

IX

The Catechism of the Industrialists

Catechisme des Industriels, Paris, 1823-6; IV, 1, pp. 3-13/73-112, 40-9, 73, 94, 178-83, 195-200.

FIRST INSTALMENT

Q. What is an industrialist?

A. An industrialist is a man who works to produce, or who puts within the reach of different members of society, one or more material means of satisfying their needs or their physical tastes; thus, an agriculturalist who sows wheat or who raises poultry or cattle is an industrialist; a cartwright, a blacksmith, a locksmith, a joiner is an industrialist; a shoemaker, a hat-maker, a linen-maker, a maker of cloth, a maker of cashmere are also industrialists; merchants, hauliers, merchant-seamen, are industrialists. All these industrialists together work to produce and place within the reach of all the members of society all the material means for satisfying their needs or their physical tastes, and they form three great classes which are called agriculturalists, manufacturers and merchants.

Q. What place should the industrialists hold in society?

A. The industrial class should have the first place because it is the most important of all; because it can do without the others, whereas the others cannot do without it; because it exists by its own efforts and it personal labours. The other classes should work for the industrial class because they are its creatures and it supports them. In a word, as industry does everything, everything should be done for it.

Q. What rank do the industrialists hold in society?

A. In the present social system, the industrial class occupies the lowest rank of all. The social order gives more respect and power to work of a secondary nature, even to idleness, than to the most important work, to work which is directly useful.

Q. Why does the industrial class, which should occupy the first rank, find itself occupying the lowest? Why are those who, in effect, are first, ranked last?

A. We shall explain this in the course of this catechism.

Q. How can the industrialists pass from the inferior position in

which they find themselves to the higher one which they have the right to occupy?

A. This catechism will explain how they should improve their social condition.

Q. What is the nature of the work which you undertake? In a word, what is your object in preparing this catechism?

A. We propose to show the industrialists how to increase their well-being as much as possible; we propose to reveal to them the general methods which they ought to use to increase their social importance.

Q. How will you achieve this aim?

A. On the one hand, we shall give the industrialists a picture of their true social situation; we shall show them that it is a completely subordinate one, and thus far below what it should be, since they are the most able and useful class in society.

On the other hand, we shall trace the route they should follow to reach the first rank in esteem and power.

Q. Therefore, in this catechism you are preaching insurrection and revolt? For those particular classes which possess power and esteem will certainly not be disposed to renounce the advantages they enjoy.

A. Far from advocating insurrection and revolt, we are putting forward the only way to prevent the acts of violence which threaten society and which will only be averted with difficulty if the industrial power remains passive amid the factions struggling for power.

There will never be permanent public peace until the most important industrialists are in charge of the administration of public wealth.

Q. Explain this to us and tell us how public order will be threatened unless the most important industrialists are put in charge of the administration of the national wealth?

A. The explanation is very simple; the general political inclination of the great majority of society is to be governed as cheaply as possible; to be governed as little as possible; to be governed by the most able men and in a way which completely guarantees public order. Now the only way to satisfy the desires of the majority in these various respects lies in putting the most important industrialists in charge of public wealth; for the leading industrialists are the people most interested in the maintenance of peace; they are those most interested in economy in public expenditure; they are also most interested in limiting despotism. Lastly, they are, of all the members of society, the ones who give proof of the greatest ability in positive administration,

their success in their own businesses having established their ability in this field.

In the present state of affairs, public order is threatened because the behaviour of the government runs directly counter to the most positive wishes of the nation. What the nation wants principally is to be governed as cheaply as possible, and never has a government been so expensive; it costs far more than it did before the Revolution. Before the Revolution, the nation was divided into three classes: the nobles, the bourgeois and the industrialists. The nobles governed; the bourgeois and the industrialists paid them.

Today the nation is divided into only two classes; the bourgeois, who made the Revolution and conducted it in their own interest, have destroyed the exclusive privilege of the nobility to exploit the public wealth; they have admitted themselves into the governing class, so that today the industrialists must pay both the aristocrats and the bourgeois. Before the Revolution, the nation paid five hundred million francs in taxes; today it pays twice that sum and it is still not enough; the government frequently calls for large loans.

Public order will be increasingly threatened because costs will inevitably go on rising. The only way to prevent possible insurrections lies in charging the most important industrialists with the task of administering public wealth, that is, entrusting them with the budget.

Q. What you have just said is very good, very interesting and of the utmost importance; but it does not tell us exactly what we want to know. The point which we ask you to elucidate is this: is it possible to take the direction of the national finances of society out of the hands of the nobles, the army and the lawyers and the landowners; in a word, out of the hands of the non-industrial classes, and put it into the hands of the industrialists, without resorting to violence?

A. Violent methods are good for overturning, for destroying, but that is all they are good for. Peaceful methods are the only ones which can be used to build, to construct, in a word, to establish solid constitutions. Now, the action of investing the most important industrialists with the supreme direction of the financial interests of the nation is a constructive action; it is the most important political measure which can be taken; this measure will serve as the foundation of the whole new social edifice; it will put a stop to revolution, it will protect the nation from any new shock. The most important industrialists will undertake to draw up the budget, without payment, and the

result will be that this function will be very little coveted. The industrialists who draw up the budget will base it upon economy in the administration of public affairs. Thus, they will only pay very modest salaries to the civil servants. As these posts will be very little sought after, they will be comfortably reduced in number, so that the number of claimants will diminish, too, and, inevitably, an order will be established in which a great many places will be filled without payment, because the idle rich will have no other way of procuring esteem.

When one studies the character of the industrialists and the way they conducted themselves during the Revolution, one recognizes that they are essentially peaceful. It was certainly not the industrialists who made the revolution; it was the bourgeois, that is, it was the soldiers who were not of noble blood, the jurists who were commoners, the landowners who were not privileged. Even today, the industrialists only play a secondary role in the existing political parties and they have no opinion or political party of their own. They lean towards the Left rather than towards the Right because the claims of the bourgeois do less violence to their ideas of equality than do those of the nobility; but they have not succumbed to the ideas of the Liberals; it is peace that they desire above all. The Liberal ring-leaders, inside and outside the Chamber are generals, jurists and landowners. The nobles and the bourgeois want to be in charge of the administration of public wealth primarily in order to exploit it for their own profit. The leading industrialists, on the contrary, want to be in charge of it to run it as economically as possible.

The industrialists are well aware that they are the most fit to take charge of the financial interests of the nation, but they never put forward this idea, for fear of causing an immediate disturbance of the peace; they wait patiently for public opinion to come round to this idea and for a genuinely social doctrine to summon them to take the helm.

From this, we conclude that peaceful means, that is, debate, demonstration and persuasion, are the only means which the industrialists should use or support to take the administration of public wealth out of the hands of the nobility, the military class, the jurists, the landowners and the public officials, in order to pass it on to the most important of their own number.

