

soluble silicate itself is a powerful detergent, and it possesses certain advantages when used with hard waters, so that, taking its cheapness into account, the question whether its introduction into soap is a fraud may be fairly discussed and much said in its defence.

**Framing.**—The frames into which hard soaps are ladled for cooling and solidification consist of rectangular boxes made of iron plates and bound and clamped together in a way that allows the sides to be removed when required. The solidification is a very gradual process, depending, of course, for its completion on the size of the block; but before cutting into bars it is essential that the whole should be set and hardened through and through, else the cut bars would not hold together. Many ingenious devices for forming bars have been produced; but generally a strong frame is used, across which steel wires are stretched at distances equal to the size of the bars to be made, the blocks being first cut into slabs and then into bars.

**Soft Soap.**—As already said, soft soaps are made with potash lyes, although in practice a small quantity of soda is also used to give the soap some consistence. There is no separation of underlyes in potash soap, consequently the product contains the whole constituents of the oils used, as the operation of salting out is quite impracticable owing to the double decomposition which results from the action of salt, producing thereby a hard principally soda soap with formation of chloride of potassium. Owing to this circumstance it is impossible to "fit" or in any way purify soft soap, and all impurities which go into the pan of necessity enter into the finished product. The making of soft soap, although thus a much less complex process than hard soap making, is one that demands much skill and experience for its success. From the conditions of the manufacture care must be taken to regulate the amount and strength of the alkali in proportion to the oil used, and the degree of concentration to which the boiling ought to be continued has to be determined with close observation.

**Toilet Soaps, &c.**—Soaps used in personal ablution in no way differ from the soaps previously alluded to, and may consist of any of the varieties. It is of consequence that they should, as far as possible, be free from excess of alkali and all other salts and foreign ingredients which may have an injurious effect on the skin. The manufacturer of toilet soap generally takes care to present his wares in convenient form and of agreeable appearance and smell; the more weighty duty of having them free from uncombined alkali is in many cases entirely overlooked. Transparent soaps are prepared by dissolving ordinary soap in strong alcohol and distilling off the greater portion of the alcohol till the residue comes to the condition of a thick transparent jelly. This, when cast into forms and allowed to harden and dry slowly, comes out as transparent soap. A class of transparent soap may also be made by the cold process, with the use of cocoa-nut oil, castor oil, and sugar. It generally contains a large amount of uncombined alkali, and that, with its unpleasant odour of cocoa-nut oil, makes it a most undesirable soap for personal use. Toilet soaps of common quality are perfumed by simple melting and stirring into the mass some cheap odorous body that is not affected by alkalis under the influence of heat. The finer soaps are perfumed by the cold method; the soap is shaved down to thin slices, and the essential oil kneaded into and mixed with it by special machinery, after which it is formed into cakes by pressure in suitable moulds.

Glycerin soap ordinarily consists of about equal parts of pure hard soap and glycerin (the latter valuable for its emollient properties). The soap is melted by heat, the glycerin is stirred in, and the mixture strained and poured into forms, in which it hardens but slowly into a transparent mass. With excess of glycerin a fluid soap is formed, soap being soluble in that body, and such fluid soap has only feeble lathering properties. Soap containing small proportions of glycerin, on the other hand, forms a very tenacious lather, and when soap bubbles of an enduring character are desired glycerin is added to the solution. Soaps are also prepared in which large proportions of fine sharp sand, or of powdered pumice, are incorporated, and these substances, by their abrading action, powerfully assist the detergent influence of the soap on hands much begrimed by manufacturing operations.<sup>1</sup>

**Medicated soaps** contain certain substances which exercise a specific influence on the skin. A few medicated soaps are prepared for internal use, among which are croton soap and jalap soap, both gentler cathartics than the uncombined medicinal principles. Medicated soaps for external use are only employed in cases of skin ailments and as prophylactic washes. Among the principal varieties are those which contain carbolic acid, petroleum, borax, camphor, chlorine, iodine, mercurial salts, sulphur, and tannin. Arsenical soap is very much employed by taxidermists for the preservation of the skins of birds and mammals. It consists of a mixture of white arsenic, hard soap, and slaked lime, say 4 oz. of each, with 12 oz. of carbonate of potash, the whole being made into a stiff paste with water.

