolution of 1789 and the middle bourgeoisie which made that of 1791.<sup>25</sup> Apparently, it is the aristocracy in the bourgeoisie which aspires to create a new dominance and a new servitude.<sup>26</sup> It represents the retrogressive force for Laponneraye sees history as a conflict between two forces, the progressive and the retrogressive or stationary.<sup>27</sup> The progressive forces will,

<sup>24</sup> For instance, see Laponneraye, Mélanges d'économie sociale, de littérature et de morale, Paris, 1835/36, p. 7, Vol. I; Vol. II, p. 185 and passim.

<sup>25</sup> See Laponneraye, Histoire de la Révolution française, 3rd ed. Paris, 1838, Vol. I, p. 40 Also Défense du citoyen Laponneraye 1832, quoted in Garaudy, Les sources françaises, pp. 172-3.

<sup>26</sup> See Oeuvres de M. Robespierre, 1840, Paris, Vol. I Notice historique par Laponneraye, p. 18.

<sup>27</sup> An idea which appears to have been taken up by Proudhon when he wrote: "C'est surtout la bourgeoisie qui est stationnaire et rétrograde" in "Qu'est-ce que la Propriété" (O.C. de Proudhon Vol. I, Paris 1873, pp. 279-280).

however, triumph.<sup>28</sup> Moreover, although he regards the question of the proletariat the pressing one of the day, in fact the pressing one for thousands of years, ever threatening the idlers and exploiters, the end will be harmony since he advised the workers to unite with capital and talent à la Fourier.<sup>29</sup>

In the 1840's, the class idea attained greater strength and became associated with the concept of struggle and violence. There was a wave of Communist publications such as "La Fraternité" of Laponneraye and Lahautière; "La Tribune du Peuple" of Pillot; "L'Egalitaire" of Dézamy; "L'Humanitaire" of May. For the most part, the movement was short lived and tended to die away by 1844.<sup>30</sup> It represented a mixture of Jacobinism and Babouvism, emphasising violence and class struggle, yet rather remote from the economic analysis originating with the Saint-Simonists, since it tended towards ideas of primitive Communism as, for example, the prospectus of "L'Humanitaire", "Nous proscrivons le luxe;

28

See Oeuvres de Maximilien Robespierre, Paris 1834 Vol. I, Notice historique by Laponneraye, p. 15. (This edition of the works of Robespierre is different to the one mentioned in Note 5).

29

See Bernstein, "Le néo-babouvisme d'après la presse" in Babeuf et les Problèmes du Babouvisme, p. 258 Colloque International de Stockholm, Paris, 1963.

30

Sencier, Note 21, p. 297  
See also von Stein, Geschichte der Sozialen Bewegung in Frankreich, Vol. II, p. 419

nous voulons l'abolition des capitales ou centres de direction.." <sup>31</sup> In general, too, the aim is not to harmonise with the bourgeoisie but to destroy it. The workers must seize power from them, those representatives of the last aristocracy, in order to establish Communism. Yet what is their concept of this aristocracy or bourgeoisie? Clearly it rests on the division into rich and poor, dating from the 18th century rather than the economic angle of the liberals and the Saint-Simonists. <sup>32</sup> (That is, of course, it ignores "industrialism"). Plechanow goes as far to say that in the Communist and Socialist literature of the forties, the concept of class struggle was far from the stage of clarity reached, for instance, by Guizot. <sup>33</sup>

There is, of course, something of truth in this, especially if we think not so much of Guizot but of the economic liberals. These Communists are not notably interested in the relation of classes to economic production. For instance, Pillot sees society divided into castes, coteries and people: a caste has special

<sup>31</sup>

Quoted in de la Hodde, Note 23, p. 270

<sup>32</sup>

See Armand Cuvillier, Hommes et Idéologies de 1840, Paris, 1956, p. 237.

<sup>33</sup>

Plechanow, "Über die Anfänge der Lehre vom Klassenkampf", Die neue Zeit, 1902-3, p. 297.

privileges, such as the nobles and clergy once had, a coterie is a group succeeding the caste in having riches, power and honour, the people are those who have little or nothing. There has been a steady progress in arts and science but the people still suffer since privilege has constantly passed from one caste to another, leaving the people without any benefit. Before 1793, the people had masters, since 1793, they have had exploiters; all riches are concentrated in the hands of a few - "ils ont organisé la société de telle sorte que les masses soient toujours contenues dans le prolétariat; c'est-à-dire, que le grand nombre soit condamné à un travail incessant".<sup>34</sup> It is time this domination ended "nous venons déclarer une guerre à mort à toutes les coteries qui leur ont succédés".<sup>35</sup> These must be no big, nor small, no master, nor slave, no superior, nor inferior, no exploiter, nor exploited. Only in this way can the happiness of all be achieved - "tous nos principes, toutes nos vues, toutes nos espérances se résument en un seul mot: COMMUNAUTE".<sup>36</sup> Similarly, Dézamy talks of the rich and poor, "des valets et des maîtres", two classes diametrically opposed in interest,

<sup>34</sup> Jean-Jacques Pillot, Ni Châteaux ni Chaumières, Paris, 1840, p. 44

<sup>35</sup> Ibid, p. 49

<sup>36</sup> Ibid, p. 60

"prolétaires" and "bourgeoisie" - "Je nomme bourgeois les hommes à la destinée desquels la destinée des prolétaires est soumise et enchaînée; les hommes qui possèdent des capitaux et vivent des revenus annuels qu'ils leur rendent .. Je nomme bourgeois les propriétaires, depuis les plus riches seigneurs dans nos villes, jusqu'aux plus petits aristocrates dans nos villages.." <sup>37</sup> Which all suggests a war of those who have something against those who have nothing. Moreover, this invariably implies that the "bourgeoisie" is a very small group opposed to the immense majority of the nation "Ce sont donc les prolétaires qui constituent l'immense majorité de la nation".<sup>38</sup> It is then only a question of removing a small section of parasites whose interests are completely irreconcilable to those of the people.<sup>39</sup>

Clearly this represents an almost unalloyed revival of Babouvism - there is much in fact which appears to be a reprint of Sylvain Maréchal's famous pamphlet - the suspicion of industry, the dislike of towns, the desire to return to a simple virtuous life. There is no

<sup>37</sup> Theodore Dézamy, L'Almanach de la Communauté, see Garaudy, Note 24, p. 196