Q. We agree provisionally that the industrialists will not seek to use violence to cause the supreme direction of the financial interests of society to pass from the hands of the nobles and the bourgeois into those of the most important of their own number;

IX

The Catechism of the Industrialists

Catechisme des Industriels, Paris, 1823-6; IV, 1, pp. 3-13/73-112, 40-9, 73, 94-178-83, 195-200.

FIRST INSTALMENT

Q. What is an industrialist?

A. An industrialist is a man who works to produce, or who puts within the reach of different members of society, one or more material means of satisfying their needs or their physical tastes; thus, an agriculturalist who sows wheat or who raises poultry or cattle is an industrialist; a cartwright, a blacksmith, a locksmith, a joiner is an industrialist; a shoemaker, a hat-maker, a linen-maker, a maker of cloth, a maker of cashmere are also industrialists; merchants, hauliers, merchant-seamen, are industrialists. All these industrialists together work to produce and place within the reach of all the members of society all the material means for satisfying their needs or their physical tastes, and they form three great classes which are called agriculturalists, manufacturers and merchants.

Q. What place should the industrialists hold in society?

A. The industrial class should have the first place because it is the most important of all; because it can do without the others, whereas the others cannot do without it; because it exists by its own efforts and it personal labours. The other classes should work for the industrial class because they are its creatures and it supports them. In a word, as industry does everything, everything should be done for it.

Q. What rank do the industrialists hold in society?

A. In the present social system, the industrial class occupies the lowest rank of all. The social order gives more respect and power to work of a secondary nature, even to idleness, than to the most important work, to work which is directly useful.

Q. Why does the industrial class, which should occupy the first rank, find itself occupying the lowest? Why are those who, in effect, are first, ranked last?

A. We shall explain this in the course of this catechism.

Q. How can the industrialists pass from the inferior position in

which they find themselves to the higher one which they have the right to occupy?

A. This catechism will explain how they should improve their social condition.

Q. What is the nature of the work which you undertake? In a word, what is your object in preparing this catechism?

A. We propose to show the industrialists how to increase their well-being as much as possible; we propose to reveal to them the general methods which they ought to use to increase their social importance.

Q. How will you achieve this aim?

A. On the one hand, we shall give the industrialists a picture of their true social situation; we shall show them that it is a completely subordinate one, and thus far below what it should be, since they are the most able and useful class in society.

On the other hand, we shall trace the route they should follow to reach the first rank in esteem and power.

Q. Therefore, in this catechism you are preaching insurrection and revolt? For those particular classes which possess power and esteem will certainly not be disposed to renounce the advantages they enjoy.

A. Far from advocating insurrection and revolt, we are putting forward the only way to prevent the acts of violence which threaten society and which will only be averted with difficulty if the industrial power remains passive amid the factions struggling for power.

There will never be permanent public peace until the most important industrialists are in charge of the administration of public wealth.

Q. Explain this to us and tell us how public order will be threatened unless the most important industrialists are put in charge of the administration of the national wealth?

A. The explanation is very simple; the general political inclination of the great majority of society is to be governed as cheaply as possible; to be governed as little as possible; to be governed by the most able men and in a way which completely guarantees public order. Now the only way to satisfy the desires of the majority in these various respects lies in putting the most important industrialists in charge of public wealth; for the leading industrialists are the people most interested in the maintenance of peace; they are those most interested in economy in public expenditure; they are also most interested in limiting despotism. Lastly, they are, of all the members of society, the ones who give proof of the greatest ability in positive administration,

but the peaceful intentions of the industrialists cannot be used to prove that this class is fit to lead. We ask you, therefore, to tell us what are the means the industrialists should employ to bring about the radical change in society which we are discussing.

A. The industrialists make up more than twenty-four of the twenty-five parts of the nation; thus they possess superiority in the sphere of physical force.

They produce all the wealth; thus, they also possess financial strength.

They are superior in intelligence, for it is their work which contributes most directly to the national prosperity.

Lastly, since they are the most fit to administer the financial interests of the nation, human as well as divine morality call upon their leaders to assume direction of the finance.

The industrialists are therefore invested with all the necessary means; they are invested with the irresistible means to bring about the transition in the social organization which would transform them from the class of the ruled into the class of rulers.

[pp. 40-49]

Q. You are too trenchant, too absolute, too exclusive; you want there to be only one class, that of the industrialists; this is absolutely impractical since the industrialists themselves need soldiers, lawyers, etc. Can you justify yourself in the face of this reproach?

A. To produce a system is to produce an opinion which is, by its very nature trenchant, absolute and exclusive: this is our reply to the first part of your objection. You go on to say that we wish there to be only one class in society, that of the industrialists; you are wrong: what we want, or rather what the advance of civilization requires, is that the industrial class should be established as the first of all the classes; that the other classes should be subordinate to it.

In the Dark Ages, the leadership of the nation was in the first place military and in the second industrial. At that time, all social classes had to be subordinate to the military class. This was, effectively, the social organization of that epoch and it would have been wrong had it not had this trenchant, exclusive and absolute character. The progress of civilization has led to a state of affairs in which the leadership of the French people is essentially industrial; therefore the industrial class should be placed above all the others; therefore, the other classes should

be subordinate to it. Of course, the industrialists need an army; of course, they need law courts; of course, proprietors should not be forced to invest their capital in industry; but it is monstrous that the military class, the jurists, and the idle rich should be the main directors of the public wealth in the present stage of civilization.

Q. Stop! You are going far too far for the moment; you are going to the root of the question and you are losing sight of the point which is occupying us at the moment, which is that of specifying the nature of the present state of affairs in politics. Tell us briefly what you mean.

A. Here in a few words is the résumé for which you ask: **THE PRESENT TIME IS ONE OF TRANSITION.**

Q. Let us go on to consider the future and tell us clearly and briefly what the political fate of the industrialists will be?

A. The industrialists will form the leading class in society; the most important of them will take on the administration of the public finances without payment; they will be the ones to make laws and decide the positions that the other classes shall occupy; they will give importance to each of them according to the services that they render to industry; this will be the inevitable result of the present revolution; and when this result has been obtained, peace will be guaranteed absolutely, national prosperity will advance with all possible speed, and society will enjoy all the individual and collective happiness for which human nature could wish.

This is our opinion on the future of the industrialists and of society. Here are the considerations upon which this opinion is based:

1. The recapitulation of society's past has proved to us that the industrial class has constantly grown in importance while the others have always diminished; and from this, we conclude that the industrial class must end by becoming the most important of all.

2. Pure commonsense has led everyone to the following reasoning: as men have constantly tried to improve their lot, the goal to which they have always striven has been that of establishing a social order in which the class employed in useful work is the most highly esteemed. This is the goal which society will inevitably attain in the end.

3. Work is the source of all virtues; the most useful work should be the most highly esteemed; thus divine and human morality both call on the industrial class to enjoy the first place in society.