The following table indicates the average composition of several commercial soaps:—

<sup>1</sup> "Soap powders" and "soap extracts" are simply preparations of alkalis.

	Water.	Fatty Acid.	Soda.		Potash.	Soluble Silica.	Glycerin.	Other Salts.	Loss.
			Com- bined.	Free.					
Tallow soap . . . .	28.8	58.0	6.8	1.6	..	..	2.3	2.9	
Marseilles soap, mottled . . . . .	10.15	76.0	8.65	0.25	..	..	..	4.95	
Palm-oil soap . . . .	35.4	49.9	7.0	1.0	..	..	1.1	5.6	
Yellow soap . . . .	22.23	62.95 <sup>2</sup>	8.03	..	..	..	..	6.79	
Cocoa-nut oil soap . . . .	58.74	32.82	4.26	1.50	..	..	2.26	0.42	
Silicate soap . . . .	50.4	5.5	10.7	..	..	33.4	..	..	
Soft soap . . . . .	43.3	41.9	..	..	10.2	..	4.6	..	

**Soap Analysis.**—Here it will be sufficient to mention a few tests which can be executed without special chemical knowledge. To determine the water in a soap—a most important question—a few thin slices are weighed and dried in a stove at 105°C. so long as loss of weight continues. The loss of weight is the measure of uncombined water in the sample. Added salts, such as alkaline silicates, sulphates, &c. and insoluble earthy admixtures are detected by boiling a sample with alcohol, in which only the soap proper dissolves. The residue is collected in a filter, washed with hot alcohol, and weighed. An excessive proportion of surplus alkali can be detected by dissolving the soap in hot water and adding a sufficiency of saturated solution of common salt to salt it out. The alkali remains in solution and can be determined by the amount of a standard acid solution it neutralizes.

**Commerce.**—Marseilles has long been recognized as the most important centre of the soap trade, a position that city originally achieved through its ready command of the supplies of olive oil. The city is still very favourably situated for obtaining supplies of oils both local and foreign, including sesame, ground nut, castor oil, &c. In England the soap trade did not exist till the 16th century. In the reign of Charles I. a monopoly of soap-making was farmed to a corporation of soap-boilers in London,—a proceeding which led to serious complications. From 1712 to 1853 an excise duty ranging from 1d. to 3d. was levied on soap made in the United Kingdom, and that heavy impost (equal when 3d. to more than 100 per cent.) greatly impeded the development of the industry. In 1793, when the excise duty was 2½d. on hard and 1½d. on soft soap, the revenue yielded was a little over £400,000; in 1815 it was almost £750,000; in 1835, when the duty was levied at 1½d. and 1d. respectively (and when a drawback was allowed for soap used in manufactures), the revenue was almost £1,000,000; and in 1852, the last year in which the duty was levied, it amounted to £1,126,046, with a drawback on exportation amounting to £271,000. What the manufacture has risen to since that time there is no accurate way of estimating. (W. D.—J. PA.)

**SOAP BARK.** A vegetable principle known as "saponin," and chemically analogous to the arabin of soluble gums and to mucilage, forms with water a lather, and is on that account available as a substitute for soap. Saponin is obtainable from soap nuts, the fruit of a tree, *Saponaia officinalis* and allied species; but its most important source is the Quillai bark of Chili yielded by a large tree, *Quillaja saponaria*. The inner bark of the tree, reduced to powder, is employed in Chili as a substitute for soap.

