



# MANUSCRIPTS OF FOURIER.

## THE IRRELIGIOUS SPIRIT OF THE MODERNS

### I. ON THE USE OF REPULSIVE SYSTEMS IN RELIGION.

The main error of reason is to consider any question of social movement as a *simple* system, to make God and man beings that are simple in mechanism and in purpose, to exclude God from regulatory intervention in social relations, to isolate the man from his essential support, which is God, wanting reason to exercise by itself alone and without intervention from God the highest function of the movement, legislation, and to complete this series of attacks with the inconsistency of imploring God, demanding his providence, when we in fact reject it by refusing to study Attraction, the sole interpreter of his social decrees.

What is a society that isolates itself from God and does not coincide with him in any branch of the social system? I compare such a society to an army that has no general, no order, no combined march, all of whose bodies act incoherently. We will see that this is the maneuver of modern Civilization. Isolated in all senses from the divine spirit that should be its pivot, its rallying point, it is compromised even by the partial successes it obtains, such as the success of the physical sciences. This is what I am going to demonstrate in this interlude, where I can only draw conclusions on the subject previously treated, on the split of human reason with the divine reason whose supremacy Civilization does not want to recognize, the necessity of intervention and revelation.

Every legislative act of men undermines the supremacy of God. He regulates in his passional code all our social relations in domestic, administrative and industrial mechanisms. In this code he pushed the accuracy to such minute details that, when reading them in the treatise on attraction that follows, we will be astounded by his foresight, his infinite generosity in preparing the means to satisfy each of our passions in all the refinements of which it is susceptible.

The discovery could not have been more timely, because the globe is flooded with these legislative pygmies who create codes to repress the passions. In no century have we seen constitutions multiply so rapidly, although the civilized, through their jumble of ancient and modern constitutions, are amply convinced of the irreparable vice of the laws of men, laws that always fall into the vicious circle and constantly reproduce the same abuses in various forms.

By thus persisting against the testimony of experience, civilized reason must go more and more wrong, and outdo the dark centuries, as is proven by the recent scandals of atheism and

materialism, which are a worthy complement to the stupidities of this Civilization always tossed between philosophy and superstition.

How can this reason, which should have been perfected in 3,000 years of experience, finally recognize the supremacy of God, the necessity of divine intervention in legislation; how is it less advanced than in its young age, since it has lost even the hope of this light whose descent a more judicious antiquity implored and hoped for? How did modern reason get lost in its innumerable systems, to the point of arousing the ridicule of its own coryphées, such as Condillac and Bacon, who condemn it *to rethink its understanding and forget everything it has learned?*

Well! What progress has it made since Condillac? It has produced theories of *clubic* fraternity and other novelties of the same ilk, of which we can say better than ever that we must forget everything we have learned, since our new enlightenment aggravates all the civilized scourges: poverty, oppression, deceit and carnage. Reason is therefore even more condemned to rebuild its understanding. We will see in the *extroduction* what rule it had to follow to achieve this goal that the human mind can only achieve by correcting itself from simple genius, by rallying itself to compound genius.

Among the vices of reason are irreligion and obscurantism. The analysis of their complicity will show the enemies of religion in those who adorn themselves with a fiery zeal for it, and the enemies of enlightenment in those who plead the cause of reason. As it is true that everything is only falsehood and disguise in civilized mores, and that the one who would make it a rule to constantly believe the complete opposite of the moral appearances of civilized people, would be the one who would pass the truest judgments on them.

Irreligion is a general vice among moderns; it has corrupted all the upper classes. It reigns even among those who for personal interest parade a religious spirit that is not in their soul. Some famous sophists, like J.-J. Rousseau, avoided this flaw, but they were jugglers who maintained the pros and the cons. He himself admits, on the subject of a speech crowned by the Academy of Dijon, that he was on the verge of supporting and addressing the opposite opinion. What basis can be made from the opinions of such men? Nor do I count as champions of religion those who owed it rich endowments, hundreds of thousands of francs in income. Everyone would be religious at this price. As for the truly neutral class in this debate, it is certain that its dominant spirit is irreligion, and it is quite scandalous that three thousand years of light have brought about this result.

Were those who attributed the system of infernal atrocities to God judicious men? They made divinity hated, they brought religion into disrepute and paved the way for impiety, for the sects of atheism and all the anti-religious intrigues.

The first tendency of man having reached the age of reason is to revolt against the dogmas that would plunge billions of barbarians and savages into the eternal fires, who have done no other harm to God than to ignore a religion that he did not teach them. This is to attribute to God cruelties that would make cannibals blush, because they only make their enemies suffer for a day. How can a century have healthy ideas about God, when the priests who are the divine militia thus dishonor their leader? Should we be surprised after this that humanity, revolted by this ferocity of the modern God, gives in to the deceptions of atheism?

Now the leaders of the cult feel the inconsistencies of such dogmas and would like to modify them, but it is too late. The damage is done. The golden age of studies, the 18th century, pushed back the natural guide, the religious spirit that would have led them to the goal. The taunts about divinity have occupied time that could usefully have been occupied in dissertations on the duties and attributes of God. The fault lies with those who exposed the divinity to disdain through the excess of absurdities and atrocities that they attributed to it.

The philosophers did not want to deliberate on this alternative: suspecting Civilization or suspecting God. They have rallied to a bastard opinion, atheism, which supposes the absence of a God, exempts scientists from seeking his views, authorizes them to give their irreconcilable theories as the rule of good and evil, and saves their works from the fall with which they would be threatened by the hypothesis of a generous God, of a universal providence that would have advised the creation and the revelation of a social code. Atheism is a very convenient opinion for philosophical ignorance, and those who have been called strong minds for having professed atheism have thereby shown themselves to be very weak in genius; fearing to fail in the search for God's views on the social order, they preferred to deny and praise as perfectibility this civilized order, which they secretly abhor and whose appearance disorients them to the point of making them doubt Providence.

“Who are you, earthworm, unworthy creature to want to plumb the depths of God’s decrees?” Thus the superstitious express themselves when speaking to man.<sup>1</sup>

Then come the philosophers who, in other words, reproduce the same prejudice, telling us: “Stop, you reckless mortals; profane people, stop! Nature is covered with a veil of brass that all the efforts of centuries cannot pierce.”

Thus the superstitious and the philosophers agree to divert the human mind from the study of nature. They compete in paradoxes to degrade God and paint him as a being hateful and jealous of our enlightenment, greedy regarding revelations, which on the contrary he wants to bring to the highest degree, by introducing us to the full knowledge of his system.

Atheism, in hands more skillful than those of the philosophers, could lead to brilliant results, provided that one had adopted conditional atheism or the simultaneous accusation of God and human reason, deferring disregarding God until after [establishing] the parallel between the operations and duties of Reason and the operations and duties of a supposedly just God.

The superstitious have no less outraged the divinity, believing they are serving it. They want us to worship without reasoning, to revere even the tiger and the rattlesnake, because they are the work of God. Well! Why then did God give us reason and free will, if not to make use of it and to exercise our critical intelligence on all the problems of movement and creation? I will prove, in this work, that the creation of the rattlesnake horrifies God, and that it took very weighty reasons to determine it, which I will make known.

That the superstitious have hindered this study is not surprising; but that people who call themselves strong minds, distributors of light, investigators of nature, have discouraged the study of movement and attraction at the very moment when Newton was opening the path, and have joined

---

<sup>1</sup> An earthworm, Newton, determined the theory of the 5th branch of motion (the law of gravitation of celestial bodies.) Isn't this an indication that other earthworms will be able to determine the other four branches of the theory of movement?

forces with the superstitious to give credence to the prejudices of impenetrability, this is what puts the philosophical cabal far below the superstition that it combats, which at least has the merit of fulfilling its task by spreading obscurantism. As for the so-called flambeaux of light, they only have the ability to evade all questions relating to social destiny; they felt that the miseries of humankind led them to choose between the two sides: to accuse God of improvidence or to accuse reason of incompetence in the search for God's views. Just men would have discussed this alternative; but, in order to avoid examining the faults of human reason, philosophers have decided to deny God.

Far from God being offended by our doubts and our criticisms of his operations, he applauds them as an old surveyor applauds the doubts of the student and stimulates him to verify the operations whose result seems inconceivable at first glance. It is the same with God who, far from requiring blind faith from us, desires, on the contrary, that we submit to doubt his operations, the justice of which a regular critique will highlight.

Exalted love for God, liveliness of faith and hope were the best compass that could guide us in the search for the calculation of destinies. Men have erred in the religious system as in everything else. The facts sufficiently prove it; religious policy must have been very absurd to have, after thirty centuries, brought enlightened nations to the most shameful degradation, to graduated irreligion, public insult to the divinity among scholars, religious hypocrisy among the great, indifference among the vulgar. Apparently the religious system that produced this result contains some gross defect that must be examined.

It has only produced a false piety, the fear of God substituted for love, a fear that has become the germ of irreligion, because we quickly come to no longer love those we must fear.

Considering the ferments of revolution that exist in Europe, in America and in all civilized countries, the necessity of princes, even the gentlest, to support themselves by rigors and fear, the lack of skill of a few, who, having so many means of making themselves loved, were only able to organize their states in the Jacobite manner, and to resurrect committees of secret denouncers in each canton, when we see the secret impatience of the subjects, the hatred against authority and the tendency of Civilization towards a general explosion which only awaits a [     ], we must conclude that never was there a greater urgency for good [     ]; but to treat an illness, it is first necessary to accurately assign its causes, and, consequently, to point out the true authors of irreligion, one of the greatest scourges of the modern generation, one that opens the way to worse revolutions perhaps than those from which we are barely emerging.

Irreligion is such a disastrous scourge that it is important to point out its causes, perpetrators and effects. There are great errors in this regard. To speak only of the authors, the disorder is exclusively attributed to the philosophers.

No doubt they contributed to it, but secondarily. The priesthood is the main culprit. I will distinguish the respective wrongs and give back to each according to their merits.

In order not to imitate these artisans of torture who dedicate the interesting vestal and the bloodthirsty Nero to the same tortures, let us establish the gradation of offenses and posit that the superstitious people who prepared irreligion are even more guilty than the philosophers who have invented it. Who is more guilty, the thief who plunders a house or the servant who, in charge of guarding, delivers the keys to the thief and encourages the plundering, while putting up a feigned

resistance? Such was the role of the superstitious in irreligion; they sacrificed religion to the lure of extortion and donations for which they based their hope on infernal terrors.

Could the priesthood be unaware that the philosophers, agitators by profession, sophists by profession as much as by false judgment, always on the lookout for ways to interfere with and revolutionize the mechanism in any branch, would not fail to attack the religious system at the weakened points, and that it was compromising both the honor of the Divinity and the peace of society to produce dogmas that expose God to ridicule, disdain and hatred, dogmas designed to rouse even children; for who among us has not been revolted from childhood to hear that there is no salvation outside the Roman church, and that six hundred million barbarians and savages will be plunged into the flames in each generation for not having heard of the Roman church?

The philosophers' fault in this matter is not to have rectified religious policy, not having produced any competing system. They only inspired party spirit and not the spirit of unity. We have seen a host of schisms, like those of Luther and Calvin; but not a cult that was able to absorb the Roman religion, to identify with it by purely political measures.

Do we lack experimental knowledge? For four thousand years of historical ages, there have appeared on the globe an infinity of religions so contradictory in dogmas and customs, that one cannot name a crime that has not been a virtue in some religion, nor a virtue that may not have been a crime according to some other religion. Murder, theft, adultery, pederasty, everything we call crime, has been a religious virtue in some nation. Regicides were saints for the Old Man of the Mountain, among the Romans and among the regenerators of 1793. Parricide is a pious work among savages, who condemn and lead their father to death. Adultery is a virtue among many peoples, who offer their wives to strangers as a sign of hospitality. Pederasty, theft and the assassination of helots were paths of virtue among the republicans of Sparta who are offered to us in schools as models. Finally, all crime has obtained altars in some regions, and all virtue has been crime in some others. The Civilized, who set themselves up as exclusive arbiters of virtue, are the most devoted to all the customs declared criminal in their religious worship.

How is it that from the parallels of these numerous and irreconcilable cults we have not yet been able to deduce the fundamental division of religious policy into three branches: the method of terror, that of seduction, and the half-party mode, a division that is the same in administrative systems?

As for the option, the alternative was the same for men as for God. If it is obvious that the government of a prince like Titus is easier to establish and maintain than that of a tyrant like Nero, was it not equally obvious that it is easier to found and maintain an indulgent, seductive cult like that of mythology, than an atrocious cult like that of Odin or of Mexico?

What would we think of a Mexican or a Scandinavian who rose up against his blood-soaked gods? Everyone would praise him for having deserted their infamous banners. But the eternal hell, the demons, vipers, infernos of the Roman system, are they not a hundred times more revolting than the dogma of the fierce Scandinavians, associated with the crude peoples, to whom it was preached, while the Roman dogma of the braziers filled with vipers is presented to civilized nations who have reached the point of appreciating the odiousness of such a dogma and its authors.

What a parallel with the tolerant cults of the mythological deities! Is it any wonder after this that the religious spirit is destroyed among the moderns, that there remains only a simulacrum of piety, based on intrigue and terror, totally devoid of the powerful lever of love?

For a long time, superstitious people were able to persuade princes that religion was a powerful force for keeping people in obedience. Today this assertion is confounded by experience. Never was a sovereign so well obeyed as Bonaparte, whose people did not believe in hell and had no religious spirit. There existed under his reign a simulacrum of worship, but only to prevent others from arising: it was a negative cult. Under his reign, ministers of the church were disdained and completely without influence. Neither peasants nor townspeople believed in hell, and yet never did a nation more cheerfully bear the burden of taxes and militias; never a braver army, never a more devoted people; the French would have gone to die for him to the last, and what is most inconceivable is that they loved him, and when he returned after a year the people welcomed him with a frenzied joy in the most religious cities, like Lyon, and the whole of France, apart from Vendée and Provence, provinces of intrigue, rose with ardor to go and immolate themselves again for him.

What sovereign will be able to obtain such devotion, if he only brings into play the lever of hell, and what is the error of these men who today want to persuade us that the juggling of hell is necessary to muzzle the civilized? The invention of hell is only an effect of weakness; it is due to the runts who realized that to govern the civilized and barbaric rabble, it is necessary to terrify them, decimate them if necessary. The civilized person is like a vicious horse, loving the rider who knows how to tame him, despising and unhorsing the one who does not know how to bridle him. Some leaders who did not know how to muzzle primitive hordes invented the tortures of the other world to support their weak administration. That of Bonaparte proved that hell is the lever of political runts, and that a skillful prince knows how to make his people a swarm of minions, without the pitiful help of hell, a juggling act to be suppressed under a prince who knows how to enforce by himself. Hell is, like philosophy, very useless under strong governments, very dangerous under weak governments.

The system of hell has a much greater disadvantage, which is to stupefy minds in the calculation of movement, to render them incapable of studying the characters and attributions of God.