<sup>38</sup> Ibid, p. 196

<sup>39</sup> See Sencier, Note 21, p. 210 ff, to show how the Communists of this group hated any idea of alliance and fraternity between the people and the bourgeoisie.

suggestion of absorbing "industrialism" in a third stage of development. As Cuvillier points out as regards the idea of classes "ce n'est pas chez les babouvistes qu'on trouve les formules les plus nettes; il est surtout question chez eux de la guerre des "riches" et des "pauvres", des "châteaux" et des "chaumières".<sup>40</sup> This, of course, does not mean that they had no idea of economic classes since even rich and poor are economic groupings but it does mean their class divisions were not based to any great extent on the concept of "industrialism". Their chief contribution appears to have been their notion that the bourgeoisie and the proletariat have absolutely no interests in common, there can be no reconciliation. This is what so sharply divides them from Cabet and the other groups we have studied, and might perhaps be related to their "materialism" for all the other groups have a very strong sense of Christian love and harmony.<sup>41</sup> It is strange though that the group with the least insight into the new economics should have developed the concept of class war to the bitter end. Of course,

40

Cuvillier, Note 32, p. 237

41

Morange says (Idées Communistes) pp. 78-79 "Seraient matérialistes, les communistes qui repoussaient l'idée d'une intelligence divine présidant à la conception du monde en intervenant dans les actions des hommes, et niaient l'immortalité de l'âme.."

even with these Communists, we are very far from any suggestion of class rule because, in fact, the very primitivity of their notions precludes this. Once in fact the very small "coterie" of the rich has gone, the vast masses will come into their own and the bourgeoisie will presumably become people. As Dézamy said: "Ce n'est pas au Peuple à se faire Bourgeois, mais à la Bourgeoisie à se faire Peuple".<sup>42</sup>

The neo-babouvist Communist movement was not in the general line of political and social thought of this time. Far more popular even amongst the workers were ideas of political and social reform, such as the introduction of universal suffrage and the organisation of labour. Representative of these ideas was "L'Atelier", a journal of the workers, founded in 1840, and based on the thought of Buchez. In this connection, the journal adopted the Buchez class divisions, i.e. "la société est séparée en deux classes - l'une, la plus faible en nombre, qui possède les instruments de travail, la richesse publique; - l'autre, de beaucoup plus nombreuse, qui ne possède à peu près rien que ses bras et son intelligence. Celle-ci ne peut vivre qu'en se mettant au service de celle-là".<sup>43</sup>

<sup>42</sup> Dézamy, Calomnies et politique de M. Cabet, 1842, quoted in Garaudy, Note 25, p. 203

<sup>43</sup> Armand Cuvillier, Un journal d'ouvriers: L'Atelier", 1840-1850, Paris, 1954, p. 99.

Moreover, it was made quite clear that workers were not "les entrepreneurs", "les patrons", "petits employers", "ouvriers patentés", "chefs d'atelier", "contremaîtres".<sup>44</sup> In fact both Capital and Talent are cast out to leave solely Labour. There are no common interests between workers and the rest for it is clear that the masters profit when things go badly for the workers; the more miserable the poor, the more prosperous the rich. There is a constant struggle, "la lutte du travail contre le capital". All legislation has the sole aim of subjecting the workers to the bourgeoisie because it is class legislation, the attempt of one class to dominate the other. How can it be different when the government is in the hands of the "hauts barons de l'industrie". It all is another form of feudalism and unless the workers achieve economic democracy, there can be no political democracy. The lower classes must reach the level of the privileged classes by means of a change in the social order.

Like all the social critics of this period, "L'Atelier" stressed the idea of a class struggle yet like the majority also, thought it a bad thing and called on the middle class to ally with the workers instead of setting themselves up as a privileged group. As Cuvillier writes on L'Atelier: "Il exhorte les ouvriers à ne pas séparer leur cause de celle du petit commerce et des professions libérales; il

<sup>44</sup> Ibid, p. 101

fait appel à la classe moyenne et lui propose une alliance avec la classe ouvrière.. il veut lui faire comprendre que les deux classes sont "solidaires" et qu'elles ont le plus grand intérêt à marcher la main dans la main".<sup>45</sup> In fact, the middle classes were urged to stop wanting to be a class of dominators and to join in harmony of all, "car vous n'avez qu'un seul maître, qui est Jésus-Christ, et vous êtes tous frères".<sup>46</sup>

Obviously, "L'Atelier" had a clear economic or "industrial" concept of classes and must have exerted an influence in propagating these concepts. It is equally obvious, however, that the class notions do not go beyond Buchez and others of this period, deriving ultimately from the Saint-Simonists although now comprising Capital and Talent in one category. The main idea is to class as the bourgeoisie all the owners of the instruments of production and their servants or as Leroux said, "La lutte actuelle des prolétaires contre la bourgeoisie est la lutte de ceux qui ne possèdent pas les instruments de travail contre ceux qui les possèdent".<sup>47</sup> In addition, the aim is to associate the struggle of the workers against their masters to the struggle of the people against the bourgeoisie or the bourgeois state as representing, in fact, the state of

<sup>45</sup> Ibid, pp. 124-25

<sup>46</sup> Ibid, p. 131

<sup>47</sup> Leroux, Revue encyclopédique, 1833, quoted in Cuvillier, Hommes et Idéologies de 1840, Paris 1956, p. 238.

the owners of capital and the instruments of production, or the state of the "industrials". The change in the meaning of the word "industrial" whereby it is now coming to mean something like industrialist is interesting in that it reveals the divergence from Liberalism and Saint-Simonism. There is a suggestion that "industrialism" is not for the workers - it is a bourgeois creation designed to enforce the power of the bourgeoisie or the capitalists, i.e. a small money aristocracy. Yet, in fact, "industrialism" is not rejected by "L'Atelier" or any of the critics of the "social" trend. It is modified and so splits into two forms, "capitalism" and "socialism" with capitalism the creation of the bourgeoisie and socialism the creation of the "prolétaires".