4. Society is composed of individuals; the development of social intelligence must be the same as that of individual intelligence on a larger scale; if we look at the progress made in the education of individuals, we see, in the primary schools, that control of the children is the strongest factor; and in schools on a higher level, we see that the function of controlling the children constantly lessens in importance, while instruction plays a more important role. The same holds good for the education of society; military action, that is feudal action, had to be very strong in the beginning; it had to diminish progressively while administrative action had always to grow in importance, and inevitably, the administrative power came to dominate the military power in the end. In the end soldiers and jurists must take orders from those most capable of administration; for an enlightened society only needs to be administered; because, in an enlightened society, the power of the law, and the power of the armed forces to enforce obedience to the law, should only be used against those who disrupt the functioning of the administration. The guiding principles of social force should be supplied by the men who are most able to administer; now, as the most important industrialists are those who have given proof of the greatest administrative ability, since it is to their competence in this sphere that they owe what importance they have acquired, in short, it is they who should necessarily be given the direction of the social interests.

Q. We accept your explanation; we accept your opinion on the political future of the industrialists, and we are going to embark at once upon the examination of the great question, in relation to which all we have previously said has been only an introduction, a preparation; a question after which we shall only have to deal with secondary ones, for it is of the most direct interest to the industrialists.

Tell us how this radical change, which you have shown us must take place, should be brought about; tell us what the industrialists should do to raise themselves to the first rank in society; tell us what to do to bring this about; tell us how this undertaking should be conducted; tell us, above all, who will be daring enough to undertake such a thing.

A. Our reply to your question will be the most obvious and the most positive; we are the daring mortals who will undertake it: WE WILL UNDERTAKE TO RAISE THE INDUSTRIALISTS TO THE FIRST RANK OF ESTEEM AND POWER.

We say more: we tell you that this undertaking has already

begun by the publication of the first instalment of this FIRST INSTALMENT OF THE CATECHISM OF THE INDUSTRIALISTS.

Q. Your reply is very positive in that it is you who undertake to bring about this change which must place the industrialists at the head of society; but that is all that is positive about it. It remains for us now to see if your undertaking is well planned, if you are capable of directing such a vast enterprise; it remains for you to make known your plan and the course you mean to follow, and, above all, what financial means you possess to defray the expense of this undertaking, for the industrialists are not likely to show any interest in an enterprise, the financial aspect of which has been badly conceived and badly planned.

Moreover, we confess that we are very satisfied, that you will make this undertaking your personal concern.

It is certain that things which are everyone's business often end up by being no one's business; it is certain that personal interest is the only agent which can direct public interest. The difficulty is to find the device which combines personal with public interest. We do not think that we need to expand further on the subject of principle, since the examination has been reduced to that of a particular fact, of the fact of your undertaking. We beg you, then, to reply to the questions which we asked you at the beginning of this enquiry.

A. We shall begin by making ourselves known, for the public likes to know exactly who it is who takes the liberty of drawing attention to their own thought. We, therefore, make the following declarations to you—declarations which bear first upon our political conduct and then upon our work.

1. We played the part of an onlooker only throughout the Revolution; we held no public office; we were not even a village notable and we were not connected with any of the political parties which have divided France since 1789; in short, the opinion which we put forward is *virgin*.

2. We have not undertaken this enterprise lightly; it has taken forty-five years to think about it and to prepare it.

As a result of our reflections and study we have realized that in order to pass from the régime in which the industrialists are subject to the military class, the jurists and the landowners, to the social order which must place the direction of the general interest in the hands of the industrialists, one indispensable condition must be fulfilled, which is to have a very clear idea of the nature of the industrial régime, and to make it known to the most

but the peaceful intentions of the industrialists cannot be used to prove that this class is fit to lead. We ask you, therefore, to tell us what are the means the industrialists should employ to bring about the radical change in society which we are discussing.

A. The industrialists make up more than twenty-four of the twenty-five parts of the nation; thus they possess superiority in the sphere of physical force.

They produce all the wealth; thus, they also possess financial strength.

They are superior in intelligence, for it is their work which contributes most directly to the national prosperity.

Lastly, since they are the most fit to administer the financial interests of the nation, human as well as divine morality call upon their leaders to assume direction of the finance.

The industrialists are therefore invested with all the necessary means; they are invested with the irresistible means to bring about the transition in the social organization which would transform them from the class of the ruled into the class of rulers.

[pp. 40-49]

Q. You are too trenchant, too absolute, too exclusive; you want there to be only one class, that of the industrialists; this is absolutely impractical since the industrialists themselves need soldiers, lawyers, etc. Can you justify yourself in the face of this reproach?

A. To produce a system is to produce an opinion which is, by its very nature trenchant, absolute and exclusive: this is our reply to the first part of your objection. You go on to say that we wish there to be only one class in society, that of the industrialists; you are wrong: what we want, or rather what the advance of civilization requires, is that the industrial class should be established as the first of all the classes; that the other classes should be subordinate to it.

In the Dark Ages, the leadership of the nation was in the first place military and in the second industrial. At that time, all social classes had to be subordinate to the military class. This was, effectively, the social organization of that epoch and it would have been wrong had it not had this trenchant, exclusive and absolute character. The progress of civilization has led to a state of affairs in which the leadership of the French people is essentially industrial; therefore the industrial class should be placed above all the others; therefore, the other classes should

be subordinate to it. Of course, the industrialists need an army; of course, they need law courts; of course, proprietors should not be forced to invest their capital in industry; but it is monstrous that the military class, the jurists, and the idle rich should be the main directors of the public wealth in the present stage of civilization.

Q. Stop! You are going far too far for the moment; you are going to the root of the question and you are losing sight of the point which is occupying us at the moment, which is that of specifying the nature of the present state of affairs in politics. Tell us briefly what you mean.

A. Here in a few words is the résumé for which you ask: **THE PRESENT TIME IS ONE OF TRANSITION.**

Q. Let us go on to consider the future and tell us clearly and briefly what the political fate of the industrialists will be?

A. The industrialists will form the leading class in society; the most important of them will take on the administration of the public finances without payment; they will be the ones to make laws and decide the positions that the other classes shall occupy; they will give importance to each of them according to the services that they render to industry; this will be the inevitable result of the present revolution; and when this result has been obtained, peace will be guaranteed absolutely, national prosperity will advance with all possible speed, and society will enjoy all the individual and collective happiness for which human nature could wish.

This is our opinion on the future of the industrialists and of society. Here are the considerations upon which this opinion is based:

1. The recapitulation of society's past has proved to us that the industrial class has constantly grown in importance while the others have always diminished; and from this, we conclude that the industrial class must end by becoming the most important of all.

2. Pure commonsense has led everyone to the following reasoning: as men have constantly tried to improve their lot, the goal to which they have always striven has been that of establishing a social order in which the class employed in useful work is the most highly esteemed. This is the goal which society will inevitably attain in the end.