A dogma that degrades God below cannibals and anthropophages, a dogma worthy of the atrocious cults of Scandinavia and ancient Mexico, the dogma of the eternal torments of hell, is taught as an obligatory belief in a century which praises its own enlightenment. Hell was invented in dark centuries, and to muzzle crude peoples, incapable of reflection. This dogma was indecently continued in the enlightened centuries, which should have purged themselves of it. It was maintained by the ease it offered in terrifying the dying, and extorting from them donations in favor of the altar.

This dogma, as revolting as it is ridiculous, produces the effect we should have expected, disgust for religion. The peoples rise up against a god of rage and extermination, who wants to plunge six hundred million savages and barbarians into the eternal fires. After they have spent their lives in the torments of slavery and famine, God will cause them to be tortured eternally, because they did not know a Roman doctrine that no one ever taught them, and among the two hundred million Christians, the immense majority will still be plunged into furnaces, according to the maxim: Many called, few chosen!

So much cruelty raises spirits. We wonder why God created the human race, if he intended to immerse ninety-nine hundredths of it in furnaces filled with vipers. Is the god of the Roman

Church really the god of peace, and how dare his ministers preach charity in the name of an executioner implacable in his fury?

## II. PARALLEL ATTRACTIVE AND REPULSIVE SYSTEMS

Without anticipating the treatise on the passionate movement, I will try to provide a glimpse of the political vice of modern religions.

The Roman Catholic religion is a maneuver of inverse diffraction, a mode that has the constituent character of pivoting on divergent conjugate extremes and always leaving the center bare.

1. It circumvents and influences the two ages, extreme and disparate in intellectual means, the children and the old people, by the cruelty of the tortures of hell; but does this same fear influence the man of the age of reason, at twenty, thirty and forty years old? No, undoubtedly! Here then is a system of terror that operates on two extreme ages, which are very divergent in guilt; for old age is steeped in crimes, while the age of childhood has committed none. Nothing is more disparate in terms of deserved penalties; however both ages intervene to admit this fear and together form the springs of maneuvers, while the central age or age of loves and rapines, at twenty, thirty, forty and fifty years old, rises up against the dogma of hell and gives itself over to its passions. Here then, on this point, is the bare center and the pivot seated on divergent conjugate extremes.

2. It influences and converts the extreme and opposite classes into intellectual means: on the one hand, the poor in spirit, the idiots with pretensions, devoid of any relief in themselves, seek relief in the affectation of piety; on the other hand it joins the class most incompatible with fools, that of the overabundant in spirit, the outdated and neglected coquettes, and the declining libertines steeped in ambition. But it misses the middle class, that of judicious men who, out of a need for seductive worship, rally around the illusions of equally absurd philosophy. Here in this second class of operation is the same vice as in the first, the center stripped and the pivots sitting on divergent conjugate extremes.

3. It influences the opposing classes in ambition, the fathers of families who only want to contain [ *gap in the text* ].

I could go further with the examples, but it is enough to conclude on the vices of this maneuver, which always leaves the center without resistance. It cannot be better compared than to the military tactics of the Tartars, who have neither center nor line of operation, and flutter on the enemy's flanks. This method is good in their deserts, and so the Catholic system has been good in the ages of darkness; but today it exposes religion to decline and fall by any regular attack on the center. Such was that of the philosophers, who, by seizing the middle age, had already won an operational victory before having won it in fact. The attack by the Freemasons would have been much more serious and without remedy for Catholicism if it had taken place. This religion was saved by their ignorance, as well as by that of the philosophers, who did not know how, during the time of their reign, to establish a judicious cult, these sophists not knowing how to invent anything. But are we sure, if Civilization continues, that we will always have to deal with such inept cabals, and should

we not fear that better directed attacks will bring about disorganization, which would become increasingly easier as long as religion pivots on combined extremes, without returning to the pivoting of the center, which would have the invaluable advantage of reestablishing love of God and hope in God? Hope in God! It is something laughable in the eyes of moderns, the immense importance of which I will demonstrate to them in a special article.

Modern nations can be criticized for having only given results similar to their maneuvers or modulation of the combined extremes. They have produced the two excesses contrary to the good religious spirit, — in ignorant centuries, ascetic fanaticism, the germ of superstitious revolutions, — then in enlightened centuries, false piety or fear of God without love. This fear was to gradually engender irreligion. Because we quickly come to no longer love those we should fear. Such must be the result of all worship, which makes fear its principal lever, and only excites the love of God by means incapable of producing it.

So irreligion has become a general vice in Civilization. Instead of religious spirit, there reigns a simulacrum of piety which offers three main varieties:

1. Mercenary piety or personal interest; for example, among those who derive a good endowment from divine worship. Their display of religious sentiment is all the more suspect because they are most eager to degrade God, by stifling all hope of the discovery of his code and by applauding the current disorder of the globe, which is a double insult to God in a material and social sense.

2. Speculative piety, — that of a crowd of people who see in religion only a means of containing their subordinates, children, valets, farmers, subjects, or who frequent the temples out of party spirit and coalition with those whose protection they seek.

3. Negative piety or the shield of mockery, resource of the poor in spirit who, for lack of means, support themselves through pietism, resource of women who in the decline of age throw themselves into the arms of God by distraction, by emptiness of spirit, and make religion a stopgap or counterweight, in the absence of finished loves for them. We also see that the old-fashioned coquettes are minions of devotion.

These are the three nuances of the religious spirit among the moderns. They only present the gradations of hypocrisy. What was the state of the religious spirit among the ancients? A very short parallel will demonstrate their great superiority in this matter.

Antiquity was not yet on the path to the revelation of Providence; like us, the ancients did not have the communication initiative provided by Newtonian calculation. However, the enlightened class of antiquity inclined towards the good religious spirit; it sought to raise people to healthy belief, to the adoration of the *one* god, *Deo ignoto*, as Cicero said; it therefore tended towards real improvement in matters of belief.

Antiquity was not irreligious, because its dogmas and rites made people love the Divinity. The mythological gods were compassionate to human weaknesses; content with the privations that poor humanity experienced, without demanding more, they allowed pleasures. Their cult identified with the passions, with the needs of the many. The victim sacrificed to Jupiter was always worth a few pennies to the poor people; Irus in the *Odyssey* obtains his share of the sacrificed victims, and the gods become friendly to the people when they seat them at a copiously served banquet. Everyone could choose gods to suit their tastes and passions. There were divinities even for thieves,



merchants, card-sharps, who were under the patronage of Mercury. Hence it was that everyone had a cordial affection for the gods.

Let us note on this point the falsity of our administrative prejudices. Antiquity allowed thieves and merchants to provide themselves with protection in the heavens; yet we did not see more thieves in the cities nor more deceitfulness among merchants, as it is true that the art of governing and containing people is exclusively the province of politics. Anyone who feels obliged to resort to religion on this point is not an administrator. The natural use of religion is to console and relax people and not to contain them.

Mythological religion had obtained this goal; it was frankly loved by the great as well as the common people. Nothing proves this better than the epithet *pious Aeneas* constantly repeated by Virgil, so bland, so shocking in the eyes of the moderns, who no longer have love for God. Would Virgil, a man of the court, the most refined poet of his century, have adorned his hero with this mediocre epithet, if it had not been agreeable to the Aristarchus of his century and to the good company of Rome? However, Aeneas, through his perpetual nickname of *pious*, becomes a very insipid character today. Each of us wonders how a man as experienced as Virgil could have lacked discernment in the qualification of his hero. The enigma can only be explained by the fall of the religious spirit. When it existed, it was the charm of nations. So Virgil, to make the tyrant Mezentius odious, first reproaches him for despising the gods.

Do we see that Virgil lacked discernment on other subjects? No, certainly. No writer of antiquity had finer tact than him and better observed the conventions of all kinds; but he wrote for a society that loved God. We no longer like him in the modern age, and the piety of Aeneas, which pleased the very polite court of Augustus and the Maecenas, becomes untenable among us; it excites the ridicule of even the vulgar, a necessary effect of modern religions, which have weakened the love of God, because of the duties, austerities and tortures that they put into play to produce it.

The ancient religion had the good spirit to attract young people of both sexes through its tolerance and respect for the voluptuousness that was honored with a religious cult pushed to ridiculous excesses. The Roman ladies, so praised by philosophy, piously made the procession of the Phallus displayed as a banner. The austere Cato, the oracle of morality, applauded the young men who frequented public women's houses, and called them virtuous children who did not seek to disturb households. It should be noted that an extraordinary circumstance, the absence of syphilitic diseases, favored these customs. Whatever the case, the multitude and especially the opulent class, attached themselves to the gods because of this non-dangerous license at the time. The youth loved God, who today does not have a sincere friend among the young people. This is the weak side of modern cults; it was mainly their intolerance for the youth that caused the irreligion. I insist on this with an example.

Pericles and Aspasia are lovers. You oppose to them a god angry with their pleasures, who will plunge them into eternal infernos to punish them for their innocent enjoyments. Necessarily the loving couple will mock such a god, and will not believe in it: they will take an aversion to his cult and his ministers. But Pericles and Aspasia set the tone for the brilliant youth, who communicated it to the lower classes. From then on, irreligion invades everything through the power of the tone or movement of opinion printed by youth or central age. Here intervene the philosophers, always adept at taking advantage of chances of intrigue, who see in this irreligious movement a means of

courting Pericles and the great ones of his caste. They attack through mockery a cult that is inconvenient for the opulent classes and defective in mechanism, as we have seen above. Soon the generation is carried away by this tactic of mockery, and irreligion gradually becomes the dominant vice. The cult is undermined at its base by the secret influence of young people revolting against a god who is the enemy of their pleasures.

Who are the authors of this disorder? They are the authors of the terrible dogmas that offend the opulent class, annoy the youth, a pivotal class in the affectionate mechanism, without whose intervention we can neither establish the love of divinity, nor solidly establish the religious spirit. To neglect the conquest of youth in a religious system is to maneuver like a general who opens his center and lets his lines be cut. Such was the attack of philosophy. It focused and still affects the center of the social system stripped by the defection of young people, and, with their support, it easily undermined Catholicism. I hold that the greatest affront in the world (politically speaking) is to allow ourselves to be beaten by the philosophers, a sect so weak that a child can [ ] by using against them the reason whose mask they borrow without having any arms. Let us continue with the analysis of this struggle.

Deprived of the support of the young people, religion is nothing more than a colossus with feet of clay. In vain does it rally around the intriguers, the poor in spirit, the old-fashioned coquettes, this whole militia is powerless to achieve the goal, which is to make people love and not fear God. Now, this bond of divine love must be formed in adolescence. To raise it to the greatest force, it must be a compound link or produced by a double spring; it must combine the prestige of childhood with the prestige of adolescence. The cult of Venus wonderfully achieved this goal. So mythological religion did not need any criticism to make itself loved. Its system, its maneuvers, were judicious, *by chance*. Victory was so easy for it that it feared no enemy, and it pushed tolerance to excess, to the point of being without distrust in intrigues, which in the end overthrew it because it did not know how to lend itself to the changes of phase and the restless spirit of civilization which periodically require innovations in worship as well as in legislation.

Christianity has sinned by a course contrary to that of mythology. it was alarmed by the attacks of the philosophers, whom it was so easy to defeat by taking the offensive, by attacking them on the theorems of reason on which it was based without grasping even the shadow of them. Instead of following this maneuver, Christianity held the defensive with a bad order of battle: it was broken by the first shock. In this matter it maneuvered like the Austrians at Decenzano. One of their strong divisions surrounded Bonaparte, isolated with twelve hundred men against five thousand; he pretended to have a large army, and summoned the Austrians to surrender. They surrendered, when they should have answered him: If you have a large army, we will see it in line, and we will measure ourselves with it before we fall back. This is the course that Christianity should have followed in fighting against the jumble of reason displayed by the philosophers. It should have forced them to deploy their forces, attacked them piece by piece with all the arguments on the three attributions of God that I have presented in this section, and we would have seen the philosophical jugglers pass from the role of the aggressors to that of the vanquished.

Today the battle is lost, since Christianity has suffered the loss of its temporal goods, of the faith of peoples and of everything that constituted its illusions. Returning to the scene after long failures, it reforms in the same order that caused his defeat. Does it want to risk new disasters?

There is no class more interested than the priests in reawakening hope in God, in preaching the test of the calculation of attraction and working, with the deliverance of the human race, for their own deliverance, for there is not today a state more disgraced than theirs, more impoverished, more reduced to humiliating procedures to obtain a meager subsistence. It seems that Providence wanted to hit them with the same penalties, that they [        ], because the real hell is poverty. We applaud the judgment of Phalaris, who condemned the inventor of a new torture to perish first by the tortures he intended for others. Thus the priestly class suffered first, and from this world, the long torments with which it threatens the human race by the revolting invention of hell, one of the main causes of civilized irreligion. Barbarians who are much more religious than us, the Muslims, are only moved by the hope of rewards. Hell has so little influence among them that they never speak of it in their religious traditions. We only see there sources of seduction like the charms of the houris, while in our religions, made for nations more sensible, we only see details of terrible tortures without any details of rewards designed to seduce. After that, should we be surprised by the progress of irreligion?

### III. TERMINATION OF THE ATTRACTIVE SPRING AMONG THE ANCIENTS AND THE MODERNS.

The mythology only plunged great culprits into Tartarus. Moreover, it was in no way alarming about the fate of souls in the other life, and did not banish from the stay of the blessed those who had enjoyed this one. Our dogmas follow an opposite course. They spread terrible terrors regarding the other life, and want us to buy, through continual austerities in this world, a no less frightening reward through the insipid fate promised to the elect of the Christian paradise.

People have rightly been surprised that Christianity gives no idea of the delights of its paradise. This gap was so well felt that various ascetic writers wanted to make up for it. I have read among these descriptions of paradise the one that is said to be the most brilliant; it is by M. de Chateaubriand. I found there what I expected to find, a paradise of simple order, with nothing for the principal senses, nothing for the principal affections of the soul. We can bet that the author himself would not agree to spend a week in such a boring place. What is there? A staircase made entirely of diamonds! This is tasteless; if we put the most precious substance on the staircase, on the steps of the altar, with what will we adorn the altar?

If the Christian paradise changes decoration according to the wishes of each narrator, hell, on the contrary, never varies. Its demons are still equally fierce there and its boilers are always at the same level of boiling. It would have been a great means of support for the religious spirit, the disproportion between the penalties. A peccadillo of love will be punished eternally with the same tortures as parricide. Robespierre and Marat will be no more burned than Daphnis and Chloé, who innocently gave in to love. Where is in this judgment the distributive justice that is the third attribute of God, and how can those who depict him as capable of so much fury and iniquity expect to make him loved?

That in centuries of obscurity, among semi-barbarian peoples, when we were ignorant of the levers of honor and other mechanisms that lead peoples and corporations in civilized countries, we made use of the dogma of hell, this is not surprising, since barbarian peoples are only governed by violence and punishment; I will examine in the chapter of passionate diffraction to what extent this

dogma can be useful among barbarians and savages; but is it forgivable for enlightened centuries to make use of it?

