

DOCTRINE OF HUMANITY

YOUR NATIONALITIES

AND

YOUR FATHERLANDS

A SPEECH

DELIVERED AT THE TOMB

OF

PIERRE LEROUX

By his son JOSEPH LEROUX¹

Humanity existed virtually before the nations, and will exist after the nations; *for the purpose of the nations is to establish it.*

(PIERRE LEROUX: *To the Politicians*, p. 122.)

We come here each year, moved by the memory, to live a moment more with him.

We come as well to live by his Doctrine and to profess our conviction in his principles. It is he who will speak through me today.

On this stone, we have had three words engraved: SOLIDARITY-TRIAD-CIRCULUS. We have added to these three words, which summarize his doctrine, the very name of his doctrine: DOCTRINE OF HUMANITY.

This, friends, was of great importance and had to be found there; for the name he gave to his doctrine marks its essential character perfectly: **Doctrine of Humanity.**

¹ These three essays by Joseph Leroux were originally published as a pamphlet in 1893. The working translations by Shawn P. Wilbur were last revised November 20, 2025.

“There is a living city,” he said, “though still ideal, where all are citizens, both those whom our sad adversaries call the *vile multitude*, and those with whom they constitute their legal country; there is a city of God, as Saint Augustine said, which includes all humankind, women as well as men, the poor as well as the rich, the ignorant as well as the learned.” I am, I want to be of this city, which will, in the near future, manifest itself on earth.”²

Yes, great man, this city, in the near future, will exist on earth. We affirm it like you and, from this moment on, we are part of it: **we are Humanitarians.**

The evil is separation, division, fragmentation, caste, this evil that still gnaws at us so terribly. In your immortal book, *ON EQUALITY*, where, in a manner quite different from that of Montesquieu, you brought to light the unrecognized and trampled titles of the vast majority of humankind, you show us the various modes, the various forms that caste has taken, the various forms of slavery and imprisonment through which people have passed and from which, alas, they have not yet definitively emerged.

Let us, friends, give it our full attention. It is about us, about our past, our present, our future. This is the most important political question. All politics hinges on this question: Caste and its definitive destruction. The evil lies there. Let us listen.

The tribes into which the Indians are divided are called *castes*.

“The defining characteristic of castes in the East,” says Pierre Leroux, “is, in fact, division. This word expresses separation, the division of one people into several peoples, or, more generally, the separation of the human species into several parts, into several species.”

“Political writers, for lack of reflection, have thus far failed to see that Eastern castes are only one of the three forms of the idea of caste. And from this results the void of all political science.

“Since the right of the man and his interest lies in free communion with all humankind, and, through humankind, with the entire universe, everything that destroys this right, everything that divides humankind, everything that herds people into hostile or indifferent groups, deserves to be severely condemned. Why should the divisions of humanity into caste-like nations, which have brought about so many wars and caused so much bloodshed, not also be philosophically designated by this name of castes?” Why should divisions arising from only one mode of human manifestation, the family, be considered castes? Politicians, you have condemned the Eastern castes, which have been in decline for centuries; but your eyes do not see other castes just as real and just as disastrous for Humanity, and your ignorance protects them!”

The past. — As far back as we can trace history, we find that Society begins with the *Family Caste*.

² *Œuvres de Pierre Leroux*, Notice on that edition (1851), A.-Gustave Sandré, publisher, page xiii.

"Ask the ancient man what he is and what his right is: he quickly traces his lineage; he tells you the name of his tribe and his most distant ancestor; he comes from Melchizedek or Abraham: he sprang from the head, or the hand, or the foot of Brahma. An outcast, he is not even surprised that there are outcasts and Brahmins; he recognizes no rights except those he has inherited; he does not know, so to speak, and is only conscious of himself because he knows those who begot him and who passed before him on earth through the same furrow of birth as he. This man therefore only truly exists through his ancestors: if he has no ancestors to name, he does not know what he is, he returns to nothingness, he ceases to be."

Almost the past, but still the present: the *caste of the fatherland*, the *fatherland-caste*.