Cuvillier says as regards "L'Atelier" group that "ils sont parvenus, avant les écrits de Marx et indépendamment d'eux, à une idée très nette, très rigoureuse même, de la classe sociale, définie moins par le niveau de vie que par les rapports de productions".<sup>48</sup> This may be so but for one thing, it was not the work of "L'Atelier" alone but the product of all the thinkers in this direction from the Saint-Simonists. Moreover without the Fourierist element of development from one stage of industrialism to that of

<sup>48</sup> Cuvillier, "Les Antagonismes de Classes" in International Review of Social History, 1956, p. 462.

capitalist feudalism, it conceals within it a very deep contradiction. For instance, how can the class which possesses all the instruments of labour and all the talent be "le plus faible en nombre"? How can a small number of exploiters, controlling all the riches include too "petits employeurs, ouvriers patentés, chefs d'ateliers, contre-maîtres" etc.? There is a tendency to conceal this confusion by referring to the big men as the "bourgeoisie" and the little men as "la classe moyenne" but this does not solve the problem at all if they are all jumbled together as capitalists. There is an inconsistency of thought, clearly shown in the idea of class reconciliation when the bourgeoisie cease always to be feudal barons but become the middle class of small owners with the presupposition, of course, that there are not two classes at all, industrial feudalism will not come and the true industrialism will be based on class reconciliation and harmony.

Summarising this Section, it might be said that, from the early criticisms of the doctrine of the economic liberals, it is possible to trace out the development into firstly the social moralism of the 1830's, then Fourierism and later Communism and Socialism. The leading group behind this development was the Saint-Simonists. Extending and modifying the ideas of Saint-Simon and Sismondi, they

made the first approach to a systematic criticism of liberalism. They are the first to formulate a system in which the bourgeoisie appear as a distinct economic class of idler exploiters. To us, this could suggest the beginnings of a class theory, nobles-bourgeoisie-proletariat, but such a scheme was never formulated. The bourgeoisie remained, it is true, a category of economic exploiters but, at the same time, possessed of a transitory, accidental character as if they should not have been at all and, as if, but for them, the moral perfection so near at hand during the French Revolution would have been realised. From this point of view, the bourgeoisie is not solely an economic category but also a moral one and generally the struggle is not between classes but between ideas. That is why in the end the classes could be reconciled for it was not a system of production that was at stake but a set of ideas.

The Fourierists are the second notable group after the Saint-Simonists. They stand out chiefly on account of their definite scheme of historical progress. This scheme was not fundamentally economic - there are no economic links between the stages and phases. However, at least, it foresaw beyond the liberal stage and suggested, in fact, that in history there was a "bourgeois" stage followed by a "capitalist" stage, followed by a "people" stage. The difficulty originating with the Fourierists was that their definition of the bourgeoisie did not accord with the

dominant version preached by the Saint-Simonists and this was a source of confusion which might ultimately have affected Marx because there was in the 1830's and 1840's in France a tendency to regard the bourgeoisie both as the feudal monopolists and as the small craftsmen and small industrials due for destruction. Certainly, the works of Louis Blanc reveal such a confusion.

In this connection, there is during this period a remarkable divergence between the analysis of society in theory and the actual society in practice. For instance, in theory, there was often the tendency to see society already divided into a small group of capitalists (bourgeoisie) and great mass of wage slaves whilst in practice it was generally seen to possess a large intermediate class of peasants, craftsmen, shopkeepers, intellectuals etc. (the bourgeoisie).

In addition, one other very noticeable feature is the strong moral or Christian element expressed in the desire for class harmony and reconciliation. Only a small group of Communists ever imagine a class struggle to the bitter end with the triumph of one class over the other. Everywhere else is the complete expectation that somehow or other bourgeois and prolétaire will come together. Of course, this reflects the basic anti-economic outlook of this period in contrast to the liberals. Class harmony in fact is attained not by economic progress but moral progress.

CONCLUSION

From the foregoing study, it is possible to trace out certain stages in the evolution of the term "bourgeoisie".

1. During the period of the French Revolution 1789 to 1796, two versions of the term develop:-

(a) the term used to denote a small aristocracy of the rich, representing a new form of feudalism based on wealth and closely allied to the moral concepts of egoism, individualism and selfishness, derived from the moral condemnation of wealth common to the 18th century, implying thereby a condemnation of the wealthy;

(b) the term used to denote the mass of citizens, the people, neither very rich, nor very poor, forming the backbone of the nation, embodying the principles of Reason, as represented in the doctrines of the Revolution.

2. The next important stage is represented by the ideas of the liberals, in particular the economists and historians (foreshadowed by Barnave), when the term "bourgeoisie" is used to denote the industrial class, the mass of industrious citizens who, in discovering and furthering industry and commerce, have realised a completely new moral, political, and economic system which will permit everyone to achieve happiness and prosperity simply by following his own interest, provided of course

the small idler and non-productive class has been overcome.

3. The third stage is to be found in the ideas of Saint-Simon. He regards the bourgeoisie to be a form of bastard feudalism, composed of non-noble functionaries, military men and rentiers who attempt to maintain the old feudal system of force and conquest against the peaceful system of the industrials. This idea of the bourgeoisie was considerably extended by the Saint-Simonists who considered the bourgeoisie to be the idler and non-productive class, that is the rentiers, the capitalists and the landowners monopolising the instruments of production and opposed to the mass of the people or the "prolétaires". It was this class which seized power in 1830, overcoming one aristocracy to establish their own bourgeois aristocracy.

4. The Saint-Simonist concept is extended by Buchez, Leroux, Blanc etc. to include all those who own the means of production whether idlers or not, that is also the entrepreneur class and the small capitalist owner-workers. This economic definition does not, however, rule out the moral factor for there is also the tendency to see the bourgeoisie as the personification of vice, the representatives of egoism, individualism, greed opposed to virtue that is, social harmony, association, and altruism, the love of man for his fellow. This moral element is particularly noticeable in the Communists with the result that for them virtue can only be attained by abolishment

of vice, property and the bourgeoisie.

5. The fifth important stage is that of the Fourierists. They introduce stages in the development of the "bourgeoisie". Originating in the Middle Ages, this class achieve its peak in 1789 and from thence forward decline into a bourgeois aristocracy since the false principles of the bourgeoisie (in the wide sense) result in their destruction by creating from their midst a capitalist and neo-feudal aristocracy. However, there is from about 1834 a tendency to confuse the Fourier use of the term "bourgeoisie" with the Saint-Simonist use so that the word is sometimes used to denote the first stage (extended sense) and the second stage (the narrow sense).