That a religion founded by a cannibal like Odin is based on a system of terror is hardly surprising; in this it follows the spirit of its bloodthirsty author; but is it not slanderous to preach the same dogma in the name of Jesus Christ, model of generous and liberal souls, Jesus, who on all occasions protected the weak and the oppressed, Jesus, who defended women against their unjust husbands and against the entire male sex, by collectively insulting the denouncers of the adulterous woman, and accusing them of being guilty before her. Jesus wanted, like Henry IV, for the people to live well and taste the joys of this world; so he changed the water into wine at the wedding in Cana. — Finally, Jesus is on all occasions the friend of good people. He only pursued contemptible and dangerous people, like the public leeches, the Pharisees and Sadducees, emblem of our hypocrites and our sophists, the thieves and merchants whom he beat with rods, in which he was much more sensible than the modern century, which praises their deceit and piracy. We will see in the treatise on Commercial Crimes that Jesus, by beating the merchants, gave the civilized the most judicious lesson. If we had followed the same system of repression with them, we would have long ago discovered the theory of true competition and doubled the income of the princes while increasing that of the people.

In summary, is it with meager rewards that we must raise hope in God? To reestablish it, my main means will be to make men aware of the system of compound existence that God intends for them, that is to say the kind of happiness that he reserves for them in this world and in the next, the detail of the material and spiritual pleasures that will devolve to them after as well as during this life.

This detail regarding the other life will be very different from the ascetic descriptions given on such a subject. God does not prepare for us mediocre and insipid pleasures like those of the *holy court*, rightly joked about by Montesquieu. But before communicating the fate enjoyed in the other life by our souls and the new bodies with which they are united, it will be necessary to give in an abstract of cosmogony some notions of the entire planet and its material and spiritual destinies to which the destinies of the deceased are connected. Until then I can only [ ] negative proofs by criticizing the atrocious systems that disfigure the divinity and destroy hope in God, whom they paint as an implacable executioner, hellbent on tormenting our souls for eternity for slight faults, many of which, such as love, are not faults in his eyes.

What hope can we base on a being susceptible to furies that even cannibals would have to blush for? For if they inflict torture on their vanquished enemies, they are half-excused by the chances of retaliation that they have incurred in battle. Moreover, one day ends the torture of the prisoner, while, according to our dogmas, an eternity of torture will not be enough to ensure the implacable fury of God against his children.

#### IV. INDUCTIONS DRAWN FROM THE USE OF THE ATTRACTIVE SYSTEM.

If I were one of those charlatans who want to identify the interests of the moment with their cause, I would represent to current governments the dangers of seeing the rebirth of the scourges whose memory is so recent. I would say to them: Since the Catholic religion was weak enough to once allow itself to be dispossessed by a weak militia like the philosophers; since it was ignorant

enough not to notice the most formidable of the attacks directed against it, the passive attack of the Freemasons, which only failed through the extreme ineptitude of its clubs, since finally this religion has experienced an irreparable failure through the loss of temporal goods, a loss that discredited and weakened it excessively; fear, I would say to them, that new, more adroitly directed attacks will reach it again under some weak reign; fear that the philosophers, skilled in taking on all the masks, do not find some new means of attacking the altar, and consequently the throne.

But I have nothing to do with all these oratorical tricks. I am not interested in any class of civilized people collectively, because, in the best, we will still find seven-eighths bad for one eighth good. From then on it doesn't matter to me if they fall back into the revolutions toward which I see them running with great strides. It is even to be hoped that they will soon be afflicted with new torments. That will serve to disabuse them of their craze for the infamous Civilization and the perfectibilizers. So the advice that I am going to give them about future dangers is not an effect of zeal for them, who collectively inspire me with nothing but contempt.

I do not consider beings steeped in deceit, civilized, barbaric and savage, as a human species, but only as embryos of the true humanity, which will regard lying and unsocial races as degraded species. Consequently, the salutary opinions that I am going to give on the dangers of religion as on any other branch of the movement, are not intended to serve Civilization, but to deliver the globe from Civilization, by indicating and recommending the various means of exit, among other things the attractive system in all its branches.

Have the nations that compromise on infernal punishment been less brave, less industrious, less well governed than those that are moved by the terrors of inferno? To decide this question, let us proceed from the simple to the compound, and judge first by the individual.

Would we entrust a treasure to the one who admitted to being inclined to theft, and to have no other brake than the terror of hell, and if we tried to eliminate the henchmen, tribunals, gibbets and fences in the country most fanaticized like Spain, can we doubt that the next day, out of a hundred poor people, there would be ninety-nine thieves, despite the fires of hell, in which the Spanish populace nevertheless believes?

Have we seen sectarians more devoted than those of the famous pontiff of Abyssinia, called Prester John, who raised minions to have the kings of his neighbors assassinated? It was not by the terror of eternal torture, but by the promise and the foretaste of future delights that he sent them to certain death. Now, if voluptuous dogmas are powerful enough to obtain from a neophyte the greatest sacrifice, that of life, what ignorance, what evil rage is it to resort to dogmas of terror to obtain through fear what love would cement!

Besides their uselessness, these dogmas have the disadvantage of loosening the administrative and religious ties, as industry improves through progress in luxury and enlightenment; because, the more civilized and educated nations are, the more they these cruelties are repugnant to them. Their hypothesis therefore obliges religion to adopt the system of obscurantism or opposition to the progress of enlightenment. This is the decision it took, and I will prove that without the dogma of hell, it would have been exempted from resorting to obscurantism; that philosophers could not have attacked religion on any of the other points; that their jokes about mysteries and miracles would have had no success; but the system of hell having given rise to ridicule and aroused hatred, the result was the successive mocking of the various branches of the religious system.

Speculative atrocities are no longer in season: other times, other mores.

Let us demonstrate with a few recent examples the absurd uselessness of this dogma. The French nation has just provided very striking proof of this. It was during the suppression of hell that it brought to the highest degree the three qualities that constitute administrative perfection, namely:

Extreme submission to the government;

Rapid and gigantic progress in industry;

Excessive bravery and dedication in combat. Have we ever seen a nation unite these three qualities more eminently than the French under the reign of the Usurper, who nevertheless did not guide them by the terror of infernal infernos? Hell was in no way in credit at that time. However, the obedience of the people was limitless and too blind, because they should have revolted against the continual conscriptions and extortions. Their industry was making colossal progress, their bravery was incomparable. The three goals of a government had therefore been fully achieved without the intercession of either hell or purgatory, about which the peasants, even the children, shrugged their shoulders at that time. Is it not obvious, from this result, that hell, considered as an administrative jurisdiction, is the resource of ignorant and weak men who allow themselves to be controlled and that any intelligent government must disdain both excesses, and avoid the the use of superstitious terrors as useless, as dangerous as philosophical illusions, in that both prepare the enslavement of any administration that has recourse to them.

A shocking error of the moderns in religious policy is to believe a system is good when it tends to press down on the people, and makes Civilization stationary and declining, as in Spain. It is a belief all the more illusory because civilized industry is not stationary like that of China and India; luxury, on the contrary, is making rapid progress in Europe. The other branches of the social system must work together, so that the religious spirit can be strengthened and grow due to enlightenment; may the love of God increase in the same proportion as luxury. Hence it is that the dogmas that were hardly agreeable in crude centuries, become, like that of hell, the seeds of disorganization in centuries more advanced in industry. The result is that the enlightened and opulent class isolates itself from religion, no longer following it wholeheartedly, but only through speculation on the enslavement of the little people. This is our current state. This secret contempt of the great, of the learned and of the priests also against the religious system and the dogmas of terror causes the irreparable damage of neglecting the love of God, the hope in God and the precious discoveries of which this hope would have been the germ. So our century, so fertile, so ingenious in physical discoveries, cannot take the slightest step in discovering social policy; it completely fails in this way, and was bound to fail, since it is deprived of the main spring, which is hope in God, destroyed by the imperfection of the religious system.

## V. TABLE OF INFERNAL ABSORPTIONS.

The dogma of hell, the main cause of modern irreligion, is so untenable even in the eyes of those who preach it, that to get them to deny it, it is enough to fully adhere to it and present to them the picture of its results. It is important to produce detailed accounts to prove that the dogmas that attribute so many atrocities to God are the main causes of the disdain that weighs on religion, that philosophy is in this matter a secondary culprit, to whom other culprits have lent arms,

provided the elements and motives of impiety. To this end, let us carry out an exact inventory of the infernal butcheries.

First, by virtue of the dogma that “outside of the Church, there is no salvation,” hell automatically swallows up in each generation three-quarters of the human race, six hundred million Barbarians and Savages, all damned without exception for not having been aware of the Roman Church and its dogmas, which no one communicated to them. Moreover, these dogmas, such as transubstantiation and consubstantiation, already very unintelligible to civilized people who pride themselves on reason, could well seem even more incomprehensible to Barbarians and Savages, who only have the knowledge of common sense, very insufficient in such studies.

Here already is the immense majority of the human race locked in eternal infernos. It remains to accommodate a quarter of the population, the two hundred million Christians among whom hell first swallows up all the Jews, and these, given their extreme deceit, hardly deserve pity.

It swallows up all the Protestants of the Reformed Church, the English, Scots, Swedes, Danes, Prussians, Dutch, Livonians, the majority of Germanic nations and Swiss cantons, almost the entire United States of America, etc., etc. All these peoples are so many victims devoted for eternity to the fires, serpents and tortures of hell, without exception for any individual, since they are outside the Roman Church, which they know very well, without wanting to join themselves to it. Hell necessarily swallows up the Russians, Moldovans and schismatics of the Greek communion. They cannot be saved, since they are in a very stubborn split with the Pope. If they escaped Gehenna, it would follow that any government could without danger disregard Roman unity and authority, establish schisms, change rites, etc. Even Bonaparte did not dare to do it. He remained in Roman unity, and yet he was excommunicated. So the Greeks, Russians, etc., who break the bond of unity, denigrate the pope and modify the rites and liturgies, are damned without there being any reason to deliberate, or else there would be a way of salvation outside of the Roman Church, which it in no way admits.

There remain the nations of Catholics, Apostolic and Roman. If we want to balance the chances of salvation and reprobation, it is obvious that nine-tenths of them will still fall into the eternal fires; — and first hell swallows up all the rich, because, according to Scripture, it would be easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven, an assertion which very formally damns all the rich, or at least ninety-nine hundredths of them.

Shall I talk about the middle class, the merchants, the prosecutors, whose every word is a lie and every action a fraud? These are damned by all accounts, and if hell did not exist, it would have to be created for them.

As for the poor populace, who, through their privations, get a foretaste of hell from this world, they can hardly escape it in the other world, by virtue of the maxim: “Many are called, but few are chosen.” Now, the poor plebeians who do not have the means to ward off the storm by oblations, and who moreover damn themselves at every moment by their drunkenness and other sensual inclinations, can hardly claim this celestial beatitude of which the most austere Trappist does not dare to judge himself worthy, although he spends his life in austerities. How then could the populace, generally given over to sensual pleasure, aspire to the salvation of which the most fervent cenobites despair?

As for certain classes who claim to arrive fully, like the Catholic prelates and ministers, I do not see on what they base their claims. The view has always been that they are excluded. On this

subject, we can cite extracts from tragedies and mysteries written in the 12th century, where religious affairs were not mocked. However, at this time ecclesiastics, prelates, monks, abbots and even cardinals were damned, witness the following piece:

In this mountain and high rock,  
Hanging on the hook,  
There is Abbot and monk in frocks,  
Emperor, king, duke, count and pope,  
And bottler with his jug  
Of joy in the pocket;  
Plowman too with his plowshare,  
Cardinal, bishop with his cope,  
None of them ever escapes  
That are not snatched  
By the devil with a fiery pitcher.  
But they are in a dark trap;  
Then hard hits them,  
The devil who catches them all.  
With his grater  
Putting them into the fire all altogether.

This is how the opinion of the century was expressed in holy tragedies, where the prelates themselves were present, and these verses justify the assertion of a writer of our century, who says:

One on earth has more than one chapel  
Who in hell bakes very sadly.

In short, to recapitulate all the chances of disapproval, it is obvious that ninety-nine hundredths of the human race are plunged into Gehenna, where there is only crying, gnashing of teeth and eternal torture, for a peccadillo of love as well as for a parricide, for Tityrus and Amarillys, as well as for Tiberius and Nero.

Here the simple presentation of the dogma and its consequences has the air of satire, so untenable and outrageous is the hypothesis of hell for God. Were those who based a religious system on such a pivot judicious? They have discredited religion and the Divinity; they prepared the way for impiety, for sects of atheists, of materialists and of all the philosophical and irreligious critiques that dishonor the 18th century.

Scientific rubbish, such as the Atheists' Dictionary, could not have occurred in antiquity; no one would have admitted it, because the gods of that time were loved. So the likes of Anytus and the whole generation of slanderers accused of impiety a man whom they wanted to destroy. Such a reproach made him odious to the entire nation, because the nation loved God, and the magistrates condemned an impious person to popularize himself, to please good company as well as the people. Athens was, however, a country where the people were more enlightened and more polite than those of Paris. An unfortunate parallel for our century! Then it was through piety, the religious spirit and the worship of the gods that we achieved general favor: today it is through the secret



contempt of religious dogma that we distinguish ourselves and recommend ourselves to the opinion of others.

Where does this contrast come from? Because in the modern age divinity has been so degraded, and the inventors of hell have made God such an implacable executioner, that the feeling of man, having reached the age of reason, is to revolt against an atrocious God who condemns six hundred million savages and barbarians to eternal torture for ignorance of a religion whose existence they were not even made aware of. Modern civilization attributes to God cruelties worse than those of the ferocious Mexican god, because the victims sacrificed to the latter were only tortured for one day; but the God of Christians is pleased to immerse for eternity a young girl in a furnace filled with vipers and demons, because this ingénue will have given in for an instant to the love whose impulse was given to her by this very God, who is the distributor of the attraction.

Another fury no less revolting! When, through austerities, a penitent is admitted to the number of the elect, he must first spend years, even centuries, in the horrible furnace of purgatory, and as a price for his good works, endures on grills and braziers torments whose duration for only one hour would be the most dreadful torture that could be inflicted on great criminals. These tortures, of which a single minute already terrifies the imagination, God will make endure for centuries for those who during their life have renounced all pleasures to please him. Can we push ingratitude, persecution and rage further, and give such a God the title of God of peace! This derision assimilates him to this cruel king of Sweden, who condemned General Patkul to be broken with sixteen strokes of the bar for forgivable faults in politics. The judge who read the sentence added: "Such is the will of the most merciful King Charles." To which the unfortunate Patkul replied: "What clemency!" Can we not likewise, after the picture of the butcheries of hell and purgatory, exclaim: What a God of peace! What worse could the prince of demons do if the judgment of the human race were to be handed over to him?

## VI. NECESSITY OF RISING FROM THE SIMPLE TO THE COMPOUND.

The preceding presentation on the dogma of hell, on the chances it gives to ridicule and malevolence, proves how urgent it would have been to purge the religious system of this monstrosity and to adapt Christian doctrine to the inclinations of an age as enlightened as it was in the times and places of the foundation.

So many other modifications had been admitted, including purgatory and limbo, which are modern creations; it was even more possible to eliminate this hell borrowed from oriental cults and to replace it with some acceptable innovation. By thus refusing to make the necessary amendments, Christianity has alienated the men best known for their piety and their enlightenment in the various communions; witness Newton among the Protestants and Fénelon among the Catholics.