"Ask the same question to the man of Middle Antiquity, to the Greek, to the Roman. He will answer you by pointing to the city around him. *Sum civis Romanus*: that is the resounding title the Roman orator bestowed upon his clients, as protection against torture. And did we not see Saint Paul himself, the great destroyer of the castes of nations (there are no longer Greeks, nor Romans, nor barbarians; we are all children of Adam), forced to resort to this title of Roman citizen for his own protection? In Middle Antiquity, man was no longer confined to castes of birth, but to castes of fatherland; he was born first and foremost a subject of his country, he and his fellow citizens forming an alliance, a city; but this city was *separated* from the rest of humankind, as was the caste of birth. The duality of Brahmins and Pariahs was succeeded by the duality of Greeks and Barbarians." Man is thus still associated with only an infinitely small portion of Humanity. He is an associate of anyone who belongs to the same city as him; *but he is hostile to all other men, and conversely, all other men are hostile to him. All other men are strangers to him; hence, he flees from war.*"

Almost the Present already, and certainly the Future: the new man. Let us listen:

"From the midst of all these ruins emerges a NEW MAN; this is the man of modern times: this is the man who has received into his heart the teachings of Christianity and Philosophy.

"Modern man has other ancestors than those of the flesh; therefore he does not argue from his ancestors: he is man, and that title is enough for him.

"Modern man does not feel himself dependent, in his essence, on the place where he was born, nor even on the nation that gave him birth." He feels himself not only a citizen of the nation from which he came, but a member of the sovereign. He feels himself to be something more; for, as if he feared to alienate his liberty, he places at the head of his Constitutions a distinction between the *rights* of the *man* and those of the *citizen*.

"The proof that the castes of the land have lost all their influence in his eyes is that he rejects as odious the enslavement of any race of men whatsoever, and that he regards war as a crime."

"Ancient man did not conceive of society without masters and slaves, without priests, nobles, and kings. Modern man no longer conceives of masters, slaves, priests, nobles, or kings. He calls himself his own priest, he calls himself his own

master, he feels noble, he feels like a king, simply by virtue of being a man. Luther taught him to do without the nobility of the Church, Descartes to judge everything for himself, Rousseau to consider himself a member of the only legitimate sovereign. He is therefore neither king nor subject, he is a man, he is neither layman nor priest, he is a man. Man, this quality in his eyes says everything; nothing bounds or limits it; it embraces all times and all places, all generations and all peoples.

“Thus, while formerly man always hid behind qualities, the quality of man is today paramount.

“By dint of overturning all the barriers of space and time, the human mind has arrived at an immense generalization. One God for all men, the earth for the dwelling and inheritance of all, and all past generations, and whatever races they may have belonged to, as ancestors of each of us.

“What a new consciousness must have arisen for humankind from such a thought! **Humanity, once divided into a multitude of streams, appears to us today as a single whole.** Ancient man, with his particular gods and his race isolated from others, felt himself like a stream in the current of a river; modern man, with his one God and his human race united, feels himself part of an ocean.

“Castes have become the only caste, that is to say, the human race. Man therefore no longer sees the man of this or that caste, but the man of the only caste that exists, the man of humankind.”³

The man of humankind. Yes, for us there is no longer any distinction of caste, race, or people. **On the ruins of castes of every kind arises HUMANITY.**

To the political jugglers who have been stirring up the infernal question of Nationalities for twenty-five years, sowing hatred and division with abandon in order to better rule and divide the spoils, Pierre Leroux once addressed the following vigorous rebuke:

“You are nothing but sectarians! With your battles, with your humanity herded into separate flocks, with your Europe composed of a collection of jealous individuals, with your border lines, with your fatherlands-castes, with your distinct races (as if God had not created us all as one), with your geographical basins (which are no longer barriers to the discoveries of modern science and industry), with your mystical materialism founded on flesh, on blood, on pride; with all these old-fashioned things, you are nothing but sectarians.”⁴

But from the heights of his genius, he had already victoriously answered them with the **Doctrine of Humanity.**

They may say, “Your Humanity annoys us!” but the day is approaching when the truth will dawn, and when all the factions of Humanity will respond in turn: Your

³ Pierre Leroux, *De l'Égalité*, pages 260, 261, 264, 265, 267, 268, 269.

⁴ Pierre Leroux, *La Grève de Samarez*, Book I, Chapter xxvii.

Nationalities annoy us; we want to unite and form the United States of Europe. We no longer need you. Withdraw, you who make the politics of nations consist of harming one another in times of peace and slaughtering one another in times of war.