3. Work is the source of all virtues; the most useful work should be the most highly esteemed; thus divine and human morality both call on the industrial class to enjoy the first place in society.

important industrialists; that is to say, we have realized that it is necessary to make the most important industrialists understand how they can and should use all their abilities in the service of industry and the interests of the producers; finally, we have recognized that this enterprise, which society needs, and which we are determined to undertake, presents only one difficulty, which is precisely that of obtaining a clear conception of the industrial system; and that the difficulty consists in finding the means to reconcile the scientific system, the system of public education, the religious system, the system of the fine arts and the legal system with the system of the industrialists; the difficulty lies in finding the way to unite the most able scientists, theologians, artists, jurists, soldiers and proprietors in the establishment of the social system which is most beneficial to production and most satisfying to the producers.

We declare to you, finally, that we have overcome this difficulty; we declare to you that, in this catechism, we shall demonstrate to the industrialists in a clear, well-developed way, the means which they should use to rally all useful abilities to the establishment of the social organization which can give them the greatest satisfaction.

SECOND INSTALMENT*

Q. Let us pass on to the third objection: to the one which is designed to prove to you that it is the English political system which should be adopted by the French nation rather than the system which you propose.

We ask you first if you recognize, if you accept that experience is the best guide for nations as for individuals?

A. Yes, we recognize this without any doubt, without any reservation.

Q. Once you have accepted this principle, it will not be difficult to convince you that your system is worthless, since it is in opposition to the principle which you have just accepted. We will establish our reasoning on this point; refute it afterwards if you can.

The English are the richest and most powerful people; it is they who above all have the greatest influence on mankind and yet they are far from being in the first rank as far as size of the territory of the mother country and population are concerned. It is in England that the numerically largest class are the best-housed, the best-fed and the best-clad; it is in England that the rich are able to procure the greatest comfort throughout the

* IV, 1, pp. 73-94.

whole country; lastly, the English people enjoy practically all the advantages which other nations desire.

To what do the English mainly owe the benefits which they enjoy? Undoubtedly, it is to their form of government, that is to the superiority of their social organization over all the political systems which have been put into practice by other nations up to now.

Let us now compare the political arrangement which is the basis of the English constitution, with the principle which you have given as the foundation of your system, and you will see that there is a radical difference between the two.

You say: The administration of public wealth should be undertaken by the leading industrialists, because the industrial class is the most competent in administration.

The English say: The main aim of those who administer the public finances should be to encourage the industrial class as much as possible, because industrial production is the real source of national prosperity; but the industrialists should certainly not be entrusted with the administration of the national finances, because they have not enough knowledge to direct this administration and the attention which administration demands would distract them from their work.

And, in fact, in England it is the peers of the realm, the bishops and the judges in the Upper House, and the lawyers, men of private means and the military in the House of Commons, who have the greatest say in the administration of public wealth, since they compose the **Upper House exclusively** and have an overwhelming majority in the **House of Commons** and the **Privy Council**.

We conclude from what you have just said that your system is in opposition to the English constitution; that it is in opposition therefore to the constitution which experience has shown to be the best and that, consequently, it is worthless. What is your answer?

A. Our answer, just as your question was, will be based on observation, that is, on experience.

We say to you, then: the series of observations on the advance and progress of civilization within French society, as it has existed from its origins up to the present, which we presented in the first instalment, has proved that the industrial class has constantly gained in importance and that the other classes have constantly diminished in this respect. From this accumulation of fourteen hundred years of experience, we come to the conclusion that the industrial class must in the end reach the first

rank, that the industrialists must win, as the final result of the progress of civilization, the first degree of esteem and of power; lastly, that a time must come when the most important industrialists will find themselves charged with the administration of public wealth, etc.

We go on to reason from this conclusion, which has been rigorously deduced from experience, and we say: since the French Revolution took place more than a century after the English one, its results should be much more favourable to the industrial class and, in consequence, much more disadvantageous to the nobility and to the bourgeois; we say: the English revolution gave to the peers, the jurists, the military, the men of private means and the public officials the task of conducting the affairs of the nation in the interests of industry; the French revolution will in the end abolish the institution of nobility and then subject the jurists, the military, the men of private means and the public officials to the orders of the industrialists.

We have both argued from experience; thus, we have acted according to the principle which you put forward and which we accepted; but there is this primary difference between our opinions, that yours is only based upon partial experience, on the experience of what has taken place in Europe since the English Revolution, while ours is based upon the widest possible series of observations of the history of the modern nations; there is, further, this second difference, that you considered the revolution in England to be the final stage in the development of the progress of civilization from a political point of view; while we see that revolution and the social organization to which it led, as the penultimate stage only in a series of improvements to which the social régime of the European peoples was open.

As a result of the considerations which we have just laid before you, we claim that our system is good and that your reasoning is bad.

Have you anything more to say on this subject? Can you think of any other way to sustain your third objection?

Q. Yes, certainly, we can uphold our objection; yes, we are sure that we shall emerge victorious from this argument. We do not attach too much importance to words, we do not give primary importance to forms, we occupy ourselves mainly with the examination of basic questions.

You claim that the members of society who are most capable of administering the public wealth well, are the most important industrialists. You maintain that if the most important industrialists were put in charge of the direction of the interests of

society, society would enjoy all the benefits to which it can lay claim, that it would be governed in the cheapest way possible, by those men who are most competent to administer its affairs well and in the way most likely to maintain public order. To accept your proposition, your principle, your system (it does not matter much what your plan is called) and we say to you: your system is accepted in England, the English have put it into practice; therefore, you should think that the French nation can do no better than to adopt the English constitution; that the French should try to adopt this constitution. A few words will suffice to prove the justice of this statement, that is to say, to ascertain that the industrial system has been established in England.

The administration of public wealth in England is controlled by the peers because they dominate the royal power and are masters of the House of Commons; for all the peers have greater or lesser interests in manufacturing or commercial enterprises; thus, the peers are industrialists and thus the industrial system has been established in England.

A. The English government is in no way an industrial government; it is a feudal government, modified as far as possible in favour of industry. A transitional régime has been established in England which has prepared the way and made it possible for the French nation, and the rest of European society, to pass from the feudal system to the industrial system, from the system of government to the administrative system.

This is how we should look at these things; looked at in any other way, they leave the mind unsatisfied and run counter to commonsense. For many years the French have regarded the English constitution as a masterpiece; it is talked of as the pinnacle of the perfection which the human mind can attain in politics; this proves that political science is still in its infancy; this proves that the men in public life are still routine-bound; this proves that their consciousness has still not been developed to the point where it can assimilate universal conceptions about the advance of civilization; and this is all it proves. In reality, England does not yet have a constitution; the order of things which has been established there has no solidity, no fixity nor is it capable of acquiring these qualities. The English social organization has activated the feudal principle and the industrial principle at the same time; now, these two principles, being different and even opposed in nature, direct the nation simultaneously towards two ends which are very far removed from each other, with the inevitable result that the English are engaged in a tug-of-war. The political state of England is a state

important industrialists; that is to say, we have realized that it is necessary to make the most important industrialists understand how they can and should use all their abilities in the service of industry and the interests of the producers; finally, we have recognized that this enterprise, which society needs, and which we are determined to undertake, presents only one difficulty, which is precisely that of obtaining a clear conception of the industrial system; and that the difficulty consists in finding the means to reconcile the scientific system, the system of public education, the religious system, the system of the fine arts and the legal system with the system of the industrialists; the difficulty lies in finding the way to unite the most able scientists, theologians, artists, jurists, soldiers and proprietors in the establishment of the social system which is most beneficial to production and most satisfying to the producers.