Newton, whose piety and probity are not equivocal, regarded Christian doctrine as irreconcilable with that of Jesus Christ. He published a work in which he demonstrates, it is said, that the Pope is the true anti-Christ. I do not adhere to this work, which I have not even read; but knowing the tolerance, the conciliatory spirit and the extreme indulgence of Jesus Christ, I consider that the capital enemy of his doctrine is the leader of those who have preached only intolerance and persecution, who have excited schisms of all kinds by the sale of indulgences and other scandals; finally those who condemned to eternal torture the immense majority of the human race for the

inconceivable crime of not having had knowledge of Roman dogmas. These excesses, by bringing Christian doctrine into disrepute, have finally destroyed among moderns the religious spirit whose fall is fatal in two respects, in that it prevented the discovery of the calculation of passionate attraction, and in that today it causes carelessness about this discovery and the delay in the advent of universal harmony.

Fénelon, so distinguished by his talents and good morals, risked a very measured attack, which Bossuet's jealousy caused to fail. He hinted at intentions of reform on which he precluded without fully stating his opinions, among others on anti-pleasure dogmas. We know that Fénelon was a quietist. On what concerns voluptuousness, he shared the opinion of Petrarch, and the morals of such sinners are well worth those of the apostles of rigorism, such as those of Alexander Borgia, Saint Bernard, etc. When the social body reaches opulence, the dogmas gradually become incompatible with the customs of the upper class who secretly laugh at them as if they were mummeries accepted to muzzle the populace, and there is a general tendency to modify the dogma. This rebellion did not take place in mythological religion. We have not seen a single remarkable schism rise against it, while Catholicism has produced innumerable ones.

The cause of this uprising is the repulsive system, the anti-voluptuous dogma of Roman doctrine. It is repelled and not loved. Everyone is secretly indignant against it and seizes the opportunities to free themselves from the servitudes it wants to impose on all classes. It only brings into play oppressive forces diametrically opposed to the spirit of its august founder. Let us judge by the following seven clues:

1. By pretending to protect authority, it only tends to enslave it. Popes, in their days of triumph, treated kings like slaves. The kings only escaped this [ ] from the moment they took the side of resistance.

2. It persecutes people much better through the odious system of the inquisition. If it did not spread everywhere, it is because the people resisted; but it was not up to the court of Rome that the inquisition did not become universal and impose on all civilized peoples a regime similar to that of Robespierre.

3. It abandons the poor and captive Christians in Barbary without taking any steps with the sovereigns to bring about their deliverance and the repression of the pirates. It instigated immensely ruinous crusades to conquer useless relics, which it wanted to make an object of lucrative speculation, and it made, during the assembly of the princes of Europe in Vienna, no solicitation for the measures to be taken for the deliverance of the captives.

4. It encourages bloodthirsty and infamous mores, witness the custom of the stiletto, which we only see in fanaticized countries like Spain and Italy. It carries the same ferocity in proselytism, as witnessed by America, whose natives it exterminated, under the pretext of conversion. It constantly tolerates the slave trade which, in addition to the infamy and cruelty attached to this traffic, introduces into Christian countries the custom of the seraglio and inoculates the colonists with the customs of the satraps of Asia.

5. It professes obscurantism; it excommunicates and persecutes men of genius, and if enlightenment has finally gained some momentum, this was only through resistance to the Roman system and through the influence of schismatic regions or the support of princes friendly of glory and resistant to superstitious insinuations.

6. It paralyzes industry, which we see languishing in the places it dominates. The state of Rome is fallow; Spain, the most fanaticized country, is uncultured and almost barbaric. Most Catholic regions lag behind in culture and good administration compared to the Protestants, and present an aspect of misery and disorder, even in the midst of abundance. It even hinders industry by disuniting nations through its spread, which excluded Europeans from China, Japan and other empires.

7. Finally it professes social selfishness by refusing to contribute to public expenses and to render to Caesar what is Caesar's. It caused the French revolution by supporting the clergy's refusal of a subsidy proportional to the deficit of 56 million that this body could and should have supported alone, by contributing an eighth of its income; which would have prevented all revolutions.

In summary, the Roman system is in every sense the opposite of the doctrine of Jesus Christ, and we should not be surprised that Newton, in an outrageous criticism, gave the pope an odious title. Without admitting these pranks, we can at least consider the Roman system and its encroachments so often repelled as an internal enemy against which the various classes, peoples and kings are obliged to remain on permanent defense. Some, like Venice, were guaranteed by the creation of a Patriarch, others by partial dissidences or reservations of national freedoms. All these measures of resistance were to make people feel the need for a reform in the dogma. It had to be undertaken before the perfidious philosophers intervened. A reform of the religious system would have cut off the germ of revolutions, and the doctrine of Jesus Christ lent itself marvelously to this reform.

Nothing was easier than to establish an attractive system of worship on this doctrine, which has been distorted by so many institutions, because according to people versed in theology, it seems proven that marriage and auricular confession are in no way of sacramental institution, and that their promotion to the rank of sacrament was only later, like the invention of purgatory and limbo.

Let us add that Jesus Christ, catechizing crude and poor peoples, had to proportion his doctrine to times and places, and to place many restrictions on the use of pleasures which he would have had the wisdom not to impose on rich and enlightened peoples. He was too conciliatory, too lenient on pleasure not to allow it the developments suitable to the customs of each century.

The extremes touch, and the more Catholicism proscribes voluptuousness, the more it was disposed to admit it as a part of religious worship, if the method of inoculation had been indicated to it. It has a lever to bring about this amalgamation that mythology did not have: *asceticism* or ecstasy of love. All that remained was to raise asceticism from the simple to the compound, by religiously combining the ecstasies of the love of God with the ecstasies of the love of men.

## VII. VICES OF SIMPLE MIXED SPRINGS COMBINED WITH REPELLENTS.

Now the leaders of the Catholic faith feel the inconsistencies of their system; they would like to modify it. They are beginning to say that we do not know precisely whether God will cast into hell these millions of savages and barbarians who have no knowledge of the Catholic religion. — But if we doubt their condemnation today, why was it affirmed so pertinently for eighteen centuries by the dogma: “Outside of the Church there is no salvation?” And moreover if savages are collectively exempt from hell as having ignored the obligations to fulfill to avoid it, they are therefore much more favored than Catholics, nine-tenths of whom are plunged into hell, and, in this case, is it

therefore a great happiness for people to be born outside the Catholic religion? This chance, the ignorance of this cult will be a guarantee of salvation for nine-tenths of them, who would, in the case of Catholicity, be plunged into hell, by virtue of the maxim: "Many are called, but few are chosen."

And if the savages and the barbarians are only partially damned and in proportion to their faults, they are therefore as advantaged as the Catholics, and there will be no advantage in marching under the Christian banner, which excludes from heaven nine-tenths of its soldiers. Furthermore, if God only damns and saves barbarians and savages because of their faults, then does he have two scales to weigh men? What rules will he follow to determine the faults of these people? He will not judge them according to the precepts of Catholicism on chastity and other virtues, since they have not known these precepts. Will they therefore only be judged on the intentional question, and will they have been able to spend their lives in the polygamy that their customs allow, without incurring damnation? Will they find the path to salvation in the continual use of these pleasures, of this polygamy, of which a single moment damns a Catholic forever, and in this case all the advantage will be on the side of the people who are ignorant of this religion?

Let us admire here the imbecility of this religious policy that created the dogma of hell. It puts itself in the alternative, either or damning again all the barbarians and savages, after having tried to return to this absurdity, or it deviates in whole or in part from their damnation; it makes the mystery of Redemption either useless or fatal to Catholics. We have just read the detailed demonstration of the various cases. If it completely damns the barbarians and savages, it rouses the Catholics with this monstrous butchery, and destroys its own system by undermining religion through ridicule. Can we found a cult on such light foundations, and is it not obvious that the inventors and continuators of these infamous dogmas of hell are the true authors of all the religious disorder that reigns in the modern age? I repeat, philosophers are only second-rate culprits; we knew that philosophy makes a business of intrigue and controversy, that it did not fail to collect in theology, as in the administrative system, all the seeds of agitation that it could find there. It was therefore necessary to be careful not to provide weapons to these disruptors and to compromise religion with dogmas that discredit God and alienate all hearts from Him without any use in administrative mechanics, as I have proven.

Well! What is the outcome of so much religious nonsense? After these second ballots of cabalistic sects have dulled minds to the point of arousing general indifference on all religious controversies, there unexpectedly arrive the sect of illiberal or frightened people who believe themselves to be religious by reproducing the cauldrons of hell, hotter than ever! Other times, other customs; infernal atrocities are no longer in season.

The people need a new yoke. The most natural, the most amiable of civilized religions, mythology, has fallen, not through obsolescence, but through not knowing how to compromise appropriately with the progressive fantasies and conveniences of Civilization, a restless society, changing by temperament, which not only needs to modify its worship according to times and places, but which, even if it is on the path of goodness, would knowingly throw itself into evil to satisfy its impatience for new things. It is really now that its cults would need modifications; but to operate on such matters, one must know the theory of the passional movement, and when one knows it, one sees that Civilization has reached such a degree of perversity that it must no longer think of correcting itself, but of escaping from itself.

Nothing could be more clumsy in this crisis than to bring back into play springs that are obsolete and suspect in every respect, like the boilers of hell. This dirty means had on its side, in 1788, the colossal fortune of its apostles, the long habit of the people. Today, when these two illusions are dissipated, hell reappears devoid of importance, like a woman who, after twenty years of absence, returning to her country without youth or fortune, would believe to find courtiers there as in the time of her wealth and her beauty. — The sovereigns are forced to abandon civilized mechanics and enter a period of guaranteeism, where there will no longer be any need for hell or other nonsense of the same kind, useless when the people will have reached the sixth period, because they will become able to guide themselves by reason, inapplicable in the civilized mechanism.

#### VIII. ABSORPTION OF THE THREE THEOLOGICAL VIRTUES BY DEFAULT OF COMPOSITE HOPE IN GOD.

##### *Thesis of composite hope in God.*

The thesis, I feel, will seem very ridiculous to the fine minds of France. It is in order that the country which publishes dictionaries of atheists mocks faith and hope in God. In this mockery, would the French have the laughers on their side? What benefit did they find in placing their hope in philosophy? Their nation, in the final analysis, became the toy of Europe, which wanted to enslave it; the philosophers of France almost all ended miserably, many on the scaffold, some in exile, others in the contempt with which traitors are paid after they have been used. We can therefore apply to the French nation and its beautiful minds the horoscope that Boileau had given on irreligion:

In the end all these games that atheism raises  
Sadly lead the joker to the Strike.

But let us move on to the point of discussion.

I have observed, in the chapter on the terrestrial paradise, that our Globe is unforgivable for not having done any research on primitive society, on the tradition of past happiness, lost temporarily, not indefinitely, because nothing proved that it was impossible to find the theory of this past society.

We would have researched it if we had had faith and hope in God. This confidence is lacking in our century. His beautiful mind throws him into two equally absurd opinions: one is to deny God, the other to only half recognize him, to make him a simple being, to believe his providence limited and to have in him only a hope simple or limited to the goods of the other world.

By composite hope I mean the expectation of happiness in both worlds. Any happiness limited to one of the two worlds is of a simple order and incompatible with the essence of God and man. They are associates of a composite nature. Their relationships must be of the same nature. The higher partner, who is God, must not designate for man a simple happiness, suitable only for animals; the lower partner, who is man, cannot accept simple happiness from God, who can and must assure him composite happiness. Happiness in this present life consists, above all, in the possession of riches; we will see the proof of this in the chapter of centers of attraction.

Consequently, any order of things which does not guarantee us riches in this world is an order of simple happiness, incompatible with the nature of God and man.

Modern religions have believed that they wisely operate by shaping us for privations, failing to know how to procure fortune, by exciting us to buy future happiness at the expense of the present. The ancient religions took a neutral and wiser position; they neither praised nor criticized wealth, rightly thinking that if God created wealth and inspires love for it in all men, it is ridiculous to preach contempt for it; it is to go against divine intentions and to suppose divinity in contradiction with itself.

We will be convinced of this truth when we have seen in the Treatise on Attraction the immensity of the enjoyments that it prepares for us from this world. For this I refer to the various chapters that deal with the pleasures of harmony unknown in Civilization. These details will prove that the centuries, peoples and cults who asked God for a simple happiness limited to one of the two worlds and who expected from him some mediocre favor in this world or the other, were incapable of penetrating the magnificence of his plans.

The extremes touch, and it may be that the century most soiled with irreligion lends itself easily to an excess of faith and hope. Let us reason on this hypothesis, warning however that I do not consider the virtues in the ascetic sense, according to the custom of fanatics, but in the composite sense, in hope of the goods of one and the other world, and first of all of riches in this one.

Let us suppose that composite hope, or the hope for the goods of both worlds, had been preached conditionally and as a stimulus to the search for the divine code; this hope would have inflamed all minds with the lure of riches. It would have exposed to disdain the 400,000 systems of the philosophers, which only produce poverty and place happiness in demagogic agitations. The hope of discovering a new social mechanism generating wealth would have ignited minds with a new ardor, with a hope of general investigation. This hope would have produced the effect of a force of momentum that doubles the original force; armed with such a vehicle, the human mind would have defied all the prejudices that prohibit the calculations of attraction, association, etc. By dint of searching, we would have reached in whole or in part the calculation of the destinies by one of the paths indicated previously.

If hope in God is already a powerful enough spring to familiarize us with the prospect of immense happiness in the *other world* and to make us overlook the implausibilities of this promise, what would have happened in the case where we would have doubled the intensity of this spring, excited as much hope for the goods of this world as we have excited for those of the other? Then the multitude, excited by the violent lure of riches, would have placed confidence in the discovery of a new social order, in return for the happiness lost from the earthly paradise. Without stopping at the implausibilities, which are very great when we ignore the calculation of attraction, everyone would have undertaken studies based on this belief. Hope in God and the prospect of riches would have prevailed over all the prestige of impossibility and impenetrability spread by philosophical cowardice.

The human mind would have been all the more successful in these attempts because it had, in addition to the calculation of attraction, 12 indirect routes, including 5 fortuitous and 7 methodical routes, as we will see later.

Hope in God is therefore a compass that the moderns lacked in their studies. To familiarize the human mind with the calculation of the delights of Harmony, it must be supported by a new force, which is lively hope in God, in his boundless generosity, the firm persuasion of his future intervention; we must convince ourselves, like Socrates, that the light or divine revelation had to manifest itself one day, that it was only delayed by the inadequacy of the sciences, that the views of a just and magnanimous God are incompatible with this Civilization, which is in every sense only an anticipated hell, and which God, at the end of this social limbo, will have to give us from this life all the goods that we believed reserved for others.

Far from this, men have only declined in hope. Instead of rising from the simple to the composite, they fell from the simple to the void and lost the expectation of future happiness, without counting on the present, of which people must despair more than ever in the current state of Civilization.