Yes, friends, it is ideas that rule the world, and, as Louis Blane said two months ago at another tomb: "I know of a thinker who governs men more sovereignly from the depths of his grave than the most absolute of monarchs ever did from the heights of his throne."

Yes, the idea governs the world, changes it, and transforms it.

We happily affirm that, concerning the great subject that occupies us at this moment, we possess the truth.

We are consistent with all of humanity's past, and we are the future.

The Doctrine of Humanity is the development, the continuation of eternal revelation, a new link in the chain of eternal progress.

Christianity and all previous religions are only waiting to lend us their support. They contained, both spiritually and materially, the dogma of the unity of the human race. They have been its heralds.

In his myth of Adam, did not Moses admirably understand the Unity of Humanity by giving all men the same father? They are therefore all issued from the same paternity, and consequently from the same fatherland.

Saint Paul, affirming the same thought, said: "He made from one blood all mankind to inhabit the whole earth." And elsewhere, with far greater depth of thought, he said: "Although we are many, we are all nevertheless one body... and we are all members of one another."

Christianity, Mosaic law, all positive religions—they are summed up in this great word: Humanity!

"The present, born of the past, is pregnant with the future," said Leibniz.

If the past, through the geniuses we have just mentioned, was able to conceive of the unity of humankind when the practical means for its realization were lacking, how close must the present, engendered by them, be to achieving it, now that science, art, and industry have propagated unity everywhere, now that the press has created a forum where millions of people simultaneously engage in the same thoughts, and now that steam power, by shortening distances, has materially realized this forum. Behold electricity, which instantly connects people from one end of the earth to the other, and abolishes space for them! What other discoveries the future holds, and which are already emerging! Everything has thus prepared the way for unity.

Don't we have a kind of image of this future right here, just a few steps away, in this Field of Mars transformed into the Field of Minerva, where all the *fractions* of humanity are united fraternally and where the struggle is a struggle for good, a victory for whoever does better?

These are not empty words. These are facts, facts, do you hear? History proves us right, as it does the inspired men of God we just mentioned.

We are all naturally inclined to bow to the facts. Let us see what history teaches us.

Let us take as an example one of the facets of Humanity; the others have undergone the same phases of formation. History is there.

For a long time in France, there was a Normandy, a Picardy, a Brittany, a Burgundy and so many other provinces, which were then States at war with one another. France was fragmented into a multitude of fatherlands. These were so many members of the same body who, instead of being united in close harmony, ignored one another when they weren't fighting. And yet, France truly existed within this chaos of seemingly opposing elements. These Bretons, these Picards, these Normans — all these diverse States — eventually merged, fused into a single nation, and today a single sentiment has replaced all the narrow and exclusive petty patriotisms.

That is history.

Well! For us, the same law of formation that history shows us will continue, and these great portions of unity that we call France, England, Germany, Russia, Italy, etc., are, in addition, so many Brittanys, Picards, and Normandies, destined to found a greater unity. The moment is coming for a similar progress for nations. Driven by the past, the future calls to us. First, there will be the UNITED STATES OF EUROPE, and then it will grow even more... Unity will prevail, assimilation will take place; unity will prevail in the unity of measurements as well as in that of currency, in the union of railways, postal services and telegraphs, and peoples will no longer appear strange and foreign to one another, and we will have the UNITED STATES OF THE WORLD.

The noble motto of the United States of America: *E pluribus unum* (many in one) will be its formula.

Pascal said of the universe: "Center everywhere, circumference nowhere." Human beings will then have a center everywhere, materially speaking; for a circumference, **they will have the circumference of our earth.**

Then the earth will become Eden:

O happy earth, reality of heaven!

Yes, friends, this happiness is destined for humankind, and Pierre Leroux, formulating this truth:

"Humanity exists virtually before the nations, and it will be after them; *for the nations have as their purpose to constitute it,*"

formulated a truth as solid as a geometric axiom. Let us therefore say with him:

"Make way, make way on earth for the family of the Human Race."

These, friends, are the principles in which we have a faith, which swells our breasts with imperishable hopes.