From this analysis, it can be seen that in order to avoid misleading or erroneous statements, the various meanings of the term must be kept in mind. For instance, during the French Revolution, it is important to distinguish the various usages of the term and to remember that the conflicting parties used the word in quite opposing senses. It would be meaningless to say that Barnave advocated the rule of the bourgeoisie without making clear that Barnave was not using the term in the same way as Robespierre, let alone Marx. Similarly, the same care should apply to the Liberals. It is hardly

correct to use the statements of Guizot to prove that he believed the French Revolution to be the triumph of the bourgeoisie unless it is made quite clear he was using the word in a sense very different to later usage.<sup>1</sup> Likewise, although Saint-Simon, the Saint-Simonists and the writers of the 1830's and 40's all use the term in the restricted sense, it must be realised that they include different groups in the same class.<sup>2</sup> For instance, when the Saint-Simonists speak of the "bourgeois" revolution of 1830, they do not mean the same "bourgeoisie" as does Louis Blanc when he uses the term. Finally, it is necessary to keep in mind the tendency from 1834 onwards to confuse the two definitions and to use the term "bourgeoisie" indiscriminately to mean the middle classes and to mean the bourgeois aristocrats.

As a general conclusion, it could be said that the term "bourgeoisie" varies in relation to three systems of thought: Moralism with the bourgeoisie epitomising the vices of greed and egoism; Economism with the bourgeoisie symbolising the virtues of industry, and Socialism with the bourgeoisie representing the vices of capitalism.

<sup>1</sup> See Soboul, The Parisian Sans-Culottes and the French Revolution, Oxford, 1964, p. 1

<sup>2</sup> See Alfred Cobban, The Social Interpretation of the French Revolution, Cambridge, 1964, p. 58, when he writes, "As St. Simon wrote, 'It was not the industrialists who made the revolution. It was the bourgeois' - a verdict which incidentally suggests that industrialists were not normally included in the term 'bourgeois' ". Cobban does not realise that Saint-Simon's definition of the "bourgeoisie" is essentially one of his own making.

Finally, there is the question of the present day usage. How useful is it to speak of the "bourgeoisie" in such phrases as 'the French Revolution was the work of the bourgeoisie'? Obviously such a statement can have meaning only when related to a social theory in the definition of, say, Thierry, or Saint-Simon, or the Saint-Simonists, or Fourier, or Marx. However, writers often use the term and apparently think it is in the same category as shopkeepers, artisans and so on, so that there is no necessity to define the term. In fact, of course, they are presuming a definition from one of the theories we have mentioned - usually the version popularised by Marx, although, often enough, they would not accept the social theories of Marx. Accordingly, it might be more profitable to ask not: did the bourgeoisie make the French Revolution but: who did make the French Revolution, and so avoid easy generalisations and clear the ground for an improved theory of revolutions.

B I B L I O G R A P H YI. INTRODUCTION

- Barber, Elinor G. The Bourgeoisie in 18th Century France, Princeton, 1955.
- Bloch, Marc, The Historian's Craft, Manchester University Press, 1963.
- Bury, J. B. The Idea of Progress, London, 1920.
- Cahen, Léon, "L'idée de lutte de classes au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle" Revue de synthèse historique, Vol. 12, 1906
- Cobban, Alfred "The Vocabulary of Social History", Political Science Quarterly, Vol. LXXI, March 1956.
- Dakin, D. Turgot and the Ancien Régime in France, London, 1939.
- Ducros, Louis, French Society in the 18th Century, London, 1926
- Espinas, Alfred, La philosophie sociale du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle et la Révolution, Paris, 1898.
- Funck-Brentano, The old régime in France
- Leuilliot, P. "Bourgeoisie en 1789" Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine, Vol. I, 1954.
- Lichtenberger, A. Le socialisme au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle, Paris, 1895
- Lough, John, An Introduction to 18th Century France, London, 1960.
- Martin, Kingsley French Liberal Thought in the 18th Century, London, 1954.
- Mercier, L. S. Tableau de Paris, Amsterdam, 1783-9
- Montesquieu, De l'Esprit des Loix, Paris, 1950
- Mornet, D. Les origines intellectuelles de la Révolution française, Paris, 1933
- Rousseau, J. J. The Social Contract, La Nouvelle Heloise, Emile
- Sagnac, Philippe, La Formation de la Société française moderne, Vol. II, Paris, 1946

- Sampson, R.V. Progress in the Age of Reason, London, 1956
- Talmon, J. L. The Origins of Totalitarian Democracy, London, 1952.
- Teggart, F. J. Theory and Processes of History, University of California Press, 1962
- Turgot, Anne Robert Jacques, Oeuvres, ed.Schelle, Paris, 1913
- Weulersse, G. La physocratie sous les ministères de Turgot, Paris, 1950

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR CHAPTERS I AND II

- Aulard, A. Etudes et leçons sur la Révolution française, Paris 1924
- Advielle, Victor, Histoire de Gracchus Babeuf et du Babouvisme, Paris, 1884
- Babeuf, Gracchus, Textes Choisis, Editions Sociales, Paris, 1965
- Bailly, Jean Sylvain Mémoires, ed. Berville et Barrière, Paris, 1821
- Barbaroux, Mémoires, Les Classiques de la Révolution françaises, Paris 1936
- Barère, Bertrand Mémoires, ed. Carnot et David, Paris, 1842
- Barnave, Antoine Oeuvres, ed. M. Bérenger de la Drome, Paris, 1843
- Bax, Ernest Belfort, The Last Episode of the French Revolution London, 1911
- Bouillé, François, Mémoires, ed. F. Barrière & Lesure (In Bibliothèque des Mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France, Paris, 1854-1890)
- Bouissounese, J., Condorcet: le philosophe dans la Révolution, Paris, 1962.
- Bécamps, Pierre, La Révolution à Bordeaux, J. B. M. Lacombe, Président de la Commission Militaire, Bordeaux, 1953
- Bessand-Massenet, Robespierre, Paris, 1961
- Bourdin, Isabelle, Les sociétés populaires à Paris pendant la révolution, Paris, 1937.