Without entering into the quarrel between the two sciences, philosophy and superstition, I limit myself to considering them in relation to the obstacles that they bring to the discovery of the divine code.

Superstition, under a mask of piety, seeks to degrade man, God's cooperator. To shape him into the dogma of hell, it treats him like ashes and dust, it inspires in him, as in the slave, a character of abjection, of stupor, which destroys in him all presentiment of his lofty destinies. How could he who is given the title of *earthworm*, who fears being torn apart in hell by the order of God, presume that he must exercise the alternation of initiative with God in the direction of the movement, and that an operation of the highest importance, the concentration of the universe, of the fixed stars and their whirlwinds cannot take place without *an earthworm*, a man, taking the initiative of this immense metamorphosis on this globe?

Philosophy, under a mask of reason, brings into play springs opposed to those of superstition. It degrades God by the hypothesis of *improvidence* in the passionate code; then, placing human reason above God through the invasion of legislative functions, it closes all access to the discovery of the divine code, the existence of which it denies, and ridicules hope.

The two sciences, by pretending to attack each other, are really accomplices. Superstition supports philosophical dogmas by admitting human legislation as wise and sufficient, and treating as profanation the search for divine secrets about general destinies, dogmas eminently favorable to philosophy, which is studied in the same way only to divert the human mind from the exploration of the divine code, the discovery of which would cause the annihilation of all human codes.

Thus the two parties, by accusing each other respectively of the evils of humanity, conspire to perpetuate them. Both tend, by opposite paths, to the same encroachments. There is no difference between them except the mode of exclusion of God. Philosophy encroaches on divine rights in legislative functions by open force and under the pretext of the rights of the people and the reign of reason. As for superstition, it encroaches by cunning, and, under the pretext of maintaining divine prerogatives, it breaks communications between God and man, by prohibiting the study of attraction and the destinies; it thus paralyzes the divine influence by pretending to maintain it.

Both achieve the same goal, one by degrading God, the other by degrading man. They can go hand in hand in absurdity and malfeasance, since they also contribute to prolonging the civilized, barbaric and savage limbo, and to hiding from the human race its own brilliant destinies.

Such is the state of the so-called enlightenment in the nineteenth century. It is more than ever tossed between Charybdis and Scylla, between superstition and philosophy. The storms that their struggle has just excited, storms that are precursors of other torments, should make us feel the need to finally resort to new sciences, to some guide more reliable than these two sirens, who for 3000 years have precipitated humanity from abysses to abysses.

### *On Charity.*

Was it not religion in the true sense of Charity and philanthropy, when all peoples honored their respective gods, even in a state of war? In the past, when besieging a city, even a barbarian one, one began with an act of religious civility, a sacrifice to the gods of this fortress, to declare to them that in attacking the inhabitants one respected the gods whatever they were. Today, civilized people, even in the midst of peace, overwhelm themselves with superstitious imprecations even in countries that boast of tolerance. The King of England wants to plunge into hell three quarters of Europeans, whom he calls damned, dogs of Catholics. He burns the effigy of the Pope, his ally, every year in London, and would to God that he would limit himself to damning the Irish, his subjects, without persecuting them in this world.

The animosity is the same between nations and societies. The Earth presents only empires hell-bent on destroying each other; Christians who damn each other, from sect to sect, because Catholics damn all Protestants; Mohammedans who damn each other, because the sect of Omar damns the sect of Ali; then religions that damn one another collectively and respectively, because Christians indiscriminately damn all Mohammedans, who on the other hand cordially damn all Christian dogs.

*Dogs*, expression used in Morocco and London, except that in Morocco and Algiers we say "Christian dogs," while in London we say "Catholic dogs, French dogs..." Is such a spirit worth the tolerant and charitable maxims that Antiquity professed in a religion that was entirely gracious and all the more attuned to convenience, as in dealing with civilized people, collectively absurd people, it very wisely presented to them its absurd dogmas without being atrocious?

Whether we use bizarre hypotheses like transubstantiation and consubstantiality, there is nothing there that can weaken the love of God. Quite the contrary! Civilized and barbaric people love inconceivable things, mysteries, miracles, etc., and the upper classes, especially women, are not averse to them, provided that there are no atrocities or tortures in perspective. So nothing better demonstrates the ineptitude of philosophers than having established in quick succession the two religions of Robespierre and Laréveillère-Lepeaux, both reasonable in dogma. Did they forget that they were working for civilized, nations steeped in absurdities and that it is necessary to [            ]?

But by taking it as a rule to prune in dogma the reason that is not compatible with civilized minds, we must not therefore indulge in atrocities. Can we not imagine popular episodes like the miracle of the 2,000 pigs drowned in the Dead Sea, to deliver a possessed person after whom the devil went to lodge himself in the bodies of these 2,000 pigs and made them all jump into the lake, where they all drowned? An unfortunate miracle, however, for the owner of the pigs, who suffered a net loss of 100,000 francs from this adventure, valuing the pigs only at the average price of 50 francs each.

Since civilized people need absurd dogmas, one can still, when it comes to indoctrinating their people, who are quarrelsome and prone to massacres, assume past cruelties that are indifferent to



the living, such as the murder of the 50,000 Benjamites who were beaten of death for having given themselves the innocent pleasure of watching the Ark of the Covenant pass by. A proof that fables, murders, rapes and robberies suit civilized and barbaric people is that in every country they avidly read the Bible, which is only filled with such stories. But all this is in the past, while hell is in the future. This is why the Bible is perfectly suitable for all places, and hell is not at all suitable for civilized and enlightened nations.

#### IX. CONCLUSION REGARDING THE ABUSE OF MODERN MEANS.

I have demonstrated that in matters of religion we know neither the causes, nor the authors, nor the effects, nor the remedies, and that on questions relating to the religious movement, as with all those of the social movement, the moderns in fleeing one pitfall never fail to fall into another. Novices in the theory of movement, they have not yet discovered that any springs, administrative, religious or otherwise, have the property of wearing out and weakening when the social period has changed phase, when it has grown or declined by the progress or decline of industry and enlightenment.

We saw in the chapter of phases that Civilization made very rapid progress in the space of a century. I inferred from this that it is necessary either to stifle industry and enlightenment, and bring Civilization back to the point where it was in the seventeenth century, or to provide for the modification of the various social springs that, although good at that time, are no longer good today, and among these springs that have become obsolete, the main one is that of the infernal system, which has the capital fault of destroying hope by pouring ridicule on the divinity.

Let us have no doubt, this lack of hope is the main reason for the weakness of modern genius, its narrowing and its obstinacy in the prejudices of brass veils, of impenetrability. This smallness neutralizes all the help provided by the progress of science. We have seen proof of this in religious politics, as in every other branch of the civilized system. Our makers of religion have shown themselves to be as stupid as our makers of constitutions. They were unable to take advantage of the 3 major means that modern Civilization possessed and of which the ancients were deprived:

1. The dogma of the unity of God, of the unity in essence of the system of operation. This dogma is, by happy coincidence, accepted among the moderns and was not accepted among the ancients. Their scholars could hardly, in a century that admitted 35,000 gods, speculate on the 3 attributes of the one god. They were absorbed by the debates on the principle of divine unity, which must first be admitted. We know that this wise opinion led Socrates to hemlock. As long as divine unity was contested and unknown, scholars had no other task than to establish this primordial truth, and could hardly debate and produce the consequences of the principle before having accepted it. They worked on it despite the obstacles of superstition and fought courageously against the multitude of idols who had managed to make themselves loved. We can therefore say (except for further discussion on the intrigues of the ancient philosophers) that they courageously stepped into the breach and agreed to the unity of God. From this laudable attempt, we can presume that if they had succeeded in having the principle admitted, they would have worked to establish the consequences, the 3 attributes of the divinity, a task that the moderns have neglected, although favored by the admission of the principle of divine unity.

2. The ancients did not have the initiative on the knowledge of the destinies. We acquired it since Newton, who revealed the theory of material. Until then, nothing disproved the prejudices of the iron veil and the impenetrability of nature. It was forgivable to allow ourselves to be struck by these terrors and to weaken in hope. Antiquity, however, shows on this point a strength of mind that the present century does not have. While claiming the title of strong mind, the moderns lose hope in God at the moment when the success of Newton opens up to them a path of initiative in the complete system of destinies. Antiquity, on the contrary, hoped when it still had only vague reasons for confidence, only presentiments, and its faith was all the more laudable as it was less supported by evidence.

3. The ancients did not have the experience of the vices of the civilized mechanism. Civilization was young and novice, intoxicated with all illusions. The very small republics of Greece were its cradle, its only germ; it was forgivable for them to be proud compared to the neighboring barbarians, and to believe that the still new Civilization was a path to improvement. Today its most enthusiastic supporters are necessarily disillusioned: twenty-five centuries of trials on so many vast empires have largely dissipated its prestige. Such an illusion, which was excusable among the Greeks, becomes shameful among the moderns. In social policy they are incorrigible old libertines; they know perfectly well that Civilization is a vicious circle that under all regimes reproduces the same abuses with various modifications; they are ridiculous to persist, in this society condemned by experience, in not looking for another.

Finally, the ancients had neither the immense help that the progress of fixed sciences and nautical and manufacturing industry gives today, nor that of the abolition of slavery, which is a major obstacle to all progress.

And yet the ancients were much more judicious than us with fewer means; yet, instead of our hodgepodge of fine wit and ideology, they possessed a great fund of good wit, a finesse of tact, an instinct for beauty, a natural justice of which we see the irrefutable proofs in their methods and monuments in poetry, eloquence, architecture, sculpture and other branches where they had reached inspiration for true beauty. The rectitude that we notice in their taste was found in their religious impulses. For example, they had an absolute tolerance on the regime of divine multiplicity, which we do not know how to establish under the regime of divine unity, a truly admirable tolerance that was established among them naturally, without intervention from philosophy or opposition from the priesthood.

The moderns, far removed from these happy impulses, have only known how to go beyond the goal of good taste and common sense and have become, with all their wit, political caricatures, mercantile histrions, fruit rotten before being ripe.

What name should we give to a century that, equipped with the numerous beacons that I have just cited, aided further by the abolition of slavery and the progress of the fixed sciences, does not know how to take a step forward in the study of the destinies, gives up at the moment when victory is declared for it and throws itself into atheism, at the moment when God obviously lets the plan and the spring of his system penetrate the movement? Such a century has the audacity to boast of perfectibility! I call it a century of scientific scribbling and academic scoundrels. Posterity will confirm this title, placing it far below the learned ages of antiquity, which with such inferior means surpassed us by so much in judiciary as in genius.

Is it any wonder that there is so much perversity in the modern age? Unhappy humanity believes itself abandoned by God. Frightened by the sight of ever-increasing poverty, it tires of imploring a God who does not come to its aid. Two empirical studies offer support; these are superstition and philosophy, and when the one by its hell has managed to make God feared and hated, is it any wonder that the other manages to make him denied, and that the century pushed in this way from abyss to abyss expects nothing more from science than new charlataneries, despairs of any means of salvation and insults the happy discovery that finally opens to it the book of divine decrees and the outcome of the civilized limbo?

Modern nations, you rightly complain of the sterility and depravity of genius. Your policies only give birth to disastrous ideas. Your artists seem to have lost the heritage of the sacred fire. Everything in modern societies bears the imprint of a declining nature, which drags itself painfully and moves only by dint of supports and artificial springs. Europeans have none of the genius for inspiration that was found among the ancients. They lack that grandiose character that makes one anticipate and invade a new career. Intimidated by the attacks of the zoili, crippled by the fear of ridicule, they are less concerned with taking the laurels than with overcoming the thorns. They are no longer the lovers of glory, but only the pursuers of favor; and to use the expressions of one of our poets, we no longer find in modern geniuses

These lines of living flame,  
And these wings of fire that carry off a soul  
To the heavenly abode.

I am careful not to ignore the services of the illustrious moderns, but I do not want, according to French usage, to indulge in excesses of apology and detraction. Let us classify each type of glory, and without disputing the honor due to the stubborn work of the moderns, let us admit that they all lack that creative spirit that knows how to trample on prejudices, to move with inspiration to discoveries deemed impossible, to suddenly overcome obstacles and

Deprive Destiny of its august secrets.

When we see the beggar Homer creating the Epic from inspiration, as a double monument; when we see the types of true beauty divined as if by magic and irrevocably fixed by a novice tribe of Greece, we are forced to recognize in it a completely divine impulse. So what was this talisman of the Greeks? It is because they were closer than we are to nature, to the compound genius from which we have continued to decline by two causes, — by the zoilism that the monopolies of capital have created, and by the irreligion that has generated the monstrosities of modern cults. In this discourse I only examine the influence and causes of irreligion.

The ancient cults approached nature, deifying the passions and the attraction that are proscribed and dishonored by modern cults. Thus civilized society, in matters of worship as in all its mechanisms, is on a retrograde march, and after having begun by following the right path, falls into inconsistencies that are barely forgivable in the ages of darkness. Indeed, if we are created in the image of God (and nothing could be more true), God therefore has the same passions as us.

Therefore, to insult our passions is to insult God, whose image they are and of which he is creator and distributor.

The good religious spirit, or agreement of human and divine reason, must tend to the following goal: to reconcile the social and religious mechanism with the passions by a system of laws and cults favorable to their development, — or, in other words, — to invent a social mechanism opposed to the civilized order, which sacrifices divine impulses and attraction to laws and cults incompatible with their development.

Let us limit ourselves to this problem that would lead us to examine to which phase of Civilization and to what degree each of the 3 religious systems must adapt: the *passional*, the *anti-passional* and the *mixed*. This is a transcendent question of movement. The examination would be out of place in these preludes. I limit myself to citing the deviations of the current system and the errors that have generated irreligion. It is necessary that these faults be very serious, that religious policy must have been very clumsy in order to have pushed into the scandals of atheism and curses a century that was also very enlightened and that, already initiated by Newtonian calculation into the knowledge of the operations of God on the system of the universe, should have grown in religious spirit in proportion to the hopes that this first initiation gave. Far from it, irreligion took birth in the century whose discoveries incited us to redouble our love for the divinity and our hope in it. Certainly the religious system that led the moderns to this shameful result conceals some primary vice that we have been unable or unwilling to correct.

#### X. PHILIPPIC ON THE FALL OF THEOLOGICAL AND SOCIAL VIRTUES.

Rival sects who have led mankind to fear, hate and deny a God, superstitious men and philosophers, you have received the punishment you deserved. You have doomed each other; fortune and opinion have disgraced you, and if Civilization continues, you will be more and more subverted in turn and persecuted in the new revolutions of which you have sowed the seeds.

Peoples, who seek happiness, are you not completely mad when you hope for it from one of these two sects. Tired of the inquisitors, of their massacres and of the auto-da-fé of superstition, you have thrown yourself into the arms of this philosophy, which for its first attempt covers a great empire with scaffolds, on which your philosophers, after having destroyed the ruling family and the elite of the citizens, immolated themselves among them. After such an ordeal, decide, if you can, which is the more absurd, the more bloodthirsty of your two guides, superstition and philosophy.