We declare to you, finally, that we have overcome this difficulty; we declare to you that, in this catechism, we shall demonstrate to the industrialists in a clear, well-developed way, the means which they should use to rally all useful abilities to the establishment of the social organization which can give them the greatest satisfaction.

SECOND INSTALMENT*

Q. Let us pass on to the third objection: to the one which is designed to prove to you that it is the English political system which should be adopted by the French nation rather than the system which you propose.

We ask you first if you recognize, if you accept that experience is the best guide for nations as for individuals?

A. Yes, we recognize this without any doubt, without any reservation.

Q. Once you have accepted this principle, it will not be difficult to convince you that your system is worthless, since it is in opposition to the principle which you have just accepted. We will establish our reasoning on this point; refute it afterwards if you can.

The English are the richest and most powerful people; it is they who above all have the greatest influence on mankind and yet they are far from being in the first rank as far as size of the territory of the mother country and population are concerned. It is in England that the numerically largest class are the best-housed, the best-fed and the best-clad; it is in England that the rich are able to procure the greatest comfort throughout the

* IV, 1, pp. 73-94.

whole country; lastly, the English people enjoy practically all the advantages which other nations desire.

To what do the English mainly owe the benefits which they enjoy? Undoubtedly, it is to their form of government, that is to the superiority of their social organization over all the political systems which have been put into practice by other nations up to now.

Let us now compare the political arrangement which is the basis of the English constitution, with the principle which you have given as the foundation of your system, and you will see that there is a radical difference between the two.

You say: The administration of public wealth should be undertaken by the leading industrialists, because the industrial class is the most competent in administration.

The English say: The main aim of those who administer the public finances should be to encourage the industrial class as much as possible, because industrial production is the real source of national prosperity; but the industrialists should certainly not be entrusted with the administration of the national finances, because they have not enough knowledge to direct this administration and the attention which administration demands would distract them from their work.

And, in fact, in England it is the peers of the realm, the bishops and the judges in the Upper House, and the lawyers, men of private means and the military in the House of Commons, who have the greatest say in the administration of public wealth, since they compose the Upper House exclusively and have an overwhelming majority in the House of Commons and the Privy Council.

We conclude from what you have just said that your system is in opposition to the English constitution; that it is in opposition therefore to the constitution which experience has shown to be the best and that, consequently, it is worthless. What is your answer?

A. Our answer, just as your question was, will be based on observation, that is, on experience.

We say to you, then: the series of observations on the advance and progress of civilization within French society, as it has existed from its origins up to the present, which we presented in the first instalment, has proved that the industrial class has constantly gained in importance and that the other classes have constantly diminished in this respect. From this accumulation of fourteen hundred years of experience, we come to the conclusion that the industrial class must in the end reach the first

of illness, of crisis, or rather, the régime under which she lives is a transitional one; her constitution, if you insist that the English people have one, is a bastard constitution.

Q. The illness which you tell us attacks the English people presents an entirely new pathological case which you must explain to us. This illness is very extraordinary; first, from the point of view of its duration, because more than a hundred and fifty years have passed since it began and it has still not come to an end. This illness is even more extraordinary from another point of view namely that the social prosperity of the English began at the same time as their political malady, and that advantages which they won over the other peoples have always increased as their so-called malady progressed.

Frankly speaking, Gentlemen, you who catechize, need yourselves to be catechized. You want to give us lessons in politics, while it is you yourselves who should take them; you undertake our education before you have taken pains to educate yourselves. You claim that England has not got a constitution; that the social organization in that country is a bastard one, that it is an order of things to which the English find themselves led by routine and which can only be maintained through gradually contracted habits; an order of things of which no clear and satisfactory account can be made; an order of things which cannot be established in any other nation; an order of things, finally, which cannot become the model for the re-organization of European society.

We answer to this; then have you not read either Montesquieu or Blackstone; do you not know the work of Delholme; have you not studied the fine debates which have taken place, on many different occasions in the English Parliament on the balance of powers?

Read *l'Esprit des Loix* and you will see that men have only invented three forms of government, to wit: despotic, aristocratic and democratic; if you think about it, you will recognize that these were the only three forms of government that could be invented; finally, you will find in a great many of the books by English and French publicists the proof that these three forms of government have been admirably combined in the English constitution and that from this combination the best possible government results.

Now that we have crushed and destroyed your argument, we hasten to tell you that you have made only one mistake, that of exaggerating the importance of your ideas. All the materials which you have used to construct your system are good; it is

only the use you have made of these materials, the general conception which underlies your ideas that we would quarrel with. To be sure, all abilities should work for the development of industry; to be sure, governments should protect industry because it is the source of all wealth; to be sure, the theologians should encourage industry because useful work is the source of all virtues, just as idleness is the mother of all vice; to be sure, the legislators should make laws more favourable to production because the most hard-working nations are those in which public order is most easily maintained; but you should not conclude from this that industrial ability should govern all the other abilities. In a word, the English have found, they have fixed, the true point at which we must stop; you have lost sight in your work of a very old proverb which applies perfectly to the present situation: *THE BEST IS OFTEN THE ENEMY OF THE GOOD.*

A. Do not 'crow' with victory before it is yours; we have not yet come to the end of the discussion. It is only now that it becomes serious. We are very grateful for the indulgence you have been good enough to show us, at the end of the lively attack you have just made on our system; but we do not feel any need to profit from it; we feel we are able to repel all the darts which you have launched against us.

First of all, we shall reply to the jokes you made about the political malady which we said attacked the English nation; for we can only regard as jokes the considerations which you have put forward on this subject. As for us, we have no intention of treating lightly the most novel and important question which can concern the human mind at this moment; we say to you:

The idea of illness only played a very secondary role in the picture which we drew for you of the political situation of the English people; the main idea, which should mainly have engaged your attention, was that of the state of crisis which has existed in England since the revolution at the end of the seventeenth century. We shall explain this idea to you, since a simple statement of it has not been enough to make you understand it.

Mankind was destined, by the nature of its organization, to live in society;

First of all, it was called to live under a *governmental régime*; It was destined to pass from the governmental or military régime to the *administrative* or *industrial régime*, once it had made sufficient progress in the positive sciences and industry.

Then, it had to undergo, because of the way it was organized,

a long and violent crisis during its transition from the military to the peaceful system.

Relative to the progress of civilization these are the most general levels of achievement which the human spirit can attain at present.