- Bradby, E.D., Life of Barnave, Oxford, 1915
- Braesch, F. 1789: L'Année Cruciale, Paris, 1940
- Brissot, J.P., To his Constituents, Trans. from the French, London, 1794.
- Brissot, J.P., Mémoires, ed. Barrière & Lesure (In Bibliothèque des Mémoires relatifs a l'histoire de France, Paris, 1854-1890)
- Buchez, P.J.B. and Roux, P.C., Histoire Parlementaire de la Révolution, Paris, 1834-38.
- Buonarroti, Philippe, Conspiration pour l'égalité dite de Babeuf, Editions sociales, Paris, 1957.
- Buzot, François, Mémoires sur la Révolution française, ed. M. Guadet, Paris, 1823.
- Caron, Pierre, Rapports des Agents du Ministre de l'Intérieur dans les Départements, Paris, 1913
- Champion, E. La France d'après les Cahiers de 1789, Paris, 1897
- Chassin, Ch. L. Les Elections et les Cahiers de Paris de 1789, Paris, 1888
- Chénier, A. Oeuvres complètes, ed. G. Walter, Paris, 1950.
- Cobban, A. The Social Interpretation of the French Revolution, Cambridge, 1964
- Cobban, A. "The Political Ideas of Maximilien Robespierre during the period of the Convention", English Historical Review, LXI, 1946.
- Colloque International de Stockholm Babeuf et les Problèmes du Babouvisme, Paris, 1963
- Condorcet, Antoine, Oeuvres complètes, Brunswick & Paris, 1804.
- Condorcet, Antoine, Sketch for a historical picture of the progress of the Human Mind, trans. June Barraclough, 1955.
- Cunow, Heinrich, Die Marxsche Geschichts-, Gesellschafts- und Staatstheorie, Berlin, 1923
- Dalin, V. M. Babeuf-Studien, East Berlin, 1961

- Danton, George, Discours, ed. André Frigbourg, Paris, 1910
- Daunou, Pierre, Mémoires, ed. Barrière & Lesure (In Bibliothèque des Mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France, Paris, 1854-1890).
- Dauban (ed.) Charles Aimé La Démagogie en 1793 à Paris, Paris, 1868
- Dautry, Jean, "Le pessimisme économique de Babeuf et l'histoire des Utopies", Annales Historiques de la Révolution française, No. 163, 33 yr. 1961
- De Ségur, Mémoires et Souvenirs, ed. Barrière & Lesure (In Bibliothèque des Mémoires relatifs à l'Histoire de France, Paris, 1854-1890).
- Desmoulins, Camille, Le vieux Cordelier, ed. Henri Calvel, Paris 1936
- Dommanget, Maurice, Babeuf et la Conjuration des Egaux, Paris, 1922
- ed. Dommanget, M. Pages Choiesies de Babeuf, Paris, 1935
- Dommanget, Maurice, Sylvain Maréchal, Paris, 1950
- Dommanget, Maurice, Jacques Roux, Le Curé Rouge, Paris, 1948
- Deville, Paul Sainte-Claire La Commune de l'An II, Paris, 1947
- Espinas, Alfred, La philosophie sociale du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle et la Révolution, Paris, 1898
- Flint, Robert, History of the Philosophy of History, Edinburgh and London, 1893
- Fleury, Edouard, Babeuf et le Socialisme en 1796, 2nd ed. Paris 1851
- Fouché, Joseph, Mémoires, Paris, 1824
- Garaudy, Roger, Les sources françaises du socialisme scientifiques, Paris, 1948
- Godechot, J. La Pensée Révolutionnaire, Paris, 1964
- Guérin, Daniel, La lutte de classes sous la première république, 3rd. ed., Paris, 1946.
- Groethuysen, Bernard, Philosophie de la Révolution française, Paris, 1956
- Hampson, Norman, A Social History of the French Revolution, London, 1963.

- Hébert, Jacques René Le père Duchesne, ed. F. Braesch, Paris, 1938
- Herriot, Edouard, Lyon n'est plus, Paris, 1939
- Jaurès, Jean, Histoire socialiste de la Révolution française, Paris, 1901
- Leroy, Maxime, Histoire des idées sociales en France, Paris, 1946
- Lichtenberger, André, Le Socialisme et la Révolution, Paris, 1899
- Louvet, Jean Baptiste, Mémoires, ed. Barrière et Lesure (In Bibliothèque des Mémoires relatifs à l'Histoire de France, Paris, 1854-1890).
- Marat, Jean-Paul Textes Choisis, ed. Vovelle, Editions sociales, Paris, 1963.
- Markov, Walter and Soboul, Albert, Die Sansculotten von Paris - Dokumente (in French and German) E. Berlin, 1957
- ed. Markov, Walter, Jakobiner und Sansculotten, Beitrage zur Geschichte der Franzoesischen Revolutionsregierung, E. Berlin, 1956.
- Mathiez, A. La Vie Chère, Paris, 1927
- Michon, Georges, Essai sur l'histoire du parti feuillant ADRIEN DUPORT, Paris, 1924
- Petion, Jérôme, Mémoires, ed. Dauban, Paris, 1866
- Prudhomme, L., Révolutions de Paris, 1791, 1792, 1793, 1794
- Robespierre, Augustin and Maximilien Correspondance, ed. G. Michon, Paris, 1926
- Robespierre, M., Oeuvres complètes, Paris, 1914 onwards
- Robespierre, M., Oeuvres, ed. Laponneraye, Paris, 1840
- Robespierre, M., Textes Choisis, Paris, 1958, Editions Sociales
- Rabaut, M. J. P., Almanach historique de la Révolution française par l'année 1792, Rédigé par M.J.P. Rabaut à Paris, 1793.
- Roland, Mme. Mémoires, ed. Barrière et Lesure (In Bibliothèque des Mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France, Paris, 1854-1890)

- Roux, René "La Révolution française et l'idée de lutte des classes". Revue d'histoire économique et sociale, Vol. 29, 1951
- Rudé, G. The Crowd in the French Revolution, Oxford, 1959
- Saint-Just, Louis, Discours et Rapports, ed. Soboul, Editions sociales, Paris.  
Oeuvres complètes, ed. Vellay, Paris, 1908
- Scarfe, F. André Chénier, London, 1965
- Schapiro, J. Condorcet and the Rise of Liberalism, New York, 1934  
Salwyn
- Schmidt, A. Tableaux de la Révolution française, Leipzig 1867-1871
- Sieyès, Emmanuel, What is the Third Estate?, Trans. M. Blondel, London, 1963.
- Soboul, Albert, The Parisian Sans-Culottes, Oxford, 1964
- v. Stein, Lorenz, Geschichte der Sozialen Bewegung in Frankreich, Munich, 1921
- Stephens, H. Morse, Orators of the French Revolution, London, 1892
- Sydenham, M. J. The Girondins, London, 1961
- Sydenham, M. J. The French Revolution, London, 1965
- Thompson, Eric, Popular Sovereignty and the French Constituent Assembly, Manchester U.P., 1952
- Thompson, J.M. Robespierre, Oxford, 1935
- Wallon, H. Histoire du Tribunal Révolutionnaire de Paris, Paris 1880  
Les Représentants du Peuple en Mission, Paris, 1889
- Walter, G. Robespierre, Paris, 1961
- Walter, G. Babeuf 1760-1797 et la Conjuration des Egaux, Paris, 1937.
- Young, A. Travels in France, ed. Bethan Edwards, 3rd ed. 1890.