There is a third pitfall for you: it is the temporary calm, the illusion that it produces. Sometimes social fury seems to calm down; each party attributes the honor to itself and promises lasting happiness. It is a decoy. From now on the volcano will only stop to prepare for other eruptions. Your apparent calm resembles the intermittences of fever, and never has the periodicity of evil been more constant than today, where Civilization, since 1789, has opened up under your feet 16 new pitfalls that did not exist then. The moments of calm, these political lulls, are nothing more than intermissions of the volcano. The material of [ ] is more [ ] than ever; passions more exasperated, more irreconcilable than ever.

See in these three scourges that pursue you — superstition or obscurantism, philosophy and the illusion of intermittency, — the disguise of the 3 theological virtues. Indeed:

1. What is superstition and its illusions, if not an abuse of faith, a speculation of intriguers on religious credulity and on the inclination of humans to rally to God?

2. What is philosophical prestige, if not the abuse of charity, intrigue cloaked in the mask of philanthropy and patriotism to tear apart and enslave the peoples?

3. Finally, what are your illusions of happiness in intermittent moments? An abuse of hope, a culpable abandonment to civilized systems that only give you a moment of rest in order to endure new tortures more imminent than ever.

Thus your confidence only attaches to the 3 simulacra of the 3 theological virtues. You are the fools of charlatans of all kinds. Make an effort to get out of the abyss. Abandon *en masse* all these charlatans of whom you have been victims for 3,000 years. Resort to God alone through the study of attraction, his eternal interpreter, and hope neither for happiness nor stability under codes that come from man alone. Embrace in good faith these virtues of which you only praise the shadow. Deliver yourselves to faith, but to faith in a charitable, magnanimous God filled with equal concern for all nations.

You refuse to make the easy test of Attraction; each year of delay costs you millions of victims through war, through poverty. Could God better punish your lukewarmness than by abandoning you to the fickle legislation of the philosophers, the superstitious, the conquerors, who in their frenzy have for 3,000 years been the blind instruments of the opprobrium that God was to imprint on the laws of men ?

Test the divine code, then the new Jerusalem, announced by your prophets, will begin for you.

It is in vain that you will tire God with your supplications. It is not to sacrifices, to the simulacra of confidence that he grants his protection; he rejects these ghosts of piety. He wants devoted, trusting hearts. He wants faith and hope in the divine revelations of which the theory of attraction is the only organ. As long as you remain deaf to the oracles of this divine interpreter, as long as you believe in suggestions outrageous to God, such as the dogma of hell, you are only rebels, disguised with fidelity; your faith is outrageous to the God of peace and mercy whom it equates with the executioner. Your incense in his eyes is a defiled incense. He abandons you to the influence of these dogmas that make you executioners of yourselves and transform your societies into armies of ferocious beasts, hell-bent on torturing themselves through spoliation, slander, and massacre. These eternal furnaces, this hell whose horrible invention you attribute to God, it is you yourself who create them in this world, and God punishes you by giving rise through your laws to the horrors that you attribute to his.

You ask God for his protection; it is assured to you from the moment you want to use it, but you will only have the protection of a beneficent God and not of a tiger thirsty for blood. Stop demanding that God transform himself into an executioner in order to please your superstitious people, who have made him an executioner of humanity. He will never be anything but the God of peace and generosity: his protection is all yours, provided that you implore a just, charitable God, friend of all humans, without distinction of savage, barbarian or civilized. Wasn't he the one who created them all? Why do you want him to plunge the vast majority into eternal infernos to please a few ferocious priests of the modern age? I hear you answer that you are not demanding cruelty. But if you agree to consider God as the common father of men, why do you not want the regime of happiness, the social system composed by him to be applicable to the barbarians and the savages, as well as to you, the civilized? You are only the youngest of this great family and you imitate those

elders who wanted to invade all the assets and reduce all their brothers and sisters to poverty. Following their example, you want to plunge into the eternal furnaces all the barbarians and savages, many more numerous and older than you. If you disavow this [ ] intention, therefore also disavow your sects, which consecrate it in their dogmas and their cults, your philosophers who make codes applicable to Civilization exclusively and to only one of its empires, your superstitious people who damn all barbarians and savages, and with them the majority of civilized people!

If there were some exceptions to the benefits of the divine code, how could you see the work and the revelation of God in this system, which would not establish universal happiness, in a simple happiness which would not extend to both lives and which would, by that fact alone, be unworthy of two beings of composite nature, such as God and man?

And what hope could you have in God if, as superstition depicts him, he took pleasure in torturing you in this life with privations, in order to test whether you would be worthy of him in another? From where would you presume that your death must have been the end of his delays, and that after having delivered you in this world to privations, to the ax of the executioners, he would not continue in the other world to persist in you, as with the 600 million savages and barbarians whose eternal torment you claim will be eternal enjoyment for God?

According to you, God will prodigiously enjoy the eternal tortures of these unfortunate people torn apart for not having been informed of the existence of the Roman cult.<sup>2</sup>

He would be free to put an end to their suffering as long as he took no pleasure in it; but by virtue of your dogmas, they will never end; God will never be satisfied or sated with their terrible torments. Vile cannibals, who for eighteen hundred years have outraged the divinity with such slanders, if it were true that he takes revenge for the outrages done to him by men, should he not strike you down in the sight of the people and in these very temples where you degrade the Supreme Being below the most odious executioners, and how could a Globe that has tolerated and still tolerates this disgusting slander against the divinity be surprised not to have penetrated the decrees of God on social destinies?

Civilized bumlbers who speak of reason and perfectibility, could you say which is more absurd: your hell or your paradise, your legislation or your morality, your atheists or your simulated devotees?

---

<sup>2</sup> ... No, said Sergius, God who made our members so fragile and so delicate that the slightest particle of iron or wood is enough to seriously injure them, cannot take pleasure in giving us one day, in the interest of revenge, muscles unalterable to the most excruciating pain, limbs of boundless flexibility and suppleness, so that they can bend and twist in endless suffering, nerves of exquisite sensitivity and miraculous vigor, in order to see them contract and vibrate convulsively, without ever wearing out or becoming jaded, in the embraces of the most terrible tortures. — Blood of Christ! interrupted the late Captain Vasco, to make of our body such a masterpiece of power and inalterability, to give ourselves the pleasure of torturing it more roughly and more at one's ease, what a horror! Come on then! master, I am of your opinion; God cannot have done this...

Fortunada,  
by Antony Méray.

O you who invented Hell, ancient priests of the East, you have unknowingly spoken a great truth. Yes, hell exists. In announcing it, you only made a mistake in time and place. Hell is the state of a Globe that ignores the divine code and groans in the sufferings generated by the laws of men; Hell is the civilized, barbaric and savage society that has vomited on this unhappy earth more calamities than the angels of darkness would ever have invented.

And you, continuators of this infamous doctrine, are punished for where you have sinned. Greed, the lure of testamentary donations suggested to you the system of hell; it is also greed that has taken away the fruit from you. At the beginning of the revolution, you refused to contribute to the expenses of the State, to render to Caesar what is Caesar's; Civilization has taken everything away from you, and you have fallen from this world into the social hell that is poverty.

You too, philosophers, modern Titans, are punished for where you have sinned. The thirst for gold and power made you apostles of atheism. God, who only punishes the impious by delivering them to themselves, delivered Europe and you to the consequences of your inept doctrine. You were caught in the traps that you created: those of you who did not mount the scaffold fell into the contempt and darkness. You are odious to the great and despised by the people; you are ashamed of your charlatanry and your intrigue; the Civilization whose perfectibility you praise has become a veritable hell for you.

And you, nation of histrions who produced the dictionaries of atheists, you deserved to undergo the test of the dogma of its authors and to suffer from philosophical nonsense. Have you paid enough for your crazy trust in these jugglers? You can now believe in hell; they created it for you. After twenty-five years of heartbreak, you have become a monument of political imbecility, a fury as odious to yourself as to the entire world upset by your philanthropic charlatans.

During your construction of greatness in 1808, you insulted the announcement of the discovery of the calculation of attraction. It was worthy of a nation of renegades to degrade the divine code before it was published and known. This Parisian valet who challenged God for a patent of existence could well reject me. Disdaining to confuse these Parisians steeped in crudeness and vandalism, I inflicted on the French the punishment that God inflicts on the rebellious Globes, abandonment to their false lights; I let France run into the abyss into which it was seen to be engulfed, into the upheavals that the war in Spain was enough to predict. I wanted to wait until France had lost another million heads in the fighting. The year 1813 completed the tribute; it is not a million, but fifteen hundred thousand heads that imbecile France has paid since 1808. The punishment extended to all those who governed it. Its fumes of grandeur are dissipated with its visions of perfectibility. Its conquerors, its philosophers ended miserably in exile or torture, the others in the contempt with which traitors are paid after they have been used.

This so-called capital of Europe from which the outrages addressed to the mathematical calculation of destinies and permanent Revelation originated, this modern Babylon, has been shamefully stripped of the fruits of its plunder, and is now nothing more than a metropolis of political abortions.

Ultimately, France fought twenty years and lost five million men to achieve the goal it feared, to create for England a continental state of eight million, including enclave-driven allies like Hesse and Brunswick. Then she boasts of having preserved her territory which is proportionally reduced by half in power by the new relations and increases of the other continentals.

It experiences in its oscillations that, under all regimes, it is only capable of submitting to despotism. Driven by its turbulent spirit and intrigue, it achieves it by all means. If we gave it as its master the log that Jupiter gave to the frogs, it would be led to despotism, less in opposition to the factious than by the impulse of the court servants. It is fitting for it, after these turpitudes, to talk about the announcement of a discovery relating to social policy.

Let impertinent France now draw a parallel between its misery and the benefits it would have gained from an easy test of harmony, let it weigh the scourges with which it has been struck by the prolongation of the civilized order which could end in 1809; let it learn from these [ ] that the author of a discovery of general utility is soon avenged by his silence; it now atones with shameful tributes and enslavement for an insult already paid for with torrents of blood:

*Discite justitiam moniti et non temnere divos.*

Civilized nations, be careful not to believe that I am apologizing for you by accusing the one you have crushed by numbers. If one of you is full of vices, the others are far from having virtues. You only differ by the nuances of wickedness more or less disguised with philanthropy. I want to be wrong, but appearances are not in your favor. Never were religion and honor more openly disregarded.

For a long time, Christianity has been outraged to see Christians tortured, martyred for the faith in the prisons of Algiers, Tunis, Morocco and Tripoli. What could be more revolting than to see a league of 150 to 200 million bending and capitulating before a handful of pirates devoid of tactics, of navy, of all the means to resist Europe if it formed against them the crusade imperiously ordered by the honor of religion?

You have undertaken seven immensely painful crusades for reasons that were almost frivolous, but at least excusable in the religious sense. Today when honor, charity, religion demand an effort, we do not notice, we do not think in the least about repressing the persecutions of these pirates, we tolerate them, we deal scandalously with them at the moment when Europe, united and equipped with an immense mass of forces available on land and at sea, would have only had to will to destroy them. But religion and honor found no support at the Congress of Vienna. Where were these writers who are decorated with the title of Christian orators and who sing to us about the martyrs of antiquity? Why evoke the dead to move us? Are there any martyrs whose suffering touches us more closely? These are our relatives and friends who are martyred at the gates of our empires. What comedy to pity hearts over the martyrdom of the deceased when our brothers perish in long tortures and implore in vain the hypocritical Europe always painted with pity in the writings of novelists and deaf to charity when it should be exercised?

We had already been indignant at the abandonment in which Europe had left the Serbians, a Christian nation destroyed before our eyes by the Turks and impaled after the capitulation. Their abandonment was blamed on the influence of the usurper of France; but after his fall, what did we do? England is instructed to negotiate some truces, that is to say, Europe places itself at the discretion of England for things that concern its honor.

We were strangely surprised that the head of religion did not make any formal steps at the congress for such a sacred cause. What must have surprised even more is the philanthropic pretense played on the subject of the Negro slave trade which today is carried out openly by the same Spaniards, signatories of the suppression of the slave trade at the Congress of Vienna.



But if philanthropy had really motivated the members of the Congress, how is it that the whites did not seem as worthy of commiseration as the Negroes, and that by pretending to be interested in the former, they did not take no effective measures to save either whites or blacks.

An immense continent demanded their generosity. The inhabitants of America had more than one right to the solicitude of the Congress. They had taken up arms for a cause sacred in the eyes of the Congress, for resistance to Napoleon's encroachments. Their freedom had to be granted for the convenience and needs of Europe, which demands their foodstuffs and direct trade from these regions. The prescription of colonial indemnity had more than expired after two or three centuries of possession, and moreover the memory of the cruelties of Spain during the conquest was one more title to oblige it to finally emancipate this immense continent, whose treasures it has sufficiently squeezed and the natives sufficiently annihilated. Disdaining these considerations, the European assembly delivered to the ax of the monks these peoples who had taken up arms for it. And to whom did Europe thus sacrifice its allies? To those who play games with justice by publicly reestablishing the Negro slave trade abolished by the Congress.

This is an edifying outcome for a league from which one might have expected, in its success, some feelings of charity. After these morals, Christians no longer have anything to reproach atheists for. These at least have a mask of laudable intention and can say that they are less ashamed to deny God out of indignation at human miseries than to confess him in order to make oppression, hypocrisy, perjury and baseness reign in his name.

Your peoples are trampled and march to the poverty of China and India. — Your kings, adored in the gazettes, are less than ever friends of the people they press down upon. — Your former knights have become usurers, croupiers of agiotage and stock market trade. — Your scholars are disdained in both camps and the useful classes share the proscription of the wicked. — Your citizens are arrested by the systems of denunciation that are encouraged in turn by the various governments. — The character of the European is distorted and offers only distrust, concentrated hatred and seeds of disunity that terror will only strengthen. The greatest curse that can be placed on you is to wish you a continuation of this odious Civilization, which tends to imminent destruction by new revolutions of which the first sowed the seeds.

With such mores, run, Empires of Europe, to these revolutions of which I have drawn you the numerous horoscopes; they cannot wait to hatch, and their very imminent shock will drag into the abyss this infamous Civilization, worthy of ending in the most shameful catastrophes, since it is deaf to the voice of religion and honor.

---

To make all the scourges disappear at once, it would be necessary to attack the radical vice, the fragmentation of cultivation, to invent a means — to bring together collectively masses of 3 to 400 families unequal in fortune, — to remunerate everyone, men, women, children, in a satisfactory manner for the three faculties, work, capital and talent, — and to usefully employ the varieties of passions, tastes, instincts, characters, which morality wants to repress, for lack of knowing how to apply them to industry, to create there an attractive mechanism adapted to everyone's inclinations.

## ON ANALOGY.

The universe is modeled on the human soul and the analogy of each part of the universe with the whole is such that the same idea is constantly reflected from the whole in each part and from each part in the whole.

SHILLING.

Genius always has something to surprise; its history consists only of inexpressible wonders; it anticipates time and guesses what mediocrity is forced to learn.

*Revue musicale*, June.

The real power of France must henceforth consist in not allowing a single new idea to exist that does not belong to it.

BONAPARTE.

The most honorable and useful occupation for nations is to contribute to the extension of human ideas.

*Messenger*, June 3.