The problem is, in fact, posed: the question of nationalities is *indisputably* linked to the question of war. The problem is posed; humanity will solve it, have no fear; She has already solved more difficult problems. Your nationalities are not, after all, insurmountable. They have not always existed in the form and within the limits they have; they will not always exist in this form and in this space. *They have been and are as fluid as the shifting sand.*

Human beings began by grouping themselves into families, then into tribes and clans, then into provinces, then into nations.

In order to destroy this evil, these egoisms, they must be bound together by the federal link. The time has come for this evolution, an evolution that Pierre Leroux masterfully foretold as early as 1827 in his work "On the European Union."

"Decentralize the nations, establish in each province, in each city, its own activity, and, at the same time, dismantle the barriers that separate the nations; This is what liberty, science, and industry strive for: so that, if their triumph were complete, one could say of **the great Society of Men** what Pascal said of the Universe: Center everywhere, circumference nowhere."

An American thinker, Henry George, said: "There is only one way to eliminate an evil, and that is to eliminate its cause."

Nationalities, as they exist today, exclusive, selfish and separated like worlds from one another, are an evil; they are undoubtedly the cause of evil; they are the cause of war among men, who are all children of the Earth.

A modification is therefore necessary of these human groupings, the fruits of chance and circumstance. The nation must be decentralized and federalized; each province, each city, must establish its own activity; the nation must be decentralized and federalized; and then, subsequently, the nations must be federalized among themselves. Federation of the nation, federation of nations, to become *Federal Humanity*.

This federal union will bring peace and harmony back to humankind. Indeed, what does humankind need? It needs its center, its home, to develop its faculties and instincts, its freedom and individuality, and then it needs free communion with the rest of humankind, with the rest of humanity who thus become its confederates; the federative bond leaving each of them their *autonomy* while still linking them all to the rest of the world in a fraternal and federal bond.

Paris, — April 1880

9th anniversary of the death of Pierre Leroux.

DOCTRINE OF HUMANITY

YOUR NATIONALITIES

Extract from a letter published in the Journal the ARBITRATOR, a newspaper of the friends of peace, appearing in London under the direction of W.-R. Cremer,⁵ knight of the Legion of Honor, member of the English Parliament.

My dear Cremer,

It is always with the most lively interest that I follow the efforts made to give a solution to the problem of peace. I see that at Rome, at the Inter-Parliamentary Congress, the disorganizing principle of nationalities has been cast at you, and that it was not without malice, for the one who cast it thought to destroy with one blow all the peaceful work elaborated, especially in the last few years. That one has cast trouble in your ranks.

The question of peace is, indeed, like all things, a question of organization. Now, if one shows you a disorganizing principle, a principle negating or destructive of all organization, it becomes difficult to conceive how one can create a harmony.

One paper has even said that it was truly a shame to have this enormous paving stone cast at you; that he should have waited until we were stronger in order to crush us definitively; that we were so weak that it was not worth the trouble. Assuredly, though attending the Inter-Parliamentary Congress, it is not friends of peace who advocate such arms. But I find it very useful that our adversaries show us the difficulties of the problem, difficulties that moreover we know well. But let them not believe that their argument for nationalities is an unanswerable argument and that our peaceful ideas are only a sort of vain utopia. They take ephemeral appearances for eternal realities a bit too much.

We will begin by remarking to them that their nationalities are not present from the creation, that it is not nature that had created the nationality, but that it is a human invention. When human beings, men or women, come into the light of this world, they are born men or women and not Germans, French, English or Italians. The nationalists have sought something that characterizes their nationalities, and they have cried: It is

⁵ William Randal Cremer.

language! Another devilishly shallow argument. The human being, when it is born, speaks no language: raised with goats, it would articulate only sounds.

You see, dear Cremer, nationalities are not, as they believe, such a big deal; they have built on a very fragile and shifting soil. If the creation produced some Italians, some English, some Germans, some French,⁶ etc., the struggle would probably be as durable as these various creations of men; but nature produces only men, that is Humanity. Therefore, our firm and unwavering will is that we, the small phalanx, contribute to the definitive establishment of a peaceful land, and we believe that the problem is perfectly solvable and will therefore be achieved.