**SOBLESKI, JOHN**, king of Poland. See JOHN III., vol. xiii. p. 714, and POLAND, vol. xix. p. 295.

**SOCAGE** is a form of tenure. Bracton, Britton, and other old writers derived the word from the French *soe*, "a ploughshare." Modern etymologists, however, prefer to derive it from the Old English *soe*, "a franchise" or "privilege," or the land over which such franchise or privilege was exercised. Socage differs from knight service in being agricultural rather than military in its nature, and from frankalmoign in being based on temporal rather than spiritual services. It is either free or villein. Free socage *in capite* was abolished by 12 Car. II. c. 24. That form of free socage called common socage is the ordinary modern freehold tenure. Varieties of it are burgage, gavelkind, and petit serjeanty. Scutage, while it existed, was another variety. The only representative of villein socage is the comparatively rare tenure of ancient demesne confined to manors, described in Domesday Book as *terra regis*. Socage tenure is said to have formerly existed in Scotland. The descent of socage lands in Scotland seems to have been to all the sons equally, as was originally the case in England. (See BURGAGE, GAVELKIND, REAL ESTATE, SCUTAGE.)

<sup>2</sup> Including resin acids.

## SOCIALISM

Origin of name.

THE word "socialism" is of comparatively recent origin, having been coined in England in 1835. In that year a society which received the grandiloquent name of the "Association of all Classes of all Nations" was founded under the auspices of Robert Owen; and the words "socialist" and "socialism" were first used during the discussions which arose in connexion with it. As Owen and his school had no esteem for the political reform of the time, and laid all emphasis on the necessity of social improvement and reconstruction, it is obvious how the name came to be recognized as suitable and distinctive. The term was borrowed from England by a distinguished French writer, Reybaud, in his well-known work the *Reformateurs modernes* (1839), in which he discussed the theories of Saint-Simon, Fourier, and Owen. Through Reybaud it soon gained wide currency on the Continent, and is now the accepted world-historic name for one of the most remarkable movements of the 19th century.

The name was thus first applied in England to Owen's theory of social reconstruction, and in France to those also of Saint-Simon and Fourier. The best usage has always connected it with the views of these men and the cognate opinions which have since appeared. The word, however, is used with a great variety of meaning not only in popular speech and by politicians but even by economists and learned critics of socialism. The general tendency is to regard as socialistic any interference with property undertaken by society on behalf of the poor, the limitation of the principle of *laissez-faire* in favour of the suffering classes, radical social reform which disturbs the present system of private property as regulated by free competition. It is probable enough that the word will be permanently used to express the tendency indicated in these phrases, as a general name for the strong reaction that has now set in against the overstrained individualism and one-sided freedom which date from the latter half of the 18th century. The application is neither precise nor accurate; but it is use and wont that determine the meaning of words, and this seems to be the tendency of use and wont.

Even economic writers differ greatly in the meaning they attach to the word. The great German economist Roscher defines it as including "those tendencies which demand a greater regard for the common weal than consists with human nature." Adolf Held says that "we may define as socialistic every tendency which demands the subordination of the individual will to the community." Janet more precisely defines it as follows:—"We call socialism every doctrine which teaches that the state has a right to correct the inequality of wealth which exists among men and to legally establish the balance by taking from those who have too much in order to give to those who have not enough, and that in a permanent manner, and not in such and such a particular case,—a famine, for instance, a public calamity, &c." Laveleye explains it thus: "In the first place every socialistic doctrine aims at introducing greater equality in social conditions, and in the second place at realizing those reforms by the law or the state." Von Scheel simply defines it as the "economic philosophy of the suffering classes." Of all these definitions it can only be said that they more or less faithfully reflect current opinion as to the nature of socialism. They are either too vague

<sup>1</sup> The aim of the present article is essentially to give a history and exposition of socialism in its leading phases and principles. The point of view is objective,—to explain what socialism has been and is. A controversial or critical article on the many vexed questions suggested by the subject would have been inconsistent with the plan of this work.

