men should act towards one another as brethren.” Ex­pressing the same idea in modern language, Saint-Simon propounds as the comprehensive formula of the new Christianity this precept—“The whole of society ought to strive towards the amelioration of the moral and physical existence of the poorest class ; society ought to organize itself in the way best adapted for attaining this end.” This principle became the watchword of the entire school of Saint-Simon ; for them it was alike the essence of religion and the programme of social reform.

During his lifetime the views of Saint-Simon had very little influence; and he left only a very few devoted disciples, who continued to advocate the doctrines of their master, whom they revered as a prophet. An important departure was made in 1828 by Bazard, who gave a “ complete exposition of the Saint-Simonian faith ” in a long course of lectures at Paris in the Rue Taranne. In 1830 Bazard and Enfantin were acknowledged as the heads of the school ; and the fermentation caused by the revolu­tion of July of the same year brought the whole movement prominently before the attention of France. Early next year the school obtained possession of the *Globe* through Pierre Leroux, who had joined the school, which now numbered some of the ablest and most promising young men of France, many of the pupils of the École Poly­technique having caught its enthusiasm. The members formed themselves into an association arranged in three grades, and constituting a society or family, which lived out of a common purse in the Rue Monsigny. Before long, however, dissensions began to arise in the sect. Bazard, a man of logical and more solid temperament, could no longer work in harmony with Enfantin, who desired to establish an arrogant and fantastic sacerdotalism with lax notions as to marriage and the relation of the sexes. After a time Bazard seceded and many of the strongest supporters of the school followed his example. A series of extravagant entertainments given by the society during the winter of 1832 reduced its financial resources and greatly discredited it in character. They finally re­moved to Menilmontant, to a property of Enfantin, where they lived in a communistic society, distinguished by a peculiar dress. Shortly after the chiefs were tried and condemned for proceedings prejudicial to the social order ; and the sect was entirely broken up (1832). Many of its members became famous as engineers, economists, and men of business. The idea of constructing the Suez Canal, as carried out by Lesseps, proceeded from the school.

In the school of Saint-Simon we find a great advance both in the breadth and firmness with which the vague and confused views of the master are developed ; and this progress is due chiefly to Bazard. In the philosophy of history they recognize epochs of two kinds, the critical or negative and the organic or constructive. The former, in which philosophy is the dominating force, is characterized by war, egotism, and anarchy ; the latter, which is controlled by religion, is marked by the spirit of obedience, devotion, association. The two spirits of antagonism and association are the two great social principles, and on the degree of prevalence of the two depends the character of an epoch. The spirit of association, how­ever, tends more and more to prevail over its opponent, extending from the family to the city, from the city to the nation, and from the nation to the federation. This principle of association is to be the keynote of the social development of the future. Hitherto the law of humanity has been the “ exploitation of man by man ” in its three stages, slavery, serfdom, the proletariat ; in the future the aim must be “ the exploitation of the globe by man associated to man.” Under the present system the industrial chief still exploits the proletariat, the members of which, though nominally free, must accept his terms under pain of starvation. This state of things is consolidated by the law of inheritance, whereby the instruments of production, which are private property, and all the attendant social advantages are transmitted without regard to personal merit. The social disadvantages being also transmitted, misery becomes here­ditary. The only remedy for this is the abolition of the law of inheritance, and the union of all the instruments of labour in a social fluid, which shall be exploited by association. Society thus

becomes sole proprietor, intrusting to social groups and social func­tionaries the management of the various properties. The right of succession is transferred from the family to the state. The school of Saint-Simon insists strongly on the claims of merit; they advocate a social hierarchy in which each man shall be placed according to his capacity and rewarded according to his works. This is, indeed, a most special and pronounced feature of the Saint- Simon socialism, whose theory of government is a kind of spiritual or scientific autocracy, degenerating into the fantastic sacerdotalism of Enfantin. With regard to the family and the relation of the sexes the school of Saint-Simon advocated the complete emancipa­tion of woman and her entire equality with man. The “social individual ” is man and woman, who are associated in the exercise of the triple function of religion, the state, and the family. In its official declarations the school maintained the sanctity of the Christian law of marriage. On this point Enfantin fell into a prurient and fantastic latitudinarianism, which made the school a scandal to France, but many of the most prominent members besides Bazard refused to follow him. Connected with these doctrines was their famous theory of the “rehabilitation of the flesh,” deduced from the philosophic theory of the school, which was a species of Pan­theism, though they repudiated the name. On this theory they rejected the dualism so much emphasized by Catholic Christianity in its penances and mortifications, and held that the body should be restored to its due place of honour. It is a vague principle of which the ethical character depends on the interpretation ; and it was variously interpreted in the school of Saint-Simon. It was certainly immoral as held by Enfantin, by whom it was developed into a kind of sensual mysticism, a system of free love with a reli­gious sanction.

An excellent edition of the works of Saint-Simon and Enfantin was begun by survivors of the sect in Paris (1865), and now numbers forty vols. See Reybaud, *Eludes sur les Réformateurs modernes* (7th edition, Paris, 1864); Janet, *Saint- Simon et le Saint-Simonisme* (Paris, 1878) ; A. J. Booth, *Saint-Simon and Saint- Simonism* (London, 1871). (T. K.)

SAINT-SIMON, Louis de Rouvray (or Rouvroy), Duc de (1675-1755), was born at Versailles on 16th January 1675. He was the son of Claude de Saint-Simon, who represented a family which had been established for many centuries at La Ferté Vidame, between Mortagne and Dreux, and which claimed descent from Charlemagne. Claude de Saint-Simon had been a page of Louis XIII., and, gaining the king’s favour as a sportsman, had received various preferments and was finally created *duc et pair.* This peerage is the central fact in Saint-Simon’s history, and it is impossible to understand him without under­standing it. To speak, as one of his few biographers in English has spoken, of “ a young duke of recent creation,” and of the apparent absurdity of such a young duke taking the aristocratic views which characterized Saint-Simon through life, is to show the most deplorable ignorance of the facts. The French peerage under the old *regime* was a very peculiar thing, difficult to comprehend at all, but quite certain to be miscomprehended if any analogy of the English peerage, such as is implied in the observation just quoted, is imported into the consideration. No two things could be more different in France than ennobling a man and making him a peer. No one was made a peer who was not ennobled, but men of the noblest blood in France and representing their houses might not be, and in most cases were not, peers. Derived at least traditionally and imaginatively from the *douze pairs* of Charlemagne, the peers were supposed to represent the chosen of the noblesse, and gradually, in an indefinite and constantly disputed fashion, became associated with the parlement of Paris as a quasi-legislative (or at least law-registering) and directly judicial body. But the peerage was further com­plicated by the fact that not persons but the holders of certain fiefs were made peers. Strictly speaking, neither Saint-Simon nor any one else in the same case was made a peer, but his estate was raised to the rank of a *duché pairie* or a *comté pairie* as the case might be. If all analogies were not deceptive, the nearest idea of a French peerage of the old kind may be obtained by an English reader if he takes the dignity of a Scotch or Irish representative peer, then supposes that dignity to be made hereditary, and then limits the heritableness of it not merely to descent