They make us laugh with their firm confidence in the famous principle of nationalities. Mr. Hubbard and Mr. Imbriani — so imbued with this beautiful principle, which makes all of the divisions of Europe look daggers at each other in that moment, forming so many separate and hostile worlds — should recall, the one, Mr. Imbriani, that the least of circumstances would have made a French patriot of an irredentist Italian patriot. Such was Gambetta: a small voyage of his parents from Genoa in Italy to Cahors in France, made him from a Genoese into what one calls a great French patriot; and for Mr. Hubbard, from a French patriot, he would have been able to become Italian like the general Pelloux, from French family, who is presently minister of war in Italy.

Indeed, dear Cremer, these obvious, elementary facts continuously escape our thought, so much do we take the *costume* for the *man*, nationality for a solid basis, when it is only a creation of human agglomerations constituted by time, circumstances, interests and chance.

Take the first child to come, born in France to French parents; carry it to England. What language will it speak? English. It will learn, growing up, not only the English turn of phrase, but the English spirit, mind, physiognomy and type. It will be the same as an English child born in England, who, carried Paris at the age of one year, surrounded only by Parisians, would speak only French and would possess everything that constitutes the most *parisiennant* of the Parisian. Take the exalted French patriot M. Déroulède at the age of one year; take that child to Berlin; let him be surrounded only by Berliners until the age of eight: M. Déroulède will only speak German and, following the tendency of his mind, would probably become the most chauvinistic of Prussians.

These obvious truths show us the fragility of nationalities, the result of successive agglomerations stemming from the work of time, but having no other virtuality than what man has given it. We are all born men and women, human beings, belonging to Humanity.

⁶ It is not even necessary to go back very far in history in order to find the moment when these different nationalities did not exist. We propose to take up the subject that we raise in this letter and to treat it from a historical point of view.

Nature has created us in a *homogeneous* manner. The problem is thus feasible, for there is no cause of disunion on the basis of nature.

For us, the question of nationalities is tied indisputably to the question of war. Nationalities as they exist today, exclusives and separated like worlds separate from one another, are an evil; they are the cause of evil, and the cause of war. A modification is necessary to these human groupings: it is necessary to decentralize the nations, to establish in each province, in each town an activity of its own; it is **necessary to decentralize and federalize the nation, then federalize the nations among themselves. Federation of the nation, federation of nations, federal union, Federal Humanity.**

That federal union will lead to peace and harmony among men; *each having his center, his home, being himself, while being linked by the federal link to the rest of the world.*

It is the Swiss confederation, it is the United States of America, many in one, *E pluribus unum*, applied progressively to the rest of the world.

As soon as that very simple modification is achieved in the present nationalities, selfish, exclusives, jealous and hostile, the cause of evil will disappear and war will be destroyed.

One of the great minds of this century, Pierre Leroux, has expressed this truth by saying:

“Humanity existed virtually before the nations, and it will exist after them; for the nations have for purpose to constitute it,” and in 1827, he announced, in his great work on the *European Union*, **the formation of the United States of Europe.**

We, the friends of peace, we respond to the cry of Mr. Hubbard, Mr. Imbriani and so many others: Nationalities; we respond: **Federation of Peoples, Federal Humanity.**

JOSEPH LEROUX.

January 1892.

La Pervenche, Mougins (Alpes-Maritimes)

DOCTRINE OF HUMANITY

FATHERLANDS

AND

FEDERAL HUMANITY

There is a great clamor in the press between the partisans of the fatherland — and, as a result, of fatherlands — and the new world, which is finally emerging and which is Internationalist and Federal. It seems to us, nonetheless, that no one, on one side or the other, has a very lucid conviction of the facts. A study of this subject seems important to us at this moment, for year by year these two currents will continue to intensify more and more.

We will begin by dealing with the question of the fatherland. We will not say to you: “Keckcékça?” We are going to tell you what it is, and when we have done so, we really think that you will no longer be patriotic or jingoistic, for there is so much evil in this state of fatherland-castes, that even the pride and the money that we can gain dividing the human race in this way could not offset for a moment the horrors that it conjures up and which are its consequences.

Fatherland! *Patrie!* — That word, that state of things dates for the primitive beginnings of the formation of human society. If we’re talking about old-fashioned things, we cannot deny that this is one of them.