or they are misleading, and they quite fail to bring out the clear and strongly marked characteristics that distinguish the phenomena to which the name of socialism is properly applied. To say that socialism exacts a greater regard for the common weal than is compatible with human nature is to pass sentence on the movement, not to define it. In all ages of the world, and under all forms and tendencies of government and of social evolution, the will of the individual has been subordinated to the will of society, often unduly so. It is also most misleading to speak as if socialism must proceed from the state as we know it. The early socialism proceeded from private effort and experiment. A great deal of the most notorious socialism of the present day aims not only at subverting the existing state in every form but all the existing political and social institutions. The most powerful and most philosophic, that of Karl Marx, aimed at superseding the existing governments by a vast international combination of the workers of all nations, without distinction of creed, colour, or nationality.

Still more objectionable, however, is the tendency not unfrequently shown to identify socialism with a violent and lawless revolutionary spirit. As sometimes used, "socialism" means nothing more nor less than the most modern form of the revolutionary spirit with a suggestion of anarchy and dynamite. This is to confound the essence of the movement with an accidental feature more or less common to all great innovations. Every new thing of any moment, whether good or evil, has its revolutionary stage in which it disturbs and upsets the accepted beliefs and institutions. The Protestant Reformation was for more than a century and a half the occasion of national and international trouble and bloodshed. The suppression of American slavery could not be effected without a tremendous civil war. There was a time when the opinions comprehended under the name of "liberalism" had to fight to the death for toleration; and representative government was at one time a revolutionary innovation. The fact that a movement is revolutionary generally implies only that it is new, that it is disposed to exert itself by strong methods, and is calculated to make great changes. It is an unhappy feature of most great changes that they have been attended with the exercise of force, but that is because the powers in possession have generally attempted to suppress them by the exercise of force.

In point of fact socialism is one of the most elastic and protean phenomena of history, varying according to the time and circumstances in which it appears and with the character and opinions and institutions of the people who adopt it. Such a movement cannot be condemned or approved *en bloc*. Most of the current formulæ to which it has been referred for praise or censure are totally erroneous and misleading. Yet in the midst of the various theories that go by the name of "socialism" there is a kernel of principle that is common to them all. That principle is of an economic nature, and is most clear and precise. The central aim of socialism is to terminate the divorce of the workers from the natural sources of subsistence and of culture. The socialist theory is based on the historical assertion that the course of social evolution for centuries has gradually been to exclude the producing classes from the possession of land and capital and to establish a new subjection, the subjection of workers, who have nothing to depend on but precarious wage-labour. The socialists maintain that the present system (in which land and capital are the property of private individuals freely struggling for increase of wealth) leads inevitably to social and



economic anarchy, to the degradation of the working man and his family, to the growth of vice and idleness among the wealthy classes and their dependants, to bad and in-artistic workmanship, and to adulteration in all its forms; and that it is tending more and more to separate society into two classes,—wealthy millionaires confronted with an enormous mass of proletarians,—the issue out of which must either be socialism or social ruin. To avoid all these evils and to secure a more equitable distribution of the means and appliances of happiness, the socialists propose that land and capital, which are the requisites of labour and the sources of all wealth and culture, should become the property of society, and be managed by it for the general good. In thus maintaining that society should assume the management of industry and secure an equitable distribution of its fruits socialists are agreed, but in the most important points of detail they differ very greatly.

They differ as to the form society will take in carrying out the socialist programme, as to the relation of local bodies to the central government, and whether there is to be any central government, or any government at all in the ordinary sense of the word, as to the influence of the national idea in the society of the future, &c. They differ also as to what should be regarded as an "equitable" system of distribution. The school of Saint-Simon advocated a social hierarchy in which every man should be placed according to his capacity and rewarded according to his works. In the communities of Fourier the minimum of subsistence was to be guaranteed to each out of the common gain, the remainder to be divided between labour, capital, and talent,—five-twelfths going to the first, four-twelfths to the second, and three-twelfths to the third. At the revolution of 1848 Louis Blanc proposed that remuneration should be equal for all members of his *social workshops*. In the programme drawn up by the united social democrats of Germany (Gotha, 1875) it is provided that all shall enjoy the results of labour "according to their reasonable wants," all of course being bound to work. It is needless to say also that the theories of socialism have been held in connexion with the most varying opinions in philosophy and religion. A great deal of the historic socialism has been regarded as a necessary implicate of idealism. Most of the prevailing socialism of the day is based on the frankest and most outspoken revolutionary materialism. On the other hand, many socialists hold that their system is a necessary outcome of Christianity, that socialism and Christianity are essential the one to the other; and it should be said that the ethics of socialism are closely akin to the ethics of Christianity, if not identical with them.

