



# SOCIAL SCIENCE

Essays from “La Phalange”

---

## Remedy for Various Slaveries.

Vol. 1 no. 5 (August 20, 1836)

At a time when England is making a mad outlay of five hundred million to free its colonial slaves, whom it could liberate without any cost and without risk of decline of industry in the West Indies;

At the moment when France, in a fit of Anglomania, wants to join in the chorus of deception and plans a new tax or loan of three hundred million to free its colonial Negroes, whom it can free without it costing anything;

Is it not the opportunity to examine the method that would emancipate GRATIS all the slaves of the globe, which would emancipate them by the will and the offer of the masters, with a guarantee of persistence in work, and progress through emulation?

The English colonial Negroes form approximately one three hundredth of the slaves and serfs of the globe. The Negroes of the French about a thousandth. Total, about four thousandths.

According to the English rate, at 500 francs, it would cost 150 billion to emancipate all the slaves on the globe, and according to the French rate, at 1,000 francs per capita, it would be 300 billion. Where to take them? And why resort to this ruinous means when you have one that would cost nothing?

Already in Rome, in the time of the Emperors, people had been able to free slaves without imposing any burden on the public treasury. Can we not find a free and even more expeditious method of release? Shouldn't someone in England call for a competition on this research, before voting for an expenditure of 500 million?

But there exists a class of philanthropists and people of progress, who, on the banks of the Thames as on the banks of the Seine, want to feel those hundreds of millions. Already in England they have established a poor tax, which costs, in imposed alms, 200 million per year, taken from 14 million inhabitants. France, to imitate this philanthropic blunder, should therefore add 430 million to its budget, according to the population ratio, 14 to 32.

What would be the fruit of this gigantic alms? Nothing other than a vicious circle, as we see in England, where it is so insufficient that we find, as before, legions of speculative or real poor. The city of London alone contains 230,000 destitute, beggars, vagabonds, prostitutes, suspicious people, etc., a brilliant result of an almsgiving which, for ten years, has already absorbed two billion!

Let us be wary of spendthrift philanthropy like that of Wilberforce; the processes of nature are not ruinous, and if the King of the French, to give his overseas neighbors a lesson in economy and

genius, wanted to abolish slavery and poverty at once, not only in French territory, but throughout the earth, it would cost, by the natural process, neither 2 billion, nor 200 million, nor 20 million, not even two. How much then? Not a cent, nothing other than WILL.

The matter is all the more worthy of attention since at this moment a bleed of 300 million is being planned for poor France; it must be proposed at the next session. The trap is well prepared, and the danger is imminent. Let us contrast it with the natural method, of which I will give a brief overview.

---

The late *Ampère* said: — When a question is well posed, we can consider it resolved in advance.

But until now nothing has been so badly posed as the questions relating to the abolition of slavery and indigence; on the one hand, we question whether slavery is an evil, while, on the other hand, we seem to doubt whether indigence exists, and we ask, in an academic program, *by what signs it manifests itself!!!* (Subject of the Beaujour Prize.)

If the signs are so unknown, so invisible that a reward of 5,000 francs is offered to whoever determines these signs by December 31, 1837, we can until then doubt that indigence exists; and yet the twelve charitable committees, in their epistles appealing for help, offer to provide very palpable proof of this existence of families destitute of everything. Why then offer 5,000 francs to search for what is found? Just carry an alms of 50 francs to the committee of the Saint-Marceau district, and he will have you taken to fifty attics where you will see the signs of indigence. As soon as you have covered half a dozen of these slums, you will be able to point out the sure signs of poverty, and win the prize of 5,000 francs.

Let's come to the position of the question.

Those who have discussed slavery, poverty and the means of their remedy have not considered that these two scourges are linked, come from the same cause, and that the cure for both must be effected by one sole antidote, which is *combined and attractive industry*, giving quadruple product.

The Academy of Sciences seems to have anticipated this innovation, because at a meeting in July 1829 it received and had printed a report by Mr. Moreau de Jonnès, demonstrating that agricultural product could be quadrupled.

Mr. François de Neuchateau came to the support, with a book in which he proves that in Champagne, the fragmentation and cutting of small properties reduces the income to a third of what it could be by the single unit of cultivation, the union into a single farm that would do the work impossible for small farmers, watering, breeding cattle, horses and other improvements impossible for poor peasants.

But M. de Jonnès and M. de Neuchateau remained with beautiful prospects; they did not provide the means of execution, which can only be *the art of associating* masses of families unequal in fortune; an art invoked by the *Décade Philosophique* in 1804; it raved about the enormity of savings and wealth that an agricultural village would obtain if it could bring together the three to four hundred families of which it is made up into unitary operations and households in varying degrees.