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR CHAPTER III

- Allix, Edgard "La Rivalité entre la Propriété foncière et la fortune mobilière sous la Révolution". Revue d'Histoire Economique et Sociale, 1913, Paris
- Baldensperger, F. Le Mouvement de Idées dans l'émigration française 1789-1815, Paris, 1925.
- Barth, P. Die Philosophie der Geschichte als Soziologie, Leipzig, 1922
- Dalin, V. M. "Marc-Antoine Jullien nach dem 9, Thermidor" in his Babeuf-Studien, East Berlin, 1961
- Dautry, J. "Saint-Simon et les anciens babouvistes" Annales historiques de la Révolution française, No. 162
- Destutt de Tracy, Antoine, Commentaire sur l'Esprit des Lois de Montesquieu, Paris 1822 (written 1806)
- Dommanget, M. Sylvain Maréchal, Paris 1950
- Flint, R. History of the Philosophy of History, Edinburgh, 1893.
- Gide and Rist A History of Economic Doctrines, trans. by R. Richards, London, 1915.
- Leroy, Maxime, Histoire des idées sociales en France, Paris, 1946.
- Mathiez, Albert La Réaction Thermidorienne, Paris, 1929
- Paganel, M. P. Essai historique et critique sur la Révolution française, 2nd ed., Paris, 1815.

- Palyi, M. "Introduction of Adam Smith on the Continent" in Adam Smith 1776-1926, 7 Lectures, Chicago, 1929
- Picavet, Francois, Les Idéologues, Paris, 1891
- Plechanow, G. "Über die Anfänge der Lehre vom Klassenkampf", Die neue Zeit: 1902-1903
- Saint-Simon, Henri de Lettres d'un habitant de Genève à ses Contemporains - in Oeuvres Choisies, 1803, Bruxelles, 1859, Vol. I. Also translated in part in Henri de Saint-Simon, Social Organisation, The Science of Man and other writings, ed. and trans. by Felix Markham
- " Introduction aux travaux scientifiques du dix-neuvième siècle, 1807-8 in O. Choisies, Bruxelles, 1859, Vol. I
- " Mémoires sur la science de l'homme 1813, Oeuvres de Saint Simon et d'Enfantin, Vol. 40, 1876, Paris
- " Travail sur la Gravitation Universelle, 1813, O. Choisies, Vol. I.
- Say, Jean-Baptiste Traité d'économie politique, Paris, 1826 (1st published 1803)
- Schmidt, A. Tableaux de la Révolution française, Leipzig, 1867-1871

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR CHAPTERS IV, V, VI, VII AND VIII

- Artz, F. B., France under the Bourbon Restoration,  
Harvard U.P., 1931.
- Bagge, Dominique, Les Idées politiques en France sous la  
Restauration, Paris, 1952
- de Barante, Brugière  
A. G. P. La vie Politique de M. Royer Collard, Paris, 1861
- Barth, Paul Die Philosophie der Geschichte als Soziologie,  
Leipzig, 1897.
- de Bonald, Louis, Oeuvres complètes, Paris, 1864
- Bonnal de Ganges, E. Manuel et son Temps, Paris, 1877
- de Chateaubriand, F. Essai historique sur les Révolutions,  
Oeuvres, Vol. I, Paris, 1840
- de Chateaubriand, F. Etudes historiques in Oeuvres, Vol. 7, Paris 1840
- Comte, Charles, Traité de Legislation, Paris, 1827
- Constant, B., Cours de Politique Constitutionnelle, 3rd ed.,  
Bruxelles, 1837 (1st published 1818/19).
- Constant, B. Oeuvres, ed. Roulin: Pléide Edition, Paris, 1957
- Constant, B. Mémoires sur les Cent Jours, Paris, 1822
- Cousin, Victor, Histoire de la Philosophie Morale, Paris, 1839
- Destutt de Tracy,  
Antoine, Traité d'Economie politique, Paris, 1823
- Dunoyer, Charles, De la liberté du travail, Paris, 1845 (mostly  
written in 1820's)
- Faguet, Emile Politiques et Moralistes du dix-neuvième siècle.  
Première Série, Paris, 1890
- Flint, R. History of the Philosophy of History,  
Edinburgh, 1893
- Garaudy, R. Les sources françaises du socialisme  
scientifique, Paris, 1949
- de la Gorce, Pierre, Louis XVIII, Paris, 1926

- Guizot, F. History of the Origin of Representative Government in Europe, Trans. Andrew Scoble, London, 1852 (Originally written 1821/22)
- Guizot, F. Essai sur l'Histoire de France, 7th ed., Paris 1847 (Originally written 1823).
- Guizot, F. Histoire de la Civilisation en France, Paris 1853 (first published 1829).
- Guizot, F. Histoire de la Civilisation en Europe, 11th ed., (Lectures given 1828, 29 and 30).
- Guizot, F. Du Gouvernement de la France depuis la Restauration, Paris, 1821.
- Guizot, F. Des Moyens de Gouvernement et d'Opposition dans l'Etat actuel de la France, Paris, 1821
- Guizot, F. Histoire de la Révolution d'Angleterre, Paris, 1864
- Hall, J. R. The Bourbon Restoration, London, 1909
- Harpaz, Ephraim, "'Le Censeur Européen': Histoire d'un journal industrialiste", Revue d'histoire économique et sociale, Vol. 37, 1959
- Johnson, Douglas, Guizot: Aspects of French History, London, 1963
- Jullian, Camille, Extraits des historiens français du XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle, Paris, 1896.
- Leroy, Maxime, Histoire des Idées Sociales en France, Paris, 1962
- de Maistre, J. Oeuvres complètes, Paris 1931
- Michel, Henry, L'Idée de l'Etat, Paris, 1896
- Mignet, F. A. M., Histoire de la Révolution française, Paris, 1824 trans. History of the French Revolution, Everyman, London, 1926
- de Nesmes-Desmarets, Robert, Les doctrines politiques de Royer-Collard, Paris, 1908
- Petit, Edouard, Francois Mignet, Paris, 1889
- Plechanow, G. "Ueber die Anfänge der Lehre vom Klassenkampf": Die Neue Zeit, 1902-03
- Pouthas, Charles H. Guizot pendant la Restauration 1814-1830, Paris, 1923.