In the beginning, the man cast on this earth had no organization. History shows us in what chaos men found themselves, isolated from one another, without language, as it were, and without links between them. Little by little, as in the cosmic matter, in the nebular stars, in space, like atoms, some centers formed. Those were first the family, then some families gather together; then, in time, tribes and clans, and with more time, cities and groups of cities; then provinces, and then, with more time, the agglomeration continuing, those became tribes and peoples.

Finally, in our time, the human world has ended up grouping itself on the globe in hardly twenty nations, — called fatherlands.

That has been the movement of grouping, a movement left entirely to itself, to the chance of wars of conquest, to the marriage of crowned heads, to the successions of noble

families, to the alliance of groups through the marriages of squires, lords, kings and queens.

The son of this family or families defended them against all threats. He was a patriot, and that was his *patrie*. The member of that tribe or clan was patriotic; he defended his tribe or clan against all others. The man of the city defended his city against the neighboring city and against all the neighbors' invasions; he was citizen and patriot. His city was a fortress; everything that was not of his city was a foreigner. The man of the province, Norman or Burgundian, or any other, defended it against the other provinces. He was also a patriot.

You see it; the idea of a fatherland is as primitive and rudimentary as the primitive and savage beginnings of society; it is the selfish association of a few against all comers. And when everything has advanced immensely, they still want to present this old relic as representing an organization! Come on! You're out of date. Let's move on.

Voltaire, in his *Philosophical Dictionary*, page 1511, in the article on the Patrie, gives an exact definition of this word or this state of affairs.

"It is sad," he says, "that to be a good patriot one should be the enemy of the rest of humanity. The ancient Cato, that good patriot, always said upon arriving at the Senate: *This is my opinion, and let Carthage be ruined!* To be a good patriot is to wish that one's city should be enriched by commerce and then be healthy by arms. It is clear that one country cannot win without another losing and that it cannot conquer without creating misery. Such is the human condition, then, that to wish the greatness of one's country *is to wish harm upon one's neighbors.*"

The definition is accurate; the small community represented by this Union of families, the beginning of a union of a few human beings; the tribe, the clan, the city, the province, the peoples, the nations formed from all these small agglomerations were the image of this patriotic selfishness and could only wish good for themselves and evil for their neighbors."

The motto, the true motto of the patriot cannot be other than the impish phrase that I have heard a Granvillaise pronounce with regard to his neighbors: "*God, protect us and flay the others.*"

But this state of nations is barbaric, you will tell me; and, no doubt, it is the primitive form of human groupings, grimacing at one another. And to redeem our species, you can say with love, with Alphonse de Lamartine, addressing this question of nations in four immortal lines:

**Nations! A pompous word to say Barbarism!
Does love stop where your steps stop?
Tear down these flags; another voice cries out to you:
Selfishness and hatred alone have a fatherland;
Fraternity has none!...**

As for the consequences of these closed and exclusive groupings, first into families, then into tribes and clans, then into provinces, then, with time, into nations, history is there to tell us the dreadful results: war, war, war and eternally war; Hatred, hatred, jealousy, exorbitant taxes, arson, rape, theft, throat-slitting, every imaginable crime, every kind of violence, every kind of misery; *such is the record of patriots against other patriots*, all equally foolish.

Can you deny it? Can you deny the history, you who so ardently support, for your own interests even today, this antiquated, abominable relic of a primitive and rudimentary social organization?

Before going any further, let us condemn this horror that has lasted for so many centuries and pause for a moment. Consider this spectacle of history and marvel, patriots of today. There were far more fatherlands in the past than there are today! Look at all those banners in the past, representing so many groups, so many fatherlands hostile to one another. Behold this organization, like that of the Sioux or the savage Iroquois; what a bloodbath for you! What a slaughter! See them crying: *Fatherland!* and rushing upon their neighbors, themselves formed into so many fatherlands. Read the History of France and remember that at one time the Lorrainer was as proud, as a patriot, to disembowel a Burgundian or a Picard as the Sioux was to scalp an Iroquois. Take the history of these Norman, Breton, Burgundian and Provençal fatherlands, and see how these patriots were happy and proud to demolish and raze their neighbors' cities and to put everything to fire and sword.

