greatly affected by both the new movements. The motive power in Owen’s career was the philanthropy and humani- tarianism of the 18th century. He had grown up in the midst of the industrial revolution ; he was one of the most successful pioneers in the improvement of the cotton manu­facture. No one could be more deeply conscious of the enormous abuses of the factory system ; and no one better knew the wonderful services it could render if technical improvement were only made subordinate to human well­being. In the career of Owen we see the new spirit of the 18th century seeking to bring the mechanism of the new industrial system under the direction of a nobler prin­ciple, in which the good of all should be the great and sole aim. The position of Saint-Simon was considerably different, yet akin. As Owen had before his eyes the evils of a young but gigantic industrialism, Saint-Simon con­templated the hoary abuses of an idle and privileged feudalism, fearfully shaken no doubt by the Revolution, but still strong in Europe, and in France as elsewhere powerfully revived during the period after Waterloo. Saint- Simon saw that a new world, an industrial world resting on labour, had arisen, while the old feudal and theological world—*-fainéant* courtiers and a clergy steeped in ignorance —still ruled. All this array of parasites, who had no longer any useful function to perform for society, Saint-Simon sought to replace by the industrial chiefs and scientific leaders as the real working heads of the French people. Only he expected that these exceptionally gifted men, instead of exploiting the labour of others, should control an industrial France for the general good. Neither Owen nor Saint-Simon was revolutionary in the ordinary sense. Owen was most anxious that the English and other Govern­ments should adopt his projects of socialistic reform. Leading statesmen and royal personages befriended him. He had no faith in the political reforms of 1832 ; he reckoned the political side of chartism as of no account, and he preferred socialistic experiment under autocratic guidance until the workmen should be trained to rule themselves. The same autocratic tendency was very pro­nounced in Saint-Simon and his school. His first appeal was to Louis XVIII. He wished to supersede the feudal aristocracy by a working aristocracy of merit. His school claim to have been the first to warn the Governments of Europe of the rise of revolutionary socialism. (For further information as to Saint-Simon and his school, see Saint- Simon.) The good and bad aspects of the Saint-Simon socialism are too obvious to require elucidation in this article. The antagonism between the old economic order and the new had only begun to declare itself. The extent and violence of the disease were not yet apparent ; both diagnosis and remedy were superficial and premature. Such deep-seated organic disorder was not to be conjured away by the waving of a magic wand. The movement was all too utopian and extravagant in much of its activity. The most prominent portion of the school attacked social order in its essential point—the family morality—adopting the worst features of a fantastic, arrogant, and prurient sacerdotalism, and parading them in the face of Europe. Thus it happened that a school which attracted so many of the most brilliant and promising young men of France, which was so striking and original in its criticism of the existing condition of things, which was so strong in the spirit of initiative, and was in many ways so noble, un­selfish, and aspiring, sank amidst the laughter and indigna­tion of a scandalized society.

The beginning of socialism may be dated from 1817, the year when Owen laid his scheme for a socialistic com­munity before the committee of the House of Commons on the poor law, the year also that the speculations of Saint-Simon definitely took a socialistic direction. The

outlines of the history of socialism are very simple. Till 1850 there was a double movement in France and England. In the former country after Saint-Simon and Fourier the movement was represented chiefly by Proudhon and Louis Blanc. In England after Owen the movement was taken up by the body of Christian socialists associated with Maurice and Kingsley. The more recent socialism is due chiefly to German and also Russian thinkers, but is generally international both in sympathy and activity.

Considered as a purely literary and speculative product, the socialism of Fourier was prior to those of both Owen and Saint-Simon. His great work, *Théorie des Quatre Mouve­ments,* was published as early as 1808. The socialism of Fourier, however, scarcely attracted any attention and exercised no influence till those of Owen and Saint-Simon were on the decline. His system is one in which the wildest fantasy is mixed with ingenious theory and the most searching criticism of the present competitive system ; even yet it is almost unrivalled in pungency and effective­ness. The pantheistic conception of the world which underlay the Saint-Simonian theory of the “ rehabilitation of the flesh ” formed the basis also of the social ethics and arrangements of Fourier. According to Fourier, evil is the artificial product and attendant of civilization, the result of perverted human institutions, which have run counter to the ordinances of the Creator in pronouncing passions and affec­tions to be bad which are simply natural. Between the creature and the Creator there have been 5000 years of misunderstanding. There is but one way of removing this misunderstanding,—to give a free and healthy and com­plete development to our passions. This Fourier sought to accomplish in his *phalanges,* which, united in a system of free federation, would, as he believed, soon cover the world (see Fourier).

The year 1830 was an important turning-point in the history of socialism. During the fermentation of that time the activity of the Saint-Simon school came to a crisis, and the ideas of Fourier had an opportunity of taking practical effect. Some of the Saint-Simonians joined him. The movement in France was short-lived ; and the numerous experiments tried in America were not more successful. One of the most notable societies suggested by Fourier’s influence, but entirely free from his immoral tendencies, was Brook Farm, established by George Ripley and other cultured Americans in 1840. A most praiseworthy and successful institution also suggested by the teaching of Fourier is the *Familistère* at Guise (Aisne) conducted by M. Godin. But by far the greatest result of the revolution of 1830 was the definitive establishment of the contrast be­tween the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Hitherto these two classes had fought side by side against feudalism and the reaction. The bourgeoisie were now rulers, and the proletariat became the revolutionary party, the first outbreak under the new conditions taking place at Lyons in 1831, when the starving workmen rose to arms with the device, “Live working or die fighting.” During the latter half of the reign of the bourgeois king Louis Philippe Paris be­came more than ever the centre of socialistic fermentation. In 1839 Louis Blanc published his *Organisation du Travail,* and Cabet his *Voyage en Icarie.* In 1840 Proudhon pub­lished his book on property. At this period Paris counted among her visitors Lassalle, the founder of the social de­mocracy of Germany ; Karl Marx, the chief of scientific international socialism ; and Bakunin, the apostle of anarchism.

The socialism of Saint-Simon and Fourier was largely speculative, imaginative, and utopian, and had only a very remote connexion with the practical life of their time. With Louis Blanc (1811-1882) socialism came into real contact with the public history of France. The most con-