- de Rémusat, Paul, A. Thiers, Paris, 1889
- Ruggiero, Guido, The History of European Liberalism, Boston, 1961
- Saint-Simon and A. Thierry, De La Réorganisation de la Société Européenne in O. Choisis, Vol. II, Brussels, 1857
- de Stael, Mme. Considération sur les principaux événements de la Révolution française in Oeuvres Complètes, Vols. 12, 13, 14, Paris, 1820
- Tchernoff, I. A. Le Parti républicain sous la monarchie de Juillet, Paris, 1901
- Thierry, A. Histoire de la Conquête de l'Angleterre Paris, 1865 (first published 1825)
- Thierry, A. L'Industrie, Vol. I, 1817 (in Oeuvres de Saint-Simon and D'Enfantin, Vol. 18, Paris, 1868
- Lettres sur l'histoire de France (25 letters, 10 published in Le Courrier français the end of 1820's, the others written in 1830's) in Oeuvres complètes, Vol. V, 1846, Paris, 8th ed.
- Dix Ans D'Etudes Historiques 1817-27 in O.C., Vol. VI
- Récits des Temps Mérovingiens précédé de Considérations sur l'histoire de France, nouvelle édition, Paris, 1840.
- Thierry A. Augustin, A. Thierry 1795-1856 D'Après sa Correspondance et ses papiers de famille, Paris, 1822
- Thiers, A. Histoire de la Révolution française, Paris, 1846 (first published
- Thureau-Dangin, Paul Le parti libéral sous la Restauration, 2nd. ed. Paris, 1888.

SAINT-SIMON

De la réorganisation de la société européenne 1814  
in Oeuvres Choiesies, Brussels, 1859, Vol. II.

Profession de foi de Comte de Saint-Simon au sujet de l'invasion  
du territoire français par N. Bonaparte, 1815. O. Choiesies

L'Industrie 1817 and 1818 in Oeuvres complètes de Saint-Simon et  
D'Enfantin, Paris, 1868, Vol. 18 and 19

(part of the 1818 L'Industrie is also printed in Rodrigues  
book, Oeuvres de Saint-Simon, 1832, under the title  
"Vues sur la propriété et la législation").

Le Politique 1819, Oeuvres de Saint-Simon et D'Enfantin, Vol. 19

L'Organisateur, 1819, Oeuvres de Saint-Simon et D'Enfantin, Vol. 20  
(parts of it in O. Choiesies)

Du Système Industriel 1821/22, first part in O. Choiesies, and  
second part in Oeuvres de Saint-Simon et D'Enfantin, Vol. 23.

Catéchisme des Industriels 1823/24 in O. Choiesies

Opinions littéraires, philosophiques et industrielles, 1825, O. Choiesies

Nouveau Christianisme 1825 in Oeuvres ed. Rodrigues.

ON SAINT-SIMON

- |                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| Bernstein, Samuel  | "Saint-Simon's Philosophy of History".<br><u>Science and Society</u> , xii, 1948  |
| Cunow, H.          | Saint-Simon als Geschichtstheoretiker",<br><u>Die Neue Zeit</u> , 38 Jg., 1919/20   |
| Cuvillier, Armand, | "Les Antagonismes de Classes de Saint-Simon<br>à 1848". <u>International Review of Social<br/>History</u> , Vol. I, 1956. |
| Durkheim, Emile,   | <u>Socialism and St.-Simon</u> , Ohio, 1958   |
| Grossman, Henryk,  | "Evolutionist Revolt against classical<br>economics", <u>Journal of Political Economy</u> ,<br>Vol. LI, Feb.-Dec., 1943.  |
| Isambert, Gaston,  | <u>Les Idées socialistes en France de 1815<br/>à 1848</u> , Paris 1905  |
| Manuel, F.         | <u>The New World of Henri Saint-Simon</u> ,<br>Harvard U.P., 1956.  |

On Saint-Simon, continued

- Muckle, F. Saint-Simon und die ökonomische Geschichtstheorie, Jena, 1906
- Pechan, Hermann, Louis Blanc als Wegbereiter des modernen Sozialismus, Jena, 1929
- Simon, Walter M. "Saint-Simon and the Idea of Progress", Vol. 17, 1956, Journal of the History of Ideas.
- Spuehler, Willy, Der Saint-Simonismus: Lehre u. Leben von Saint Amand Bazard, Zurich, 1926
- Stark, W. "Saint-Simon as a Realist", The Journal of Economic History, Vol. III, N.Y., 1943

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR CHAPTERS IX AND X

- D'Allemagne, Henry René Les Saint-Simoniens, 1827-1837, Paris, 1930
- Bourgin, Hubert, Fourier, Paris, 1905
- Charl  ty, Sebastien, Histoire du Saint-Simonisme, Paris, 1896
- Cole, G. D. H. Socialist Thought: The Forerunners 1789-1850, London, 1953.
- Cuvillier, A. "Les Antagonismes de Classes de Saint-Simon   1848", International Review of Social History, Vol. 1, 1956
- Flint, R. History of the Philosophy of History, Edinburgh, 1893.
- Fourier, C. Oeuvres Compl  tes, Paris, 1841
- Grossman, Henryk, "The Evolutionist Revolt against Classical Economics", Journal of Political Economy, LI, 1943.
- Hunt, H.J. Le Socialisme et le Romantisme en France, Etude de la presse socialiste de 1830   1848, Oxford, 1935.
- Isambert, G. Les Id  es Socialistes en France de 1815   1848, Paris, 1905
- Leroy, Maxime, Histoire des id  es sociales en France, Paris, 1946.

- Mazaurio, C.                    "Babouvism et le Saint-Simonisme" in Babeuf et les Problèmes du Babouvisme, Paris, 1963.
- Pechan, Hermann,                Louis Blanc als Wegbereiter des modernen Sozialismus, Jena, 1929
- Simonde de Sismondi,          Nouveaux Principes d'Economie Politique, 2nd. ed., Paris, 1827.
- Spühler, Willy,                 Der Saint-Simonismus: Lehre u. Leben v. St.-Amand Bazard, Zurich, 1926.
- Tchernoff, I.                    Le parti républicain sous la monarchie de Juillet, Paris, 1901
- Talmon, J.                        Political Messianism: The Romantic Phase, London, 1960.
- Thureau-Dangin                 Histoire de la Monarchie de Juillet, 3rd. ed. Vol. I, Paris, 1897.
- Weill, Georges,                 L'Ecole Saint-Simonienne, Paris, 1896

-----

Also Oeuvres de Saint-Simon et D'Enfantin, Paris, 1877

- For instance: Vols. 2, 3, 4 .. .. L'Organisateur 1829-1831
- Vols. 14, 15, 16, 17 . Enseignement 1831/32
- Vols. 24, 25, 26, 27   Correspondance d'Enfantin 1825-1831
- Vols. 41, 42   ..    Doctrin Saint-Simonienne  
                                  Exposition par Bazard  
                                  (Vol. 41 also ed. Bouglé and  
                                  Halévy, Paris, 1924, and  
                                  translated by Iggers, 1958).
- Vols. 43, 44, 45 ..   Prédications 1830-32
- Vol. 47                 ..    Procès.