Ah! poor Normans, poor Franks, poor Burgundians, poor Picards, poor Bretons, poor Aquitaine, if you had been told that one day you would be one! How much you would have sent to hell the Norman fatherland, the Breton fatherland, the Languedocian fatherland, the Picardy fatherland, and the Provençal fatherland. Since all your efforts to maintain them were useless, and since these fatherlands were destined to cease to exist by uniting with one another. Go! Sleep in peace, all of you who believed in this principle of stupid hatred of fatherlands; all of you who were disemboweled and who disemboweled your neighbors in the name of fatherlands. Today, my friends, *you are Departments* of a greater fatherland, soon to become *Departments of Federal Humanity*; and although thus agglomerated, you still utter this cry of hatred toward others; the word *fatherlands* is still put in your mouths to satisfy, today as in the past, the pride, ambition and fortune of a few; And as long as you possess them, your fatherlands, you will suffer hell; for it is a principle of egoism, hatred, pride and death.

Yesterday, poor Frenchmen, poor Germans, poor children without hatred, two emperors threw you against each other, shouting: Fatherland! *Vaterland!*

Fatherland! It is again to this supposedly sacred name of the fatherland — sacred no doubt because it leads to funerals — that you were made to slaughter each other.

And the other day, they were pulling your poor bodies from the earth, and they were still playing out the macabre comedy of the fatherland on your poor bones.

“The bones of a Frenchman must remain in France; those of a German must remain in Germany!”

And there they were, those austere patriots, *journalists* and others, watching this exchange of bones of the victims of their guilty idea of fatherlands, swooning, not with grief, before these dead bodies, but with pleasure at the beauty of the spectacle, finding it beautiful, magnificent, a final and complete consecration of their idea of fatherlands, and their newspapers sang: *Fatherlands! Fatherlands!* But, you wretched fools, there is the Earth of the good God, but there is no French land, no German land; and these dead bodies of your victims are there to tell you so, for you *would not have known how to call them French or German, if it weren't for the remnants of their clothing.*

The best doctor could not have told you: This is a French body, this is a German body.

The cursed, damned division that murdered these men, it is you who maintain it, it is the fatherland, it is your fatherlands.

And you find it strange that we no longer want your fatherlands, thank you! You call us dreamers, and you have spent twenty years maintaining your fatherlands, maintaining your hatred, your pride, not to mention the money many of you have made there: ninety-five billion francs. That's not hollow, is it? And the million corpses you are preparing! That may well be hollow. The stomachs of the people from whom you have taken everything you could may well be hollow. It is beginning to be time that you were held accountable. It is time, patriots of all fatherlands, it is high time that you were placed under interdict.

We believe we have sufficiently explained the significance of this word *fatherlands* and its consequences. People, the patriot is not your friend, nor is the fatherland, for it is your death he is preparing, as well as your ruin and that of your children. Man, when you hear this word fatherland, remember well that it means hatred for your neighbors and therefore war, murder, and death. Do not be taken in by the deceitful flattery of the patriotic instigator who will make you feel the sweetness of the word fatherland, fatherland and who will speak to you of fathers, and even, to make it more tender and sweeter, of mothers, he will call it motherland. He will tell you that it is for your own good, like the assassins of Don Carlos, who, running after him and surrounding him to strangle him, said to him: *It is for your own good, my lord!* There is neither father nor mother in this word fatherland; there is hatred and death to all our brothers, and, consequently, to ourselves. As soon as you say *Fatherlands*, you say *death*. And the proof, it is the song that says it: *To die for the fatherland.*

It doesn't say to live, it says *to die*, because its principle is one of hatred and death. It is in the name of fatherland that a son is taken from his father and poor mother; it is in the name of fatherland that twenty times more taxes are levied than would otherwise be

necessary; and it is in the name of fatherland that human slaughter is perpetrated between two so-called fatherlands — slaughter that makes all of nature shudder.

History has shown us families united and absorbed by tribes and clans; cities and clans absorbed by provinces; provinces absorbed by tribes and nations. Today, the nations will in turn be absorbed by **Federal Humanity**.

This is an inescapable fact, a certainty, stemming from the very law of the successive formation of human groups, as history shows us.

It is the imperative need, the ardent, burning aspiration of our time. Everything converges upon it, everything tends toward it.

Industry, through Railways, Telegraphs and Telephones, reduces distances daily and will soon make our globe seem too small.

Thought, through the geniuses of all nations, has conceived and celebrated this reunion of all members of this body *of Humanity*, united at last, and has proclaimed its imperative necessity.