Still it should be insisted that the basis of socialism is economic, involving a fundamental change in the relation of labour to land and capital,—a change which will largely affect production, but will entirely revolutionize the existing system of distribution. But, while its basis is economic, socialism implies and carries with it a change in the political, ethical, technical, and artistic arrangements and institutions of society which would constitute a revolution greater probably than has ever taken place in human history, greater than the transition from the ancient to the mediæval world, or from the latter to the existing order of society. In the first place, such a change generally assumes as its political complement the most thoroughly democratic organization of society. The early socialism of Owen and Saint-Simon was marked by not a little of the autocratic spirit; but the tendency of the present socialism is more and more to ally itself with the most advanced democracy. Socialism, in fact, claims to be the economic complement of democracy, maintaining that without a fundamental

economic change political privilege has neither meaning nor value. In the second place, socialism naturally goes with an unselfish or altruistic system of ethics. The most characteristic feature of the old societies was the exploitation of the weak by the strong under the systems of slavery, serfdom, and wage-labour. Under the socialistic régime it is the privilege and duty of the strong and talented to use their superior force and richer endowments in the service of their fellow-men without distinction of class or nation or creed. In the third place, socialists maintain that under their system and no other can the highest excellence and beauty be realized in industrial production and in art, whereas under the present system beauty and thoroughness are alike sacrificed to cheapness, which is a necessity of successful competition. Lastly, the socialists refuse to admit that individual happiness or freedom or character would be sacrificed under the social arrangements they propose. They believe that under the present system a free and harmonious development of individual capacity and happiness is possible only for the privileged minority, and that socialism alone can open up a fair opportunity for all. They believe, in short, that there is no opposition whatever between socialism and individuality rightly understood, that these two are complementary the one of the other, that in socialism alone may every individual have hope of free development and a full realization of himself.

Having seen, then, how wide a social revolution is implied in the socialistic scheme of reconstruction, let us repeat (1) that the essence of the theory consists in this—associated production with a collective capital with the view to an equitable distribution. In the words of Schaffle, "the Alpha and Omega of socialism is the transformation of private competing capitals into a united collective capital" (*Quintessenz des Socialismus*). A Wagner's more elaborate definition of it (in his *Grundlegung*) is entirely in agreement with that of Schaffle. This is the principle on which all the schools of socialism, however opposed otherwise, are at one. Such a system, while insisting on collective capital (including land), is quite consistent with private property in other forms, and with perfect freedom in the use of one's own share in the equitable distribution of the produce of the associated labour. A thoroughgoing socialism demands that this principle should be applied to the capital and production of the whole world; only then can it attain to supreme and perfect realization. But a sober-minded socialism will admit that the various intermediate stages in which the principle finds a partial application are so far a true and real development of the socialistic idea. (2) Socialism is both a theory of social evolution and a working force in the history of the 19th century. Some of the most eminent socialists, such as Rodbertus, regard their theory as a prophecy concerning the social development of the future rather than as a subject of agitation. In their view socialism is the next stage in the evolution of society, destined after many generations to supersede capitalism, as capitalism displaced feudalism and feudalism succeeded to slavery. Even the majority of the most active socialists consider the question as still in the stage of agitation and propaganda, their present task being that of enlightening the masses until the consummation of the present social development, and the declared bankruptcy of the present social order, shall have delivered the world into their hands. Socialism, therefore, is for the most part a theory affecting the future, more or less remote, and has only to a limited degree gained a real and practical footing in the life of our time. Yet it should not be forgotten that its theories have most powerfully affected all the ablest recent economic writers of Germany, and have even considerably