Also separately

- Trançon .. .. De la Religion Saint Simonienne, Paris, 1830.

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR CHAPTERS XI TO XIV

- Andler, Charles, Le Manifeste communiste, Paris, 1923
- Bernstein, Samuel, "Le Néo-babouvisme d'après la presse" 1837-1848", in Babeuf et Les Problèmes du Babouvisme, Paris, 1963 (Colloque International de Stockholm).
- Blanqui, Auguste, Textes Choisis: Les Classiques du Peuple, ed. Volguine, Paris, 1955.
- Blanqui, Auguste, Critique Sociale, Paris, 1885
- Blanc, Louis, Histoire de Dix Ans, 4th ed., Bruxelles, 1846.
- Blanc, Louis, Organisation du Travail, 5th ed. 1848 in The French Revolution of 1848 in its economic aspects, ed. Marriott, Oxford 1913.
- Bourgin, H. "La Doctrine de Pecqueur", Revue Socialiste, XLVI, 1907
- Buonarroti, P. Conspiration pour l'égalité dite de Babeuf, Les Classiques du Peuple, Paris, 1957.
- Bouglé, C. Socialismes françaises, Paris, 1932
- Buchez, P. J. B. Introduction à la Science de l'Histoire, 2nd ed. 1842, Paris (first published 1833)
- Buchez, P. and Roux, Histoire parlementaire de la Révolution française, Vol. I, Paris, 1834.
- Charléty, S. La Monarchie de Juillet, Vol. 5 of Lavisse Histoire de France Contemp., Paris, 1921.
- Chateaubriand F. de Mémoires d'outre-tombe, ed. Levaillant 2nd ed. 1964
- Cabet, Etienne, Histoire populaire de la révolution française de 1789 à 1830, Paris, 1839
- Cabet, Etienne, Révolution de 1830 et situation présente expliquées et éclairées par les révolutions de 1789, 1792, 1799 et 1804 et la Restauration, 2nd ed., Paris, 1833.
- Cabet, Etienne, Voyage en Icarie, Paris, 1848
- Considerant, Victor, Destinée Sociale, Paris, 1835

- Considerant, Victor Principes du Socialisme: Manifeste de la Démocratie au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle, 2nd ed. Paris, 1847
- Cuvillier, Armand Hommes et Idéologies de 1840, Paris, 1956
- Cuvillier, Armand, "Les Antagonismes de Classes" in International Review of Social History, 1956.
- Cuvillier, Armand, Un journal d'ouvriers "L'Atelier" (1840-1850), Paris, 1954.
- Derre', Jean-René, Lamennais: Ses Amis et le mouvement des idées à l'époque romantique, 1824-34, Paris, 1962
- Dommanget, M. Les Idées Politiques et Sociales d'Auguste Blanqui, Paris, 1957
- Dommanget, M. Victor Considerant, Paris, 1929
- Festy, Octave, Le Mouvement Ouvrier au début de la monarchie de Juillet, 1830-34, Paris, 1908
- Garaudy, Roger, Les sources françaises du socialisme scientifique, Paris, 1949
- Gide and Rist, A History of Economic Doctrines, London, 1915
- Gisquet, Henri Joseph, Mémoires - Ancien Préfet de Police, Paris, 1840
- Heine, H. Französische Zustände and Lutetia
- de la Hodde, Lucien, Histoire des Sociétés secrètes et du parti républicain de 1830 à 1840, Paris, 1850
- Laponneraye, Albert, Mélanges d'économie sociale, de littérature et de morale, Paris, 1835/36.
- Laponneraye, Albert Histoire de la Révolution française, 3rd ed., Paris, 1838
- Laponneraye, Albert Notice historique, in preface to Oeuvres de Robespierre, 1834, Paris, and also another Oeuvres de Robespierre of 1840.
- Lamennais, F. de Divers Ecrit pour le Peuple, Editions Lutetia, Paris, o.d.
- Leroux, Pierre De l'Egalite, Nouvelle ed. Boussac, 1848 (1st published 1838).

- Loubère, Leo "Louis Blanc's Philosophy of History",  
Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol. 17, 1956
- Lehning, A. "Buonarroti": International Review of Social  
History, Vol. I, 1956.  
  
"Buonarroti's Ideas on Communism and Dictatorship",  
International Review of Social History,  
Vol. II, 1957
- Morange, Georges, Les Idées Communistes dans les sociétés secrètes  
et dans la Presse sous la monarchie de Juillet,  
Paris, 1905
- Nobecourt, R. G. Armand Carrel, Journaliste, Rousen, o.d.
- Pechan, Hermann, Louis Blanc als Wegbereiter des modernen Sozialismus  
Jena, 1929.
- Pecqueur, C. Des Améliorations Matérielles dans leurs rapports  
avec la liberté, 2nd ed. Paris, 1843
- Pecqueur, C. Economie Sociale des intérêts du commerce,  
Paris, 1839
- Pillot, Jean-Jacques, Ni Châteaux ni Chaumières, Paris, 1840
- Plechanow, G. "Ueber die Anfänge des Klassenkampfes"  
Die Neue Zeit, 1902/3
- Robiquet, Paul Buonarroti et la Secte des Egaux, Paris, 1910
- Sencier, Georges, Le Babouvisme après Babeuf 1830-1848, Paris, 1912
- Spitzer, Alan B. The Revolutionary Theories of Louis-Auguste  
Blanqui, Columbia U.P., N.Y. 1957
- v. Stein, Lorentz, Geschichte der sozialen Bewegung in Frankreich  
(ed. 1921, München)
- Thureau-Dangin, Paul Histoire de la Monarchie de Juillet, 3rd ed.  
Paris, 1897
- Weill, Georges Histoire du parti républicain en France, 1814-1870,  
Paris, 1928.