To carry out this meeting, there are three problems to resolve:

1. Distribution of work in attractive mode;
2. Useful employment of discord and inequalities;
3. Distribution satisfactory to everyone.

1. As long as the work is repugnant, it is imprudent to free the slaves; every philanthropic act is beyond the ways of nature if it leads to the decline of industry; this is what happens with the Wilberforce method, which our Anglomaniacs want to imitate. We must therefore discover an attractive method, guaranteeing the persistence of the freed slave, and likewise that of the employee who, obtaining through the quadruple product a lifestyle quadruple in well-being, could in various countries indulge in laziness, as in Spain.

2. If in order to associate it is necessary, according to the moralists, to change men and passions, to establish moderation, fraternity, equality, we will fail in every attempt; because it is established by three thousand years of experience that men do not want to change their characters, passions and tastes; they want to remain as nature made them. Now, they are varied and variable in taste; they do not want equality or moderation; we must therefore find a process that uses the qualities and forces that morality declares to be vicious and that it wants to suppress: discord, inequalities, immoderate ambitions, etc.

3. If out of the quadruple product some wanted to take everything, to claim the lion's share, the societary assembly would fall into dissolution at the end of the first campaign. The multitude wronged in distribution would mutiny; we therefore need a mode that satisfies everyone according to their three industrial faculties, which are: 1. shareholder capital, 2. labor, 3. talent, and which distributes the quadruple product to the various classes in the following proportion:

<i>Rich,</i>	<i>Affluent,</i>	<i>Middling,</i>	<i>Generous,</i>	<i>Poor.</i>
Double,	Triple,	Quadruple,	Quintuple,	Sextuple.

So the 22 million French people who earn a salary of 6 1/2 sous per day will have around 40 sous. Those who have a hundred thousand francs in income will have two hundred thousand. The middle class earns 2 or 3,000 francs, and will have 8 to 12,000. Everyone will be happy.

These are three conditions that our association spoilers had little idea of, Robert Owen, Saint-Simon, Van-den-Bosch; they wanted to take from the rich to give to the poor; they only dreamed of community, moderation, penitentiary, frugality, patience and other unnatural dispositions, which obtain prices of 6,000 francs at the Institute.

None of them dared to pose the three problems to themselves; everyone avoided the question by pretending to deal with it.

The solution I give would lose its merit if it did not resolve a fourth problem, that of the *equilibrium of population*. When humanity is happy and rich, the population will grow rapidly, because the regime of combined industry operating in short and varied sessions, gives great vigor and saves 2/3 on child mortality.

The population would therefore quadruple in less than a hundred years, despite the outpouring of colonial swarms. France (a current limit which will be changed) would soon have 130 million instead of 32 1/2; they would fall back into a regime of fragmentation, because the societal order, with all due respect to the moralists, cannot be maintained without great luxury scaled in degrees, and spread across all classes of the social body.

As for the population, its progress, which will be very rapid during the first and second generations, will stop in the third. Births will be reduced to a third of the current number, and this third will be enough to maintain the entire globe, because longevity, the absence of wars, epidemics and excesses, will reduce the number of deaths to a third.

The exuberance of the population is one of the disorders that denounces the incompetence and cowardice of the philosophical sciences. Far from applying ourselves, following Ampère, *to asking questions well in order to facilitate their solution*, we are only concerned with falsifying and distorting them. For example, Malthus said in substance to civilized people: “Your industrial and social progress is illusory, the outraged population neutralizes all your efforts, it overwhelms you; and false competition, by reducing wages, always leads to the destitution of your anthills of populace; we must either populate less, or produce more and distribute better. Current progress is just a vicious circle.”

In this apostrophe to ANTI-POLITICAL *economics* (a name rightly given to it by Baron Dupin), Malthus posed the question well; he put his finger on the wound. What was the response? The scholarly world cried out against the sacrilegious writer who had the audacity to tell the truth and ask a question in the right sense. He was forced to retract; he had the weakness, let us say cowardice, to consent to it.

If he had strictly maintained his opinion, the entire scaffolding of the philosophical sciences would have been overturned; we would have come to suspect the current state of societies, to conceive that it is probably a subversive mechanism of social destiny, a state of FALL, as Scripture so rightly says; a fall from which humanity can only recover through a complete reform of the industrial system, extended to all branches, culture, manufacturing, household, commerce, etc. We would have recognized that the reforms attempted in politics, in religion, having generated only scourges, we must enter another career, try the method opposed to the system of incoherence, fragmentation and deceit that reigns in current industry; try the combined and truthful mode, since a theory finally appears that resolves all the problems to be posed on this subject; problems that none of the sophists who rambled on about association had addressed, not daring to address any of the three questions posed above, and without the solution of which we cannot organize the societal mechanism on masses of three to four hundred families unequal in fortune.