modified German legislation. Its influence is rapidly growing among the lower and also among the most advanced classes in almost every country dominated by European culture, following as a destroying negation the development of capitalism. (3) In its doctrinal aspects socialism is most interesting as a criticism of the present economic order, of what socialists call the capitalistic system, with which the existing land system is connected. Under the present economic order land and capital (the material and instruments without which industry is impossible) are the property of a class, employing a class of wage-labourers handicapped by their exclusion from land and capital. Competition is the general rule by which the share of the members of those classes in the fruits of production is determined. Against this system critical socialism is a reasoned protest; and it is at issue also with the prevailing political economy, in so far as it assumes or maintains the permanence or righteousness of this economic order. Of the economic optimism implied in the historic doctrine of *laissez-faire* socialism is an uncompromising rejection. (4) Socialism is usually regarded as a phase of the struggle for the emancipation of labour, for the complete participation of the working classes in the material, intellectual, and spiritual inheritance of the human race. This is certainly the most substantial and most prominent part of the socialist programme, the working classes being the most numerous and the worst sufferers from the present régime. This view, however, is rather one-sided, for socialism claims not less to be in the interest of the small capitalist gradually crushed by the competition of the larger, and in the interest also of the large capitalist, whose position is endangered by the huge unmanageableness of his success, and by the world-wide economic anarchy from which even the greatest are not secure. Still it is the deliverance of the working class that stands in the front of every socialistic theory; and, though the initiative in socialist speculation and action has usually come from the middle and upper classes, yet it is to the working men that they generally appeal.

While recognizing the great confusion in the use of the word "socialism," we have treated it as properly a phenomenon of the 19th century, beginning in France with Saint-Simon and Fourier, in England with Robert Owen, and most powerfully represented at the present day by the school of Karl Marx. As we have seen, however, there are definitions of the word which would give it a wider range of meaning and a more ancient beginning, compared with which capitalism is but of yesterday,—which would, in fact, make it as old as human society itself. In the early stages of human development, when the tribe or the village community was the social unit, the subordination of the individual to the society in which he dwelt was the rule, and common property was the prevalent form. In the development of the idea of property, especially as regards land, three successive historical stages are broadly recognized,—common property and common enjoyment of it, common property and private enjoyment, private property and private enjoyment. The last form did not attain to full expression till the end of the 18th century, when the principle of individual freedom, which was really a reaction against privileged restriction, was proclaimed as a positive axiom of government and of economics. The free individual struggle for wealth and for the social advantages dependent on wealth is a comparatively recent thing. In all periods of history the state reserved to itself the right to interpose in the arrangements of property,—sometimes in favour of the poor, as in the case of the English poor law, which may thus be regarded as a socialistic measure. Moreover, all through history revolts in favour of a rearrangement of property have been very frequent. And in the societies

of the Catholic Church we have a permanent example of common property and a common enjoyment of it.