Analogy is the most amusing of sciences; it gives a soul to all nature. In every detail of the animals and plants it depicts human passions and social relationships, the interior of man as faithfully as a painter depicts the exterior to us, and these paintings are very spicy due to the fidelity of the brush. For example, why does the *Lion* have his ears cut off as if the scissors had cut them off? This is because the Lion represents the King. We do not make kings hear the truth; the courtiers do not let it approach, the sovereigns are therefore *morally* deprived of the use of ears. They do not know the true state of things, the misery of the people, their cries of distress against tax extortion. His grievances do not reach the monarch. Some well-paid chiefs of artisans are sent to mislead them to extol the happiness of the people and the virtues of the administrators. Such was the last scene of Charles X : he was presented with coal burners in their Sunday best to incite him to *coups d'état*, to tell him that the coal burner was the master of his house.

To depict to us this moral deafness to which nine-tenths of kings are affected, nature cut off the ears of the Lion.

She did not do the same for the *Donkey*, which she provided with very large ears. This is because the *Donkey* represents a being who hears the august truth more than he wants. Everyone mocks his heavy and grotesque appearance and his trivial language; he is bluntly reproached for his ignorance, his thefts, his hypocritical philandering. The idlers of the towns and the lackeys of the lords pepper him with jeers. The poor peasant is similarly obliged to hear the hardest truths. So the donkey, emblem of the peasant, has copious ears to receive this shower of truths, but his long ears are shaky; they seem battered by the storm, riddled with fatigue, while those of the hare and the rabbit, much longer in proportion to the body, have an elevated and graceful pose. What is the cause of this difference? On this, we would have to begin a long [ ] on ear analogies, and we

would find there more than one unfortunate picture for ears of high pretension, which believe themselves to be intelligent and which are hardly so.

Scholars agree in suspecting the existence of the analogy; some claim that man is *a mirror of the universe* or in other words that the *universe is modeled on* the human soul. This presumption is very correct. It is certain that each animal, vegetable and mineral, is emblem of some effect of our passions, that the rose is emblem of virginity, as the viper is emblem of slander, (that the lion is emblem of the barbarian monarch and the eagle of the civilized monarch.)

Instinct has introduced us to some analogies; but we have not thought of studying them as a general system. Those who know how to explain the emblems provided by the rose and the viper should explain to us those of the carnation and the toad, those of the tiger and the vulture, those of a hundred thousand creatures of the three kingdoms that must be a hundred thousand pictures of our passions, if it is true that man is a mirror of the universe. A cedar and a violet, an elephant and a flea, are part of the universe, and reflect an idea of the whole, according to Schelling. We therefore lack a fixed science to navigate this labyrinth that we call the great book of nature.

In the meantime, a few daubers took up the idea; we see small booklets containing tables of analogies written at random, without any principle, like this one: "*the tulip, pride, ingratitude.*" This is a very clumsy way to characterize the beautiful flower which represents *justice*.

It is especially on the subject of analogy that we recognize the spirit of the 19th century, incapable of taking a step outside its sphere, and not even daring to seek the treasures of which everything announces the existence. Instinct, by revealing to us a small number of analogies, provoked the research of the whole of science, just as the stream carrying flakes of gold announces the proximity of the mine. Often a discovered mine leads to richer ones, as we have seen in the Ural range, where gold and diamond mines were found after copper mines. Likewise, the theory of analogy would have led us to more valuable sciences and especially to that of true progress in social mechanism, where we backslide shamefully. To prove it, let's start with a quadrille of analogies applied to the social movement.

### *The Elephant, the Dog, the Ant, the Spider.*

The Elephant is a mold or emblem of the four passions from which affectionate groups are born, namely:

- Friendship, reciprocal convenience without influence of sex or kinship or interest;
- Love, or affection for the other sex;
- Paternity, or secondary family ties, or consanguinity;
- Ambition, or corporate league in interest.

These four passions can develop in various directions, in a vicious or virtuous mode, nature has depicted in the elephant the direction that the four passions must take to lead to social virtues and broader connections. We can therefore observe in this animal the character of true virtue, disguised by our philosophical prejudices and our moral hypocrisies.

Let us first define a real virtue and a false virtue, by comparison of the Elephant and the Dog, one of which is the emblem of noble friendship and the other of false friendship.

1. Friendship. — It is noble in the Elephant; it always reconciles its with honor. It does not have the baseness of the dog, which is sometimes beaten without cause and has no memory of it. The

Elephant endures just corrections, but does not allow itself to be mistreated without cause; it does not forgive offenses; moreover, its friendship is as unalterable, as devoted as that of the Dog. This noble friendship is the one which leads to collective and corporate links, but the friendship served by the dog is only favorable to despotism, to the civilized and barbaric regime, which is not the one where noble passions reign, such as we see them in the Elephant. Despots demand from people the friendship of the Dog who, unjustly mistreated and degraded, still serves and loves the one who offended it.

2. Love. — It is decent and faithful in the Elephant; it is scandalous and criminal in the Dog who is in love the most ignoble of quadrupeds, combining all the vices with this passion, like the civilized in whose loves trickery, fraud, oppression dominate.

3. Paternity. — It is judicious and honorable in the Elephant. It does not want to create children who would be unhappy, and it abstains from procreation as soon as it is a slave. It is a lesson that it gives to civilized people, murderers of their children by the quantity they procreate, without being sure of providing them with well-being. Morality or the theory of false virtue stimulates them to produce cannon fodder, anthills of conscripts forced to sell themselves out of poverty. This improvident fatherhood is a false virtue, the selfishness of pleasure. Nature has also preserved the elephant from this vice, which is the type of the four emotional passions taken in a truly social sense and suited to general bonds. The Dog, emblem of false virtues, is gifted with this false paternity that generates anthills, litters of eleven (first of the anti-harmonic numbers), masses of which three-quarters must perish by iron, tooth or famine.

4. Honor. — It is the fourth virtue molded in the elephant; but it is not the moral honor that preaches contempt for riches and wants us to drink from the palm of the hand, like Diogenes. The elephant not only wants good food (80 pounds of rice per day); it still likes great luxury in clothes, in food, in dishes, in drink; it finds himself humiliated by a change from silver dishes to earthenware.

If the elephant is a model of the four social virtues, it is necessary, for the fidelity of the picture, that it represents to us the fate of the virtue flouted in Civilization. So nature covered it with mud. It likes to cover itself with dust, out of the image of the virtuous man who delights in following the paths of poverty, rather than seeking a fortune, which it would only achieve through the practice of all the vices, plunder, baseness, venality, injustice, trafficking, agiotage, hoarding, usury. Nature could have given this noble animal a rich coat like that of the tiger; but it would have been a contradiction, a false portrait, because in our societies real and truly honorable virtue only leads to poverty; — I say real virtue and not the philosophical virtues, the chameleon wisdom that lends itself to all the infamies leading to fortune.

The elephant is a very costly worker; it works well, but its food is expensive. It is not the image of our industrious people, of our country workers who with six and a half cents a day do not even have enough to buy bread. So their emblems are the Camel and the Donkey, who feed on rejects and mistreatment. The donkey is the emblem of the peasant and the camel the emblem of the slave. They are the heroes of morality, which requires that the worker suffer all privations and miseries for the honor of virtue and that he pays taxes with joy. Nature is of the opposite opinion, she wants the worker to live well: she has also made the hardworking animal which is the emblem of sociable virtues expensive and a lover of luxury. Our people will be sociable when they live comfortably. As

for the so-called virtues of deprivation, these are unsociable virtues relegated to the most unfortunate of our servants, the camel and the donkey, who are not in intellectual society with us.

Nature gave the elephant tusks of ivory, very rich weapons, by analogy with our social state which assigns luxury to force, to the unproductive and dominating class. So the trunk which is weapon and machine at the same time is poorly dressed because it is productive and the elephant must represent the state of industry and virtue victims of injustice and mockery. As an emblem of the fate of virtue, it is laughable at the *back* by the contrast of its rump and its puny and graceless tail. Like it, virtue is laughable *behind*; as soon as the virtuous man turns his back, as soon as he leaves an assembly, he is peppered with jeers, his virtues are an object of ridicule: "he is," they say, "a beast with his visions of probity; he could have done his business in such a financial position; he did not scratch a crown. He declaimed against corruption and spoke indiscreetly about certain particularities; he was made to flee with his virtue. He's one of those idiots who can't interact with the world properly, he's an imbecile who will never have a penny." To this, the moralists respond that the virtue perfected by modern philosophy must know how to lend itself to the conveniences of the world. Nature thinks quite differently; she painted the accommodating virtues or moral virtues in the Chameleon, a contemptible reptile, a faithful image of those virtues of the world that Bernardin de Saint-Pierre rightly calls *frivolous and comedic virtues*.

The teeth of the elephant — distributed in 4 groups, 2 ascending and 2 descending — are the emblem of the 4 groups formed by the 4 emotional passions whose virtuous growth the elephant depicts: 2 ascending groups, friendship, ambition; 2 descendant groups, love, paternity.

The extreme smallness of his eyes forms a shocking contrast with the enormous size of his body. It is a picture of the narrowed views of the virtuous man. It is not enough to practice virtue, we must know how to take measures to make it dominant and happy. Such an effect can only take place in a social order where virtue would be more lucrative than virtue; it was necessary to seek and discover this social state which I indicate below and which is very different from Civilization. Our virtuous men, from Socrates to Fénelon, have not foreseen the necessity of this research. They are blind in the politics of virtue. To represent their blindness, the narrowing of their political views, nature gives the Elephant a little eye, ridiculous because of its disproportion with such a colossal being.

Its ears are the opposite of its eyes. Their immense volume and their crushed form represent the suffering of the good man who hears only a language of hypocrisy or perversity in our societies where some praise virtue without practicing it, others brazenly praise happy vice. The just man is overwhelmed, offended by this double language of depravity; his ear is crushed to hear only falsehood; this unhappiness is depicted in the elephant's ear. [Marginal note]: Lives 144 years, future and perfect man.

Let us judge by the extent of this very abbreviated prelude (and which should be increased by a parallel with the adversary or counter-mold of the elephant which is the rhinoceros) of the extent that each article could include of analogy carried in full, to the exterior and interior forms of the animal or plant, its habits and tastes, appearances and instincts.

Women would have as much and more aptitude for this new science than men; this path to fame in fixed science would be well worth the trophies of the novel to which until now they have limited themselves.

The Dog is a real cesspool of vices, such as the following 12:

1. It is the animal most subject to hydrophobia and the most dangerous in our societies, by analogy with false friendship and perfidy, so common among us. [Marginal note:] hydrophobic *cur?* *Tongue-tied* friendship betrays you and that if not circulated by family, by water, man despairs, is at war with social state.

2. The most filthy of animals in love, especially by the property of prolonged mating, which teaches all children what it would be advisable to let them ignore.

3. Fierce executioner for pleasure. The elephant and the horse also wage war out of obedience, but without taking pleasure in it, while the dog delights in the role of executioner.

4. Oppressor of the weak. If a weak dog is chased or attacked by a stronger one, we see all the other dogs uniting against the weak one.

5. Servile, full of baseness, enduring all affronts. We very rarely see a dog become indignant at an affront, a privilege.

6. It is a screamer, making a terrible noise for the slightest injury he receives; it is the opposite of the horse which suffers without any complaint.

7. It is surly without reasons, impudent without offense, defiant without appearing suspicious, seeking to show off, to give itself importance, the air of a useful guardian, when its noise is only annoying and displeasing; yapping.

8. It is jealous of movement, furious at cart wheels and galloping horses. (This is an analogy with Administration, which I will explain elsewhere.)

9. It adopts the vices of its master, becomes haughty among the great, fierce and quarrelsome among the people, and so among other classes.

10. It is gluttonous, drinking meat rather than eating it, devouring carrion and garbage, even when it has the necessities, brutally invading the cats' portion and swallowing it in one gulp.

11. It insults the poor; poorly dressed men and children hardly escape the gratuitous outrages of the dog.

12. It has the hieroglyphic character of unlimited population. The female dog gives birth to eleven pups from a single litter. (Eleven is the first of the numbers assigned to confusion in the general theory of motion.)

Let us continue the analytical preludes. This is about signaling social demotion. To achieve this goal, I examine two well-known and poorly judged insects.

The *Ant* is the heroine of the moralists. Ardent at work, collecting in good seasons for future needs, one would believe her to be wise; but what is the fruit of this wisdom? The ant, often the anthill, perishes from hunger. This is the opposite of the work of the bee. It is a confused mass of provisions, without any proportion to its needs and without a fixed distributive method; finally it is the image of the work of the civilized people who work confusedly and prodigiously, only to arrive at extreme poverty, to be trodden down by the great as the ant is crushed under the feet of man and destroyed by itself: because this insect is subject to collective wars like us. It is harmful and unproductive, devouring our edible foods without producing anything for us. It is an emblem of industrial scandal, double abuse of industry, misery for the insect, damage for man.

Great cause for complaint! — So you claim, someone will say to me, that we should only value each animal or plant because of its usefulness to man, whom you thereby establish as a tyrant of

nature? — No doubt, and this is not tyranny, because man being the center of industry, the center to which everything must be coordinated, any creature that deviates from this rule is necessarily an emblem of evil, and it is a principle of which one will be fully convinced by the study of the analogy. I support it with a second example.

The *Spider* is a very industrious animal, but its parasitic work produces nothing for us and causes us disgust; it therefore represents work of evildoing. Indeed, the Spider is the emblem of Commerce or industrial trap, parasitic, unproductive and repugnant work due to the deception that we constantly fear. Commerce, the most complicated function of the social system, involves a thousand agents where there would not be fifty if truth fully reigned. Now, if the distributive part of commerce, which is the only useful one, can be carried out by one twentieth of the agents, the nineteen twentieths are parasitic, — I prove it in note (1), — and more repulsive, as the spider is by its ugliness and its material filth. This is the image of commerce which is moral ugliness and political filth; its lines of merchants who clutter the towns are a collection of useless workers, setting traps for passers-by to deceive and despoil, as the spider sets webs for flies to devour them. The merchant does not devour the individual, but only the money, and as money, or the source of circulation, is represented in the animal kingdom by blood, the spider, the picture of commerce, must not devour of its victims only the blood, in order to be a faithful image of the genre of commercial plunder .

In tracing these outlines, my goal is to show that the analogy will unravel all our prejudices about vice and virtue. We will have sure oracles; and it is from their totality, from their unanimity that we will deduce the true characters of virtue, the true routes to social happiness, and many other unexpected sciences, for example, natural medicine or the antidote assigned by nature for each disease. There are several that are the pitfall of science: hydrophobia, epilepsy, gout, rheumatism and others, do not yet have a specific, and perhaps the remedy for each of these ills is found in some despised plant, trampled under foot, like coffee for 4,000 years was disdained in the fields of Moka.

It is not the chemical analysis of substances that will reveal their hidden properties to us. This can only be achieved through emblematic analysis.

If everything is linked in the system of nature, if there is unity of system, the created substances must be linked to the creator. Now what kind of links can a turnip and a cabbage have with God? This link is the table of passions.