We shall now apply this general observation on the advance of civilization to the circumstances prevailing in England. But to make this application exact and easy to grasp it is necessary to begin by describing the present social condition of the English nation, from the point of view of its internal politics and from that of its foreign policy.

When we take a bird's-eye view of England's domestic policy, we are struck from the outset by the existence of the most extraordinary phenomenon imaginable; we see that the English have allowed two fundamental principles to converge in order to form the basis of their social organization; we see that these two principles, being in their natures different and even opposed, the result had to be and still is that the English have simultaneously been subjected to two very different types of social organization that they have double institutions in all directions or, rather, that they have everywhere established the counter-institutions of all the institutions which were in force before their revolution and that they have for the most part preserved them.

Thus, we see that in England the *press-gang* co-exists with the law of *habeas corpus*; a shepherd is seen taking his wife and his ewe together to market, both with ropes around their necks. He sells his wife for a shilling without incurring any punishment for having degraded her by treating her like an animal, and he is sentenced to a fine of five pounds sterling if he ill-treats his ewe. The wealthy, populous and essentially industrial manufacturing town of Manchester has no representative in parliament, while a peer who owns land on which there are utterly deserted boroughs can himself nominate up to nine members, which he uses to support his feudal interests, to increase his political importance as much as possible, and to make the government pay him at the nation's expense.

A hundred folio volumes of small print would not be enough to describe all the organic inconsistencies which exist in England.

If we pass from the examination of the domestic policy of England to its foreign policy, we find the consequences of the imperfections in the organization which we have just pointed out; we see on the one hand that the English government de-

clares that the sovereignty of the seas belongs to it and therefore demands that all flags should be dipped to the Royal Navy while, through another measure, it works at the same time to establish equality between the black and white races, by putting an end to the slave trade.

We see the English government supporting the governmental régime in Europe, while in America it protects the system of industrial organization against the governmental system.

In short, the English nation has for a long time been in a state of crisis as regards its internal as well as its external policy and this crisis, in which all the inhabitants of Europe and America, too, share today, is clearly the crisis which mankind was destined by virtue of its organization to undergo during its transition from the governmental to the industrial social system.

These are the most general considerations which we can lay before you in support of the opinion which you have argued since the beginning of this second conversation; now we ask you to agree that we are right or to recognize that you have been wrong. We ask you, in the name of commonsense, to recognize the accuracy of the facts we have thus laid before you; we will repeat them in order to clarify our argument.

1. England has no constitution, since a constitution is a plan of social organization by means of which all the political institutions of a nation derive from the same principle and direct the national forces towards the same goal; whereas English social institutions are of two different kinds and they direct the national forces of that people towards two opposite goals.

2. The English social organization, being radically imperfect should not be presented to the French people as a model which it should try to imitate as closely as possible; and a revolutionary state of affairs will inevitably continue to exist in France until the governors and the governed have acquired clearer ideas about the means which should be employed to establish a fixed and stable social order.

3. Lastly, the crisis in which England and France find themselves involved will inevitably end in the complete abandonment of the feudal system and the exclusive establishment of the industrial system. The nations which today have the reputation of being the most civilized will never really emerge from barbarism until the time when the most hard-working and peaceful class has been given the direction of public power, and when the military class is completely subordinate.

Q. Do not go to so much trouble to answer our objections; that is not the most important point in your argument; you must

of illness, of crisis, or rather, the régime under which she lives is a transitional one; her constitution, if you insist that the English people have one, is a bastard constitution.

Q. The illness which you tell us attacks the English people presents an entirely new pathological case which you must explain to us. This illness is very extraordinary; first, from the point of view of its duration, because more than a hundred and fifty years have passed since it began and it has still not come to an end. This illness is even more extraordinary from another point of view namely that the social prosperity of the English began at the same time as their political malady, and that advantages which they won over the other peoples have always increased as their so-called malady progressed.

Frankly speaking, Gentlemen, you who catechize, need yourselves to be catechized. You want to give us lessons in politics, while it is you yourselves who should take them; you undertake our education before you have taken pains to educate yourselves. You claim that England has not got a constitution; that the social organization in that country is a bastard one, that it is an order of things to which the English find themselves led by routine and which can only be maintained through gradually contracted habits; an order of things of which no clear and satisfactory account can be made; an order of things which cannot be established in any other nation; an order of things, finally, which cannot become the model for the re-organization of European society.

We answer to this; then have you not read either Montesquieu or Blackstone; do you not know the work of Delholme; have you not studied the fine debates which have taken place, on many different occasions in the English Parliament on the balance of powers?

Read *l'Esprit des Loix* and you will see that men have only invented three forms of government, to wit: despotic, aristocratic and democratic; if you think about it, you will recognize that these were the only three forms of government that could be invented; finally, you will find in a great many of the books by English and French publicists the proof that these three forms of government have been admirably combined in the English constitution and that from this combination the best possible government results.

Now that we have crushed and destroyed your argument, we hasten to tell you that you have made only one mistake, that of exaggerating the importance of your ideas. All the materials which you have used to construct your system are good; it is

only the use you have made of these materials, the general conception which underlies your ideas that we would quarrel with. To be sure, all abilities should work for the development of industry; to be sure, governments should protect industry because it is the source of all wealth; to be sure, the theologians should encourage industry because useful work is the source of all virtues, just as idleness is the mother of all vice; to be sure, the legislators should make laws more favourable to production because the most hard-working nations are those in which public order is most easily maintained; but you should not conclude from this that industrial ability should govern all the other abilities. In a word, the English have found, they have fixed, the true point at which we must stop; you have lost sight in your work of a very old proverb which applies perfectly to the present situation: **THE BEST IS OFTEN THE ENEMY OF THE GOOD.**

A. Do not 'crow' with victory before it is yours; we have not yet come to the end of the discussion. It is only now that it becomes serious. We are very grateful for the indulgence you have been good enough to show us, at the end of the lively attack you have just made on our system; but we do not feel any need to profit from it; we feel we are able to repel all the darts which you have launched against us.

First of all, we shall reply to the jokes you made about the political malady which we said attacked the English nation; for we can only regard as jokes the considerations which you have put forward on this subject. As for us, we have no intention of treating lightly the most novel and important question which can concern the human mind at this moment; we say to you: The idea of illness only played a very secondary role in the picture which we drew for you of the political situation of the English people; the main idea, which should mainly have engaged your attention, was that of the state of crisis which has existed in England since the revolution at the end of the seventeenth century. We shall explain this idea to you, since a simple statement of it has not been enough to make you understand it.

Mankind was destined, by the nature of its organization, to live in society;

First of all, it was called to live under a *governmental régime*; It was destined to pass from the governmental or military régime to the *administrative* or *industrial régime*, once it had made sufficient progress in the positive sciences and industry.

Then, it had to undergo, because of the way it was organized,

combat the views of the father of science. You must prove that Montesquieu was mistaken; this is the only way you can ensure your system is adopted.