In all science the false precedes the true. Judicial astrology reigned before geometric astronomy, magic before medicine, alchemy before experimental chemistry. Is it any surprise that it is the same in association? It is only since the new century that we have occupied ourselves with it; the charlatans, as usual, led the way; they seized the idea, disguised it in theory and practice; it is now the turn of true science.

---

To these overviews, let us add some details of methodical direction; let us see how the human mind should have oriented itself in researches on the destiny, on the means of recovering from the FALL; it should have reasoned like this:

Science, called philosophy, which for three thousand years has served as our guide, has only known how to lead us astray, to engulf us in all the social miseries: poverty, deceit, oppression, carnage, etc. These shameful results condemn philosophy, so let us look for another guide.

What guide to resort to? He is a being who knows how to make laws of geometric harmony for the largest and smallest creatures, for the stars as well as for the bees; would he not have done something for men, to regulate the order of their industrial and social relations? He must have done it if his providence is complete, extended to all creatures.

How does he reveal to them their destiny, the kind of life he assigns to them? It is through attractions and repugnances; to know if God uses the same path with us, we must make a calculation of analysis and synthesis on the attractions and repugnances that have reigned and that persist among all nations.

Could it not be that humanity had two destinies, two social mechanisms, like the worlds where we see incoherence among comets, and combination among the planets? Would our industry not also be subject to duality of mechanism?

We give God the name of *eternal geometer*. Had he therefore ceased to be a geometer the day he created our passions? Could it not be that they were the springs, the elements of a mechanism of geometric accuracy, the discovery of which our moral sciences have missed through their diatribes against the passions?

Basing ourselves on these conjectures, we would have proceeded to calculate passionate attraction, and we would have recognized that it tends to introduce into industry the same order that God established in all his creations, the scales of inequalities or series of groups; we would have tried them on a mass of three to four hundred families, and we would have easily succeeded in obtaining quadruple product, attractive industry, mechanism of the passions; hence the general imitation.

Newton's success, in calculating material attraction, invited us to exploit the other veins of the mine, the passionate, instinctive, organic, aromatic attractions, etc.

Napoleon wanted to study both the instinctive and aromatic branches. The day before leaving Egypt, he vigorously refuted Monge, who claimed that everything was done in calculation of attraction; he regretted that his duties had prevented him from continuing the work started by Newton.

The task having been accomplished, it remains to be seen what course a century that claims to be rational, positive and eager for progress should take in this regard.

It must make a try in spite of the obscurantist party that caused Malthus to retract, a party that has always stifled inventions; speaking only of the steamboat, we saw the four inventors eliminated successively:

Blanco de Garay, by the Zoïles, under Charles V.

Salomon de Cos, by Cardinal Richelieu.

Papin, by the Paris Academy.

Fulton, by Napoleon, giving in to jealous sailors.

Does France want to repeat such a mistake? Are we, behind a mask of rationalism, such Vandals as we were with regard to Columbus and Galileo? What is frightening about the attempt at an attractive, combined industry model farm? The Dutch have just founded fourteen large internal colonies, in penitentiary and incoherent mode; will France not dare to found a quarter of one in attractive mode?

I say a quarter, since we can reduce the testing of the mechanism to 450 children from 3 1/2 to 13 years old for boys, from 3 to 12 for girls, and 150 hectares of garden land; a capital of one million in 1,000 shares of 1,000 francs, and six weeks of exercise for the demonstration.

If the King takes the first action, the other 999 will be placed the next day. He can misappropriate 1,000 fr. of the 500,000 fr. that he allocates as relief to the workers of Lyon, through

a purchase of silks on which he will lose at least 20 percent. Let's see what he will earn on his 1,000 francs share:

The conquest of all sovereigns: all, more or less burdened and running to borrow, will be intoxicated with joy upon learning that they can, thanks to the quadruple product, *double their taxes by reducing taxpayers by half*, according to this proportion for France :

1 billion being taken today from 7, we could take 4 billion from 28, the amount of the quadruple product; but the tax authorities will have enough with 2 billion. Taxpayers will therefore only pay 2/28 instead of the 4/28 that they pay today. The advantage will be the same for all sovereigns; they will praise Louis-Philippe, founder of the new industry, all will seek a marital alliance with his children; his dynasty will become the most stable on the globe.