How are we to distinguish the socialism of the 19th century from these old-world phenomena, and especially from the communism<sup>1</sup> which has played so great a part in history? To this query socialists, especially of the school of Marx, have a clear and precise answer. Socialism is a stage in the evolution of society which could not arrive till the conditions necessary to it had been established. The first and most essential of these was the development of the great industrialism which after a long period of preparation and gradual growth began to reach its culminating point with the inventions and technical improvements, with the application of steam and the rise of the factory system, in England towards the end of the 18th century. Under this system industry was organized into a vast social operation, and was thus already socialized; but it was a system that was exploited by the individual owner of the capital at his own pleasure and for his own behoof. Under the pressure of the competition of the large industry, the small capitalist is gradually crushed out, and the working producers become wage-labourers organized and drilled in immense factories and workshops. The development of this system still continues and is enveloping the whole world. Such is the industrial revolution. Parallel with this a revolution in the world of ideas equally great and equally necessary to the rise of socialism has taken place. This change of thought which made its world-historic announcement in the French Revolution made reason the supreme judge and had freedom for its great practical watchword. It was represented in the economic sphere by the school of Adam Smith. Socialism was an outcome of it too, and first of all in Saint-Simon and his school professed to give the positive and constructive corrective to a negative movement which did not see that it was merely negative and therefore temporary. In other words, Saint-Simon may be said to aim at nothing less than the completion of the work of Voltaire, Rousseau, and Adam Smith. Thus socialism professes to be the legitimate child of two great revolutions,—of the industrial revolution which began to establish itself in England towards the end of the 18th century, and of the parallel revolution in thought which about the same time found most prominent expression in France. Robert Owen worked chiefly under the influence of the former; Saint-Simon and Fourier grew up under the latter. The conspiracy of Babeuf is properly to be regarded as a crude revolutionary communism not essentially different from the rude efforts in communism made in earlier periods of history. With Saint-Simon and Owen historic socialism really begins, and is no longer an isolated fact, but has had a continuous and widening development, the succession of socialistic teaching and propaganda being taken up by one country after another throughout the civilized world.

We have seen, then, that the rise of socialism as a new and reasoned theory of society was relative to the industrial revolution and to the ideas proclaimed in the French Revolution, prominent among which, besides the much emphasized idea of freedom and the less easily realized ideals of equality and fraternity, was the conception of the worth and dignity of labour. Though Owen was most largely influenced by the former and Saint-Simon and Fourier by the latter, it is certain that all three were

<sup>1</sup> As used in current speech, and also in economics, no very definite line of distinction between communism and socialism can be drawn. Generally speaking communism is a term for a system of common property, and this should be accepted as the reasonably correct usage of the word; but even by socialists it is frequently used as practically synonymous with socialism. Collectivism is a word which has recently come into vogue to express the economic basis of socialism as above explained.



greatly affected by both the new movements. The motive power in Owen's career was the philanthropy and humanitarianism 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 well-being. 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-

spicuous feature of Louis Blanc's teaching was that he demanded the democratic organization of the state as preparatory to social reorganization. His system, therefore, had a positive and practical basis, in so far as it allied itself to a dominant tendency in the existing state. Louis Blanc was an eminent journalist, born at Madrid, where his father had a high post on the finances of King Joseph. His celebrated work on socialism, *Organisation du Travail*, exerted a very large influence on the thought of France. The formula of progress, says Louis Blanc, is double in its unity,—moral and material amelioration of the lot of all by the free co-operation of all and their fraternal association. He saw, however, that the great end of social reform could not be attained without political reform. It was not enough to discover the true methods for inaugurating the principle of association and the organization of labour according to the rules of reason, justice, and humanity. It was necessary to have political power on the side of social reform, political power resting on the chambers, on the tribunals, and on the army; not to take it as an instrument was to meet it as an obstacle. For these reasons he wished to see the state constituted on a thoroughly democratic basis as the first condition of success. He demanded that the state thus reformed should establish associations, which he called *social workshops*, for co-operative production. The money should be provided by the state, which also should draw up the rules. The state should appoint the functionaries for the first year. After that the workmen should elect their own managers. "Though the false and anti-social education given to the present generation makes it difficult to find any other motive of emulation and encouragement than a higher salary, the wages will be equal, as the ideas and character of men will be changed by an absolutely new education." Louis Blanc hoped that private firms would not be able to exist under the competition of such associations, and that the latter would in time absorb all the production of the country. Notwithstanding the influence exerted by Louis Blanc and the working men's party in the provisional Government of 1848, it cannot be said that his plans obtained a fair hearing or a fair trial. His schemes were certainly not carried out in the national workshops of that year. These were really a travesty of Louis Blanc's proposals, instituted expressly to discredit them. They were simply means of finding work for a motley proletariat thrown out of employment during the period of revolutionary disturbance; and these men were put to unproductive work, whereas of course Louis Blanc contemplated nothing but productive work, and the men he proposed to invite to join his associations were to give guarantees of character. The months following the revolution of February were, moreover, a period of industrial stagnation and insecurity, when any new project of trade, either on the old or new lines, had very little prospect of success. This remark applies largely also to the private associations for co-operative production subsidized by the republican Government. These were more closely akin to the plans of Louis Blanc; but to them also the times were unfavourable, and the help given them was both scanty and injudicious. As one of the leaders during this difficult crisis Louis Blanc had neither personal force nor enduring political influence sufficient to secure any considerable success for his cause. He was an amiable and genial enthusiast, but without weight enough to be a controller of men on a wide scale. The labour conferences at the Luxembourg, over which he presided, ended also as his opponents desired, without any tangible result. The proletariat at Paris, incensed at the closing of the national workshops, rose in armed insurrection, which was overthrown by Cavaignac in the sanguinary days of June (see