A. Science makes continual progress. Today, there is not a pupil of the Polytechnic who cannot solve, with the utmost ease, problems of geometry which taxed the genius of Archimedes; there is not one of these pupils who does not know more about geometry than that prodigious genius ever knew.

More than fifty years have passed since the publication of *l'Esprit des Lois*. Since then the most memorable political event in history has taken place: the French Revolution. Thus we can reason from facts which were entirely unknown to Montesquieu.

Montesquieu was a great admirer of the social régime which had been established in England and he was right, for it was undoubtedly very superior to anything which had gone before; but we must not conclude from this that, had Montesquieu been alive today, he would not have found a way of improving it considerably.

The English have accepted, as we have already said several times, they have invented political institutions with an industrial character and they have set them against the old feudal institutions which existed there; the result has been that the feudal government was far more constrained in England than in the other European countries.

The French Revolution did not take place till nearly a century after the English one; it inevitably resulted in an improvement on the English constitution; for, when we reflect on how the English constitution can be improved, the first thing which strikes us is that industrial power, which was introduced into the English social organization as a power to counterbalance feudal power, should become the leading power in France.

ON LIBERALISM AND INDUSTRIALISM*

We invite all industrialists who are dedicated to the public good and who are aware of the connections between the general interests of society and those of industry no longer to allow themselves to be called *liberals*: we invite them to hoist a new flag and to inscribe upon their banner the device: *Industrialism*.

We address the same invitation to anyone, regardless of rank and profession, if he is profoundly convinced, as we are, that the only way to establish a calm and stable order of things lies in entrusting with the supreme administration of public wealth

* IV, 1, pp. 178-83; the second instalment, or volume, of the *Catéchisme* contained two Appendices, only the second of these is included here.

those who pour the greatest amount of money into the public treasury and who draw out the least; we invite them to call themselves *industrialists*.

It is mainly to the true royalists that we address this invitation, that is to say, we address it especially to those who desire that national prosperity should be the basis upon which the tranquillity and well-being of the House of Bourbon rests.

Q. What benefit do you think can result from this change of name? What advantage do you think the substitution of the word *industrialism* for that of *liberalism* would bring? What are the drawbacks attached to the word *liberalism*, that make you think it is so important to abandon it.

A. You put too many questions at once; which would you like us to answer first?

Q. Tell us what are the drawbacks attached to the word *liberalism*; what good can come of its abandonment by the party which wants to improve the social organization, using only loyal, legal and peaceful methods to attain this goal?

A. The denomination *liberalism* seems to us to have three great drawbacks for well-meaning men who march under this banner.

Q. What is the first of these drawbacks?

A. The word *liberalism* has a normative connotation* (signifies an order of sentiments); it does not indicate a class of interests; the result is that the expression is vague and therefore bad.

Q. What is the second drawback?

A. Most of those who allow themselves to be called *liberals* are peace-loving men, men who are animated by the desire to bring the revolution to an end, by establishing through loyal, legal and peaceful means a calm and stable order of things; an order of things which is in tune with the state of enlightenment and civilization. But the leaders of this party are men who have preserved the critical approach, that is they are eighteenth-century revolutionaries. All those who have played a part in the revolution, first as *patriots*, then as *Bonapartists*, today call themselves *liberals*; thus, the party which is called *liberal* is composed today of two kinds of men with different and even opposing opinions. The founders of this party are men whose main aim is to overturn any possible government in order to put themselves in its place; whereas the great majority of this same party wishes to give the government the greatest possible stability and strength, provided that it takes openly the direction called for by the national interests.

Once the designation *liberalism* has been adopted and pro-

* Literally: 'désigne un ordre de sentiments'.

claimed by the remnants of the *patriotic* and *Bonapartist* party, the name has very great drawbacks for those whose essential purpose is the establishment of a stable order of things by peaceful means.

We do not claim that the patriots and Bonapartists have not rendered services to society; their energy was useful, because it was necessary to demolish before it was possible to build. But, today, the revolutionary spirit which animated them runs directly counter to the public interest; today a denomination which does not indicate a spirit directly opposed to the revolutionary spirit cannot be acceptable to enlightened and well-intentioned men.

Q. What is the third drawback attached to the denomination of *liberalism*?

A. The party which called itself *liberal* has been defeated, not only in France, but in Naples, in Spain, in England; the members of the extreme Left in France carry no more weight there than do Mr. Brougham and Robert Wilson in England. The many defeats of the *liberals* have proved that nations, as well as governments, do not want to adopt their political opinions: now, when it has been pointed out to sensible men that they have taken the wrong course and chosen bad guides, they quickly change direction.

We conclude from these three reasons that we have just given you that peaceful men whose opinion tends towards the setting up of a calm and stable order of things should make haste to proclaim that they no longer want to be called *liberals* and that they should inscribe a new device on their banner.

Q. Has this not been done already? Has not M. Ternaux remedied the drawback of which you speak, by publishing his profession of faith?

A. In France, there are three denominations of political parties; we call *ultras* those who want to retard civilization, by re-establishing the political influence of the nobility and of the clergy as it was before the Revolution.

We call *ministerials* those who support the intentions of the ministers, either because they are animated by the appetite for reward, or by the fear of falling back into revolution, or by both reasons at the same time.

We call *liberals* those who want to force the government to change course, either because they intend to overset the government in order to take its place themselves, or because they are determined to use only loyal, legal and pacific means to reach their goal.

We declare, and this is the object of this second appendix, that: 1. the time has come for the two classes who make up the party known as *liberal* to divide; 2. that the *liberals* who have the firm determination to use only peaceful means to direct the march of the government towards the national interests, have only one means of forming a group separate from those who have preserved the old political prescription of 'move over, so that I can take your place', and that this means lies in adopting a new name for this party.

[pp. 195-200]

Q. Let us now return to the question which concerns us in this second appendix. You have proved to us that the name *liberal* is no longer suitable for those who have decided only to employ loyal, legal and pacific means to persuade the government to act openly in the interests of the majority of the nation, that is to say, in the direction of the interests of the industrial class; you must now tell us what name these men should adopt in order to form a political party which will be quite separate from all those which have existed between 1789 and now.

A. The name *industrialism* for the policy of this new political party and that of *industrialist* for those who join this party seem best to us.

Q. What are the advantages of these names?

A. It seems to us that there are three great and quite separate advantages attaching to the name *industrialism*.

Q. What is the first of these advantages?

A. The name *industrialism* concentrates attention on interests, and it is consequently preferable to that of *liberalism* or to any designation which indicates only attitudes; because interests are far less variable than attitudes.

For example, today someone who is nobly born cannot truly be *liberal*, unless he works openly to abolish all the advantages which the nobility still enjoys in respect of esteem, power or the ability to obtain preferment; for, experience has shown us that a very small number of noblemen have enough tenacity to succeed in such an undertaking. Experience has proved to us that it is, in general, very easy for the government to influence reputedly *liberal* noblemen to take the government's part; the truth is that the number of nobles reputed to be *liberals* is very great but the number who really are *liberals* is extremely small. In the whole of the new nobility there is not one to be found; for it is obvious that every man who has allowed political privilege

combat the views of the father of science. You must prove that Montesquieu was mistaken; this is the only way you can ensure your system is adopted.