The holy scriptures tell us that man is created in the image of God. Man therefore has the same passions as God, and to link created substances with God, it was enough to link them with man, to represent in each some effects of human passions and societies.

On the other hand, if man is a mirror of the universe, his passions must be a mirror of the system followed in creation; they must be analogous to the properties of created beings. We have just seen it through the elephant, the ant and the spider.

And since man can form different social mechanisms, five of which are known under the names of Civilization, Barbary, Patriarchy, Savagery and Primitive, known as Eden, of which there remain confused traditions; animals, plants and minerals must represent the effects of the passions in these various societies. The first society, called Eden, could not maintain itself. It is normal that certain animals which were paintings of it perished like it. Hence it is that the Mastodon was unable to stand against man and other animals, and that the giraffe, emblem of truth, is preserved with

difficulty and becomes more and more rare, by analogy with the fate of the truth, which declines more and more in civilized and barbaric societies.

If there have been five societies there may exist a sixth, a seventh, an eighth yet to be born, the mechanism of which we have not been able to discover. It is represented in some beings that strike us with admiration such as the bee and the peacock. The bee has been taken as an emblem of equality. It is quite the opposite. Each bee in its cell represents a societary effect that does not exist, a large household with several degrees of fortune and expenses, a corporate canton of approximately eighteen hundred people very unequal in fortune, carrying out combined cultivation work, manufacturing, cleaning, etc., and distributing to each, men, women and children, several dividends allocated to capital, work, talent. This meeting of unequals and societal agents is represented by the peacock's wheel.

If there did not exist a system of analogy between the substances of the various kingdoms and the passions of man, creation would therefore be an arbitrary and haphazard work. God himself would not be able to realize the correctness of his method; he would not know whether he did right or wrong in creating the tiger and the rattlesnake, for these odious productions can only be justified by the necessity of a system of analogy with our vices, such as ferocity and slander. Without analogy, there would be, not unity, but duplicity in God's system, because it would be mathematical and just as to the effects, and arbitrary as to the causes. It would be a friend of harmony in material movement, and a friend of chaos in passional movement.

Knowledge of the analogy alone can demonstrate to us the correctness of the works of God, which until now must have seemed problematic. So Civilization grows in atheism as it grows in science. She could only get out of this maze through the knowledge of social periods where justice, truth and the intervention of God would reign, which leaves us free will, the full freedom to direct ourselves by the false reason called philosophy, producing the three industrial societies known as Civilization, Barbary, Patriarchy, or to let ourselves be directed by divine reason, the interpreter of which is passionate attraction, identical in system with the material attraction of which Newton gave us the theory.

It is by continuation of this calculation, by analysis and synthesis of passionate attraction, that we arrive at the knowledge of the true and happy societies where the combined industry will reign. The same theory explains all the mysteries of analogy from which our philosophical theories had so distanced us that we have never been able to discern the most obvious analogy, that of incoherent movement and combined movement, both represented in the planets and comets, images of the two fundamental mechanisms of our societies, the fair and societary state, and the false and incoherent state.

Scientists of all centuries, having glimpsed and proclaimed the necessity of the system of analogy in all parts of the universe, have never been able to explain this analogy. This is because they did not know the key to the calculation, the division of the movement into false societies and true societies. The effects of these two kinds of societies being represented in contrast in the antipathetic animals, for example, in the bee and the wasp which depict the results of incoherent industry and of combined industry, our scientists, who do not suspect the possibility of these two industries, could not understand anything about the analogical tables of creation, tables which, in the three known kingdoms, represent the results of these two industries.

In the bee, double benefit from wax and honey;



With the wasp, a double deception by the laziness of two classes that is nourished by an industrious class, all without any benefit for the man to whose convenience everything must be coordinated.

*The Butterfly, the Caterpillar, the Harte.*

A hideous and evil insect which strips our trees, is transformed after a few weeks into a charming insect which beautifies our countryside without harming them, and which gives us in one of its species the most beautiful and strongest of all threads, which is silk.

This metamorphosis is the image of the double mechanism of the passions, the true and the false. We have seen that their development takes place in false mode in societies 2, 3, 4, 5, and in just mode in societies 1, 6, 7, 8. However, the passions are the same in these two mechanisms; all that has changed is the paths of development.

In societies 1, 6, 7, 8, we achieve wealth and pleasures through the practice of truth and justice; in societies 2, 3, 4, 5, this goal is only achieved through falsity and injustice. From this moralists conclude that we must despise riches and pleasures and repress our passions. It is to stifle nature or attraction and to split man against himself. To reconcile nature and virtue, we must organize societies 1, 6, 7, 8, where nature and virtue become compatible.

Before being able to achieve this goal, humanity is obliged to pass through five levels or social periods. They are represented by the sleeps during which the silkworm sheds its envelope and takes on a different one. Its four sleeps give five consecutive envelopes to the caterpillar.

During the 5 periods the insect amassed silky material to form the cocoon. This is how the human species operates which, during the 5 periods 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, amasses materials, industry and sciences, to form an opulent and happy society. There is neither wealth nor happiness in an order where three-quarters of the collaborators, not having enough to feed and clothe themselves, would destroy society if they were not contained by the fear of torture.

Following these 5 periods, the caterpillar passes into the mixed state called *chrysalis*, and similarly the social state would pass to a mixed state, forming the 6th period, that of guarantees. We will cross it as well as the 7th; but without the discovery of the calculation of attraction, we could have spent centuries going through periods 6 and 7.

Period 7 is represented by the butterfly without adornment, which is that of silk.

Period 8 is that of great luxury; it is depicted by the butterfly with large wings adorned with rich colors. The four wings dotted with eyes depict the 4 groups that are the springs of industrial charm and luxury in combined agriculture.

The insect only frequents flowers, lives only on flower pollen and flits from flower to flower. It is an emblem of the attractive works of the 8th society, which are in short and varied sessions, supported by numerous charms (see in the treatise, chapters 21, 22), even in functions repugnant to the senses.

Nature distributes the same subject over several paintings. So to paint for us the property that the 8th society will have of giving both the useful and the pleasant, riches and pleasures, it allocates the table of the useful to the silkworm caterpillar, and the table of the pleasant to the bright, but non-productive butterflies.

The Harte or destructive butterfly,<sup>3</sup> *with simple wings*, is an inverse mold of the two previous ones, which grow and metamorphose for the service of man. The Harte, on the contrary, metamorphoses to carry out destruction, devouring our clothes, our furniture, our furs, our stores. It is the image of poor and incoherent industry, which destroys the envelope of the globe, removes the mountains, dries up the springs, silts up the plains and local seas, like the Red Sea, increasingly silted up by deposits of sand clouds.

By analogy, the harte, despite its smallness, causes great damage. There is hardly a more ruinous insect. Thus the little being called man has the property of unfixing the Globe, upsetting and degrading its temperature through the incoherent industry that we call a civilized and barbaric state, exploiting without a societal combination, distributed by family household, that is, by the smallest possible gathering and that most opposed to economy, truth and the views of God. The charter is also inconsistent with us, since, far from giving us the pleasant and the useful, it causes us double harm in damage and in painful surveillance and precautions.

Thus nature always provides the emblems of the double game of movement, the Butterfly as the emblem of societies of combined industry, the Harte as a picture of incoherent societies that only result in impoverishing the multitude and the globe.

We would understand nothing about the system of movement and analogy if we failed to constantly consider the effect of duality or double play of movement, of which our philosophers have never had the idea although they see it traced in the planets and comets. I will often come back to this rule, in order to familiarize readers who want their perfected Civilization to be the sole destiny of the human race.

#### The *Eagle*, the *Vulture*, the *Ostrich*, the *Dodo* .

The Eagle is named king of animals. Instinct has not deceived us by giving it to us as an emblem of royalty, which is found in other molds, such as the lion.

The eagle takes away the *Sheep*, which is the image of the defenseless people. Like the eagle, every king is obliged to devour his people with taxes, almost always excessive and crushing for popular industry. — The eagle raises its flight in the highest regions; it is still one emblem of higher rank. — It has a receding crest, it is an emblem of alarm; royalty is not exempt. (I said in the preface that the crests and hairstyles paint the thoughts and the furniture of the brain.)

The eagle inhabits the cold part of the region's atmosphere. It seems that this is a contradiction on the part of the painter, because the court lives in luxury, whose emblem is the sun and the heat. This property of living in opulence is represented in lions and tigers, emblems of kings and ministers; they live in hot countries, but we have seen that nature distributes paintings of the same subject on various molds.

Thus the eagle is sympathetic to cold regions by analogy with the icy tone of the courts and the selfishness that reigns there. Etiquette, intrigues, perfidies, false friends are all [ ] that tend to spread coldness in court relations. Thus the eagle paints the monarch in a moral sense and the lion in a material sense.

---

<sup>3</sup> A clothes moth. The word *harte* is identified as originating in Dauphiné, a former French province. — TRANSLATOR.

The *Vulture* and the eagle, placed in parallel, offer a brilliant picture. Both represent the two authorities that take possession of civilized man, — the government, which invades the material part, and superstition, which invades the spiritual part or soul. The eagle frankly attacks the living, the lambs, just as the government bluntly demands tribute. The Vulture attacks corpses as an emblem of the superstition which surrounds old people, weak spirits, to devour them by capturing their inheritance, by selling them the sky for good money. This is in all countries the goal at which the leaders of superstition (which must be clearly distinguished from the religious spirit) aim; they want to grab hold of inheritances by pretending to solicit for the Church and not for themselves.

A general character of religions is begging; they keep asking. Unable to impose tribute by force like the authority, they impose it by trickery, sometimes also by violence like tithes and other benefits; but in general they beg and make the wounds of the Church resound. Nature has painted this trick in the vulture which has the larynx, or organ of speech, bare, stripped of feathers and very poor. The head, the beak, the neck, finally the entire speaking part is repulsively naked. It is the emblem of begging which in speech only expresses complaints, excites pity by its destitution; but is it real? No, because a little below its stripped head, the vulture displays a sumptuous necklace of feathers, a sort of crown that it seems to have been unable to fit on its head. Thus the priesthood, although directly deprived of the crown, actually wears it through its influence; it has everything it seems to lack at first glance; he complains of his privations in public, and we find great fare in his domestic. So the vulture, except for the speaking parts, is provided with useful feathers and well suited to take the high flight that is the emblem of power.

The *Ostrich* and the *Dodo* are paintings of the Great Incompetents. The ostrich, by its height, represents the highest rank, that of the monarch. It is a large body without a head (a name given to any man devoid of spirit and means.) Nature has depicted this absence of mind by the smallness of the head and by the stupid ideas of the bird which, pressed by the hunter, hides its poor head behind a tree stem and thinks it is not seen by the hunter, because it no longer sees him itself. — It has precious feathers at the back; they are picked up, *it*à looted by courtiers.

The Dodo is much the same picture applied to the ignorant and proud Greats. They are raised only in vain titles, as the dodo is raised only in height, lacking the wing feathers that would fulfill the function of a bird. It is the image of these great people without spirit and without means, who are only great because of the position they occupy: great machines without a job, like the dodo, which serves no purpose, is of no use either by the flesh or by the plumage. Its head, proudly raised, expresses the proud stupidity even better expressed in its looks. A crest of horn and earthy color represents the trivial and stupid ideas that escape from its brain.

All these birds that represent the Great ones generally inhabit warm countries, and all the creations of hot countries are commonly hieroglyphics of the customs of the rich class and those who surround it. For example, the crocodile is not found in the rivers of cold countries, because it represents the collector of inheritances, which only attaches itself to the opulent class. I refer the details to the article *Amphibians*..

[Here the manuscript ends.]

NOTE 1. To judge accurately the falsehoods of commerce, let us resort to the hypothesis of a guarantee of truth. I suppose that the *guardian angels* who accompany each of us, and who, knowing our thoughts and actions thoroughly, received orders from God to speak aloud the full truth in all matters of commerce, to give denials to every deceptive actor, whether seller or buyer: the result would be that the current mode, deceptive competition would become impossible; our commercial mechanism would be changed, reduced to a continuous warehousing. Let us examine this effect.

Some merchant would say to the buyer: Here is a beautiful and good blue cloth, I will give it to you at thirty-two francs per yard: it is a friendly price; I gain nothing from it, in honor! I'm losing big, but it's to oblige you. — Immediately the invisible angel would say: You are lying, you want to deceive this man. This sheet is a false color; you bought it for sixteen francs as a fake color, and you want to earn fifty percent on it, by saying that it is a good color, that you are losing big. — On this, the buyer says: Ah! ah! you wanted to mystify me with your beautiful words. Farewell, M. Friend of Commerce. Thank you, Lord Angel. Ah! How kind the guardian angels are since they tell the truth! — Then the merchant, abandoned and furious, would cry out: Citizen angel, if you do not want to keep quiet, it will be impossible to do business. You are ruining us, you are causing us to miss all our sales. — Yes, replies the angel, you will be confounded as many times as you lie; I won't tell you the smallest lie!

And the same with the wine merchant who would say to the buyer: Here is real Madeira, delicious, which I will sell you for five francs. I hardly have any left; I only have it for a few friends. I have reserved a basket for you, because you are a friend of the house; because I sell them for six francs to others. But with you I don't want to win: it's all about friendship. — Then the angel will say aloud: You have lied about it. You made this wine two days ago with three-six, alum and other drugs; It doesn't contain a drop of Madeira, and it doesn't cost you a franc. You want to gain four hundred percent, while pretending that you gain nothing. — Then the buyer finds it by saying: Long live the guardian angels! We will no longer be victims of merchants. —And the wine merchant, abandoned, cried out: Will you shut up, you scoundrel of a guardian angel! Damned dog! Enemy of commerce!

On this the merchants would say in chorus: We can no longer live if justice does not hang these rascally angels. But how are we to do it? We don't see them, we can't take them. Alas! Trade is doomed! The angels are murdering us! We can no longer sell the goods at a friendly price. These monsters tell all the secrets of the trade; it's the death of commerce. Ah! Damned truth! Cursed angels!

Truly trade would be destroyed even among the peasants, who tell many lies when they come to sell their goods at the market. We would know through the angels the real value and the defects of any object put up for sale; we would only grant the real price, a price of intrinsic value, with fair and accepted profit, plus transport costs. And, in this state of things, all commerce would be transformed into large warehouses, where, the value of each object being fully known, there would be no occasion for haggling and deception. The lines of merchants lining the streets would be useless and would return to productive work, and sales would be quick and easy; one could make requests from afar without a purchasing trip. Moreover, the primitive warehouses would ship to each country what would be of guaranteed consumption. This method would restore at least a million individuals to cultivation in France and would establish prodigious speed in transactions, and they would multiply considerably; because many purchases and businesses are hampered by the risk of fraud.

Suppose the invention of a method that would establish in every commercial relationship the same guarantee of truth that the intervention of guardian angels would give, the commercial mechanism will be dissolved and transformed into warehouses. It is currently a scaffolding of lies, a most ruinous complication due to the obstacles and slowness that falsity brings. And yet this tree of lies is advocated, erected as a source of virtue by our moralists, who claim to seek the august truth. Let us judge by this their competence in matters of virtue and truth.