CAVAIGNAC). Louis Blanc was in no way implicated in the revolt, but he found it necessary to go into exile in England. With the bloodshed of the days of June French socialism ceased for a time to be a considerable force. Socialism in the true acceptation of the word was indeed only partially responsible for the insurrection. It was a rising of a proletariat not particularly versed in theories of social reconstruction, but deeply incensed at the reactionary measures of their rulers. Inasmuch, however, as it destroyed the most enterprising leaders of the workmen and quelled the spirit of the remainder, it thoroughly repressed the tendency to innovation amongst them for a long time to come, while the false prosperity of the second empire removed their most crying grievances. Under Napoleon III. there was consequently comparative quietness in France. Even the International had very little influence on French soil, though French working men had an important share in starting it.

Compared with the parallel movement in France the early socialism of England had an uneventful history (see OWEN). In order to appreciate the significance of Owen's work it is necessary to recall some of the more important features of the social condition of the country in his time. The English worker had no fixed interest in the soil. He had no voice either in local or national government. He had little education or none at all. His dwelling was wretched in the extreme. The right even of combination was denied him till 1824. The wages of the agricultural labourer were miserably low. The workman's share in the benefits of the industrial revolution was doubtful. Great numbers of his class were reduced to utter poverty and ruin by the great changes consequent on the introduction of improved machinery; the tendency to readjustment was slow and continually disturbed by fresh change. The hours of work were mercilessly long. He had to compete against the labour of women, and of children brought frequently at the age of five or six from the workhouses. These children had to work the same long hours as the adults, and they were sometimes strapped by the overseers till the blood came. Destitute as they so often were of parental protection and oversight, with both sexes huddled together under immoral and insanitary conditions, it was only natural that they should fall into the worst habits, and that their offspring should to such a lamentable degree be vicious, improvident, and physically degenerate. In a country where the labourers had neither education nor political or social rights, and where the peasantry were practically landless serfs, the old English poor-law was only a doubtful part of an evil system. All these permanent causes of mischief were aggravated by special causes connected with the cessation of the Napoleonic wars, which are well known. It was in such circumstances, when English pauperism had become a grave national question, that Owen first brought forward his scheme of socialism (1817). In his communities, which were intended to be self-dependent units, Owen sought to provide the best education and the constant exercise of unselfish intelligence, to unite the advantages of town and country, and to correct the monotonous activity of the factory with the greatest variety of occupation, while utilizing all the latest improvements in industrial technique. The causes of Owen's failure in establishing his communities are obvious enough. Apart from the difficulties inherent in socialism, he injured the social cause by going out of his way to attack the historic religions and the accepted views on marriage, by his quixotry and tediousness, by refusing to see that for the mass of men measures of transition from an old to a new system must be adopted. If he had been truer to his earlier methods and retained the autocratic guidance of his experiments, the chances of