A. Science makes continual progress. Today, there is not a pupil of the Polytechnic who cannot solve, with the utmost ease, problems of geometry which taxed the genius of Archimedes; there is not one of these pupils who does not know more about geometry than that prodigious genius ever knew.

More than fifty years have passed since the publication of *l'Esprit des Lois*. Since then the most memorable political event in history has taken place: the French Revolution. Thus we can reason from facts which were entirely unknown to Montesquieu. Montesquieu was a great admirer of the social régime which had been established in England and he was right, for it was undoubtedly very superior to anything which had gone before; but we must not conclude from this that, had Montesquieu been alive today, he would not have found a way of improving it considerably.

The English have accepted, as we have already said several times, they have invented political institutions with an industrial character and they have set them against the old feudal institutions which existed there; the result has been that the feudal government was far more constrained in England than in the other European countries.

The French Revolution did not take place till nearly a century after the English one; it inevitably resulted in an improvement on the English constitution; for, when we reflect on how the English constitution can be improved, the first thing which strikes us is that industrial power, which was introduced into the English social organization as a power to counterbalance feudal power, should become the leading power in France.

ON LIBERALISM AND INDUSTRIALISM*

We invite all industrialists who are dedicated to the public good and who are aware of the connections between the general interests of society and those of industry no longer to allow themselves to be called *liberals*: we invite them to hoist a new flag and to inscribe upon their banner the device: *Industrialism*.

We address the same invitation to anyone, regardless of rank and profession, if he is profoundly convinced, as we are, that the only way to establish a calm and stable order of things lies in entrusting with the supreme administration of public wealth

* IV, 1, pp. 178-83; the second instalment, or volume, of the *Catéchisme* contained two Appendices, only the second of these is included here.

those who pour the greatest amount of money into the public treasury and who draw out the least; we invite them to call themselves *industrialists*.

It is mainly to the true royalists that we address this invitation, that is to say, we address it especially to those who desire that national prosperity should be the basis upon which the tranquillity and well-being of the House of Bourbon rests.

Q. What benefit do you think can result from this change of name? What advantage do you think the substitution of the word *industrialism* for that of *liberalism* would bring? What are the drawbacks attached to the word *liberalism*, that make you think it is so important to abandon it.

A. You put too many questions at once; which would you like us to answer first?

Q. Tell us what are the drawbacks attached to the word *liberalism*; what good can come of its abandonment by the party which wants to improve the social organization, using only loyal, legal and peaceful methods to attain this goal?

A. The denomination *liberalism* seems to us to have three great drawbacks for well-meaning men who march under this banner.

Q. What is the first of these drawbacks?

A. The word *liberalism* has a normative connotation* (signifies an order of sentiments); it does not indicate a class of interests; the result is that the expression is vague and therefore bad.

Q. What is the second drawback?

A. Most of those who allow themselves to be called *liberals* are peace-loving men, men who are animated by the desire to bring the revolution to an end, by establishing through loyal, legal and peaceful means a calm and stable order of things; an order of things which is in tune with the state of enlightenment and civilization. But the leaders of this party are men who have preserved the critical approach, that is they are eighteenth-century revolutionaries. All those who have played a part in the revolution, first as *patriots*, then as *Bonapartists*, today call themselves *liberals*; thus, the party which is called *liberal* is composed today of two kinds of men with different and even opposing opinions. The founders of this party are men whose main aim is to overturn any possible government in order to put themselves in its place; whereas the great majority of this same party wishes to give the government the greatest possible stability and strength, provided that it takes openly the direction called for by the national interests.

Once the designation *liberalism* has been adopted and pro-

* Literally: 'désigne un ordre de sentiments'.

to be created in favour of himself and his descendants is an *anti-liberal*.

Q. What is the second advantage attached to the name *industrialist*?

A. The industrial class is the most numerous: thus anyone who declares himself to be an *industrialist*, in a single word, makes a profession of faith that he intends to support the interests of the majority of the nation against all individual interests.

Q. Tell us, lastly, what is your third reason for advising those who want to use only loyal, legal and peaceful methods to abandon the name *liberals* and to adopt that of *industrialists*?

A. In this instalment we have established:
First, that primitive men being ignorant and subject to violent passions, the law of survival of the fittest had to serve as the foundation of the first social organizations, and the nations had to live under the military system alone, and then under the feudal system, for many centuries; concentration of arbitrary powers in the hands of a few was a lesser evil than anarchy.

We then established that the human race was destined to become enlightened, to refine itself by trade, to acquire the taste for work and production and then to propose the common interest as the basis for its organization.

Lastly, we have shown that the transition from the first to the second political system gave rise to a long and violent crisis.

We now add to these thoughts, the idea that the crisis of transition was started by the preaching of Luther, and that the object of our catechism of the industrialists is to bring it to an end.

I add that, from the time of Luther until today, the human spirit has been cast in a critical and revolutionary mould because the feudal government had to be overthrown before it was possible to work towards the establishment of the industrial organization of society; but that today, when the industrial class has become the strongest, the critical and revolutionary spirit must be extinguished and be replaced by a peaceful drive towards organization.

It is with the purpose of marking the formation of the party of peace and organization that we invite those persons who want to set up a calm, stable order of things to adopt the name of *industrialists*, because this name indicates both the end and the means: the end is to base the organization of society upon the interests of the majority; the means are to entrust the most important industrialists with the administration of public wealth.

Q. We regret deeply that the name of *patriot* should have been degraded and completely debased by the *sans-culottes*; for this name signifies an interest common to all the members of the nation: the national interest; and it was by this means, that not only one class in society but all classes were indiscriminately called upon to form this party.

A. The denomination of *patriotism*, even had it not been debased by *sans-culottism*, does not have the same value as that of *industrialism*. This is our opinion, and we shall justify it.

Let us first analyse the idea of *patriotism*; we find as follows: A *patriot* is a man whose sentiments are dominated by his affection for the national society of which he is a member; he is a man who is always ready to sacrifice all of his fortune and all his credit in the interests of his nation. Brutus immolating his son and thus sacrificing his paternal feeling to his affection for the Romans was a true model of *patriotism*.

We ask you now to tell us if, in the present state of enlightenment and civilization, men can or should be *patriots*?

We are convinced that having thought about it, you will agree that philanthropic sentiments, those new family sentiments of *Europeanism*, take precedence today among all Europeans over their national sentiments. You will recognize that what we have just said is true even of the English.

The best code of moral sentiments which we possess is that of Christian morality. Now, in this code much is said about the reciprocal duties of the members of the same family; the code tells all men to regard themselves as brothers, but it never urges men to subordinate their philanthropic and family feelings to *patriotism*.