A charm no less flattering for them will be the guarantee of an end to revolutions and conspiracies: their main cause is indigence, *malesuada famas*. If Fieschi and Alibaud had been paid a thousand crowns, they would not have committed their attack; now, I can prove arithmetically and in minute detail, that in the society system, the poorest of men lives like the one who, today, has a thousand crowns of income in a country outside of excise. Could we find in a such order, assassins, rioters driven by hunger?

The king will therefore have conquered monarchs and peoples in one fell swoop; his personal enemies will become his most zealous supporters. The parties will fall into oblivion; it will be obvious that none of them could do anything for the happiness of the people, because none can enrich them; under the republicans or the legitimists they would always be reduced to starvation and disgusting work; double misfortune which will suddenly be followed by double happiness, especially in the kinds of enjoyment that the people value most, good food and a carefree tomorrow.

The man of the people will have no worries about wife or children; because, in the combined regime, the woman earns a lot, the child is supported for up to three years by the phalanx, at four he already earns his living, at six years much more. Education is free in all degrees and kinds.

Then there can no longer be slaves, because combined domesticity is an infinitely better and less costly service than that of slaves. Moreover, any owner will want to benefit from the quadruple product, and he will offer his slaves freedom, except joint ransom payable in ten or twelve years. This will end both slavery and poverty.

Let us say slaveries, because there are many kinds of slavery. Is the employee not an indirect slave? And among the class that owns, what servitudes for man, woman and child! Let's move on from this far too broad subject.

But there is an unknown slavery that must be pointed out, which is the yoke of obscurantism and philosophical superstitions, of atheism and materialism, of dogmas that have degraded God, denied his providence as an industrial mechanism, denied the existence of his code and prevented research into it.

If they were rational and positive as they boast, they would understand that in the direction of social or other movement, divine reason must be first, and human reason second; it is therefore from God that the organic and general laws of the social system must emanate; man must be limited to secondary or circumstantial laws.

If their reason is both positive and negative, let them recognize the *positive* proof of subversion in the poverty of the most industrious nations, English, French, Chinese, Hindus; and the *negative*

proof in the obstinacy of the savages in refusing agriculture. They are free and organs of nature; it tells us through their refusal that our industrial method is a subversion of the natural mode.

If our philosophers seek truth, why have they never studied the results that the universal use of truth in industrial relations would produce? This study would have revealed to them the spring of the societal mechanism, the scales of discord and inequalities, the series of rival groups.

For fourteen years, they have been preventing this ordeal: here is a great opportunity to suspect and confuse them. They want to bleed three hundred million from France, to free one thousandth of the globe's slaves; let everything be franked free of charge: it is a great reward for the King, the security of his person and his dynasty are at stake. France, instead of losing 300 million, will gain at least 500 million which will be given to the liberating King, to whom each sovereign, each nation, will wish to show their deep gratitude through offerings of estates, gold and precious stones.

And what will this metamorphosis of human societies cost? Not a penny, because taking action on a model farm which will return much more than ours, is making a good investment and not a crazy expense like that of the hundreds of millions whose useless profusion philanthropists meditate on.

What luck for the king! An end of conspiracies; a dynasty consolidated by vote of the whole world; enthusiasm for France which will restore the civil list to the usual figure, 25 million to the king, 8 to the princes; the honor of having abolished poverty and slavery, of having elevated the human race to a happy destiny, of having pulverized atheism and materialism by introducing the divine or mechanical code of souls and passions, of having established throughout the earth free movement, replaced all odious and harmful taxes, substituted for industrial chaos true commerce, and units of language, alphabetical signs, currencies, weights and measures, etc.

*But it's so beautiful, it's a dream!* Well! America too was a dream, before we had agreed to verify: I am not asking for credulity here, nothing other than the dubious tone, like that of the prelate, Isabella's confessor: he said very sensibly to the strong minds of 15th century: "I do not see that this theory of Columbus is as stupid as you make it out to be: I am no more credulous than you, but I think that there is no risk in verifying it, by a voyage of exploration which we will always yield *some fruit.*"

Here the case is the same and there is much more certainty of drawing *some fruit* from a test on the only theory which has a chance of success, in that it bends men, passions, characters and instincts, *such they are*. Such a process is more specious than the methods which for 300 years have struggled in vain to change passions.

If the King or some influential person expressed this dubious, very circumspect opinion, far removed from credulity, the test on 400 children would immediately be resolved, carried out: 2 months later the human race would enter into a mechanism of harmony; he would pass from *the strong mind* to the judicious mind, which grants divine reason first place in legislation, and assigns second place to human reason.

CH. FOURIER.

Working translation by Shawn P. Wilbur  
Last Revised July 8, 2024