Pierre Leroux, that master of masters of socialism, had inscribed at the head of the Revolution's motto: Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, the sublime phrase **Doctrine of Humanity**.

Castes have become the only caste, that is to say, the Human race. Man is therefore no longer the Man of this or that caste, but the Man of the only caste that exists, the Man of Humankind. Modern Man does not feel dependent on the place where he was born, nor on the nation that gave him birth. Since the right of Man and his interest is free communion with all humankind and, through Humankind, with the entire Universe, everything that destroys this right, everything that divides Humankind, everything that herds men into hostile or indifferent flocks, deserves to be severely condemned.

“Decentralizing nations, establishing in each province, in each city, its own activity, and at the same time tearing down the barriers that separate nations — this is what liberty, science, and industry strive for.”

And here are our brothers, the workers of the whole world, about to deliver the final blow to these walls that ooze death, which we call borders, and finally embrace one another in a kiss of peace and love by proclaiming the Doctrine of Humanity, of *Federal Humanity*.

The jokers and skeptics who profited so greatly from these divisions are still trying to hold them back by shouting their antiquated rhetoric: fatherlands and even stateless peoples; but it's useless; today they answer them: Long live the International of Peoples, and tomorrow they will answer them: We want to unite, to federate together; we want the *Federation of Peoples*, we want the constitution of **Federal Humanity**.

This Federal Humanity will restore peace and harmony among humankind; each person will have their center, their home, where they can develop their faculties and

instincts, proclaim their pride or abilities without harming their neighbors, all while being connected by the federal bond to the rest of humanity.

And an immense wave, filled with songs of joy and happiness, will melt, unify, and forever federalize this world divided into nations — nations that still regard each other like porcelain dogs — and a measure of harmony and happiness will be established on this earth.

JOSEPH LEROUX

APPENDIX

ON THE EUROPEAN UNION

(1827.—AFTER THE BATTLE OF NAVARINO) ⁷

In the last centuries, war was the necessary consequence of the internal organization of states. — Doctrine of war professed then generally. — Agreement of Bodin, of Bacon, of Hobbes, etc., with Machiavelli. — Origin and development of the pacific principle. Thomas More, Fenelon, the Abbé de Saint-Pierre.

§ 1.

On the unity that is revealed in Europe. — This unity is not the work of Catholicism.

The victory of Navarino has given occasion to some writers to recall the memory of Lepanto. They viewed this victory as a new triumph of Christian unity, and they were right; because the Christian World, which includes Europe and America, which already extends into Asia and surrounds the African Continent, forms a system, of which all the parts live a common and progressive life; and this system is clearly distinguished from the two other great systems, Brahmanism and Mohammedanism, which share the earth with it. In this sense, what we have just seen is only a repetition of what the Sixteenth Century experienced. But there are also essential differences between these two events. For then it was the pontiffs who gave the signal; it was they who called Christendom to arms against the barbarians of the East, the destroyers of Alexandria, the despoilers of Byzantium, the tyrants of Greece, the slave traders. Their galleys were seen fighting at Lepanto, and the entire fleet was Orthodox. Today the pope has nothing more than an empty title, and many different crosses could have been displayed on the ships of Navarino. Then, before the combat, indulgences were preached in all the pulpits; and we saw all the Catholic pulpits remain silent. But what is the point of continuing this comparison, since it is too obvious that Catholicism is ruined today? A union far superior to Catholic unity was formed; and this one suits our time, as the other may have suited the first developments of European society. This new unity has no material organization, and it does not need one; it has no stakes, no inquisition, but it is no less powerful: it is it that abolishes slavery, that emancipates America, that saves Greece.

⁷ “On the European Union” was originally published in *Le Globe*, November 24, 1827. It then appeared as the first essay in the “Appendice aux Trois Discours” in the *Œuvres de Pierre Leroux*, Vol. I (1850.) This translation incorporates headings from both publications.

§2.

Two diverse Influences are felt there: the Kings and the People.

This unity, however, is not complete, and it will perhaps still be a long time before it becomes so; for two diverse influences are felt there: a struggle has begun between the general spirit of the cabinets and the general spirit of the societies.

It is the spirit of the societies that formed the European Union, which the cabinets would now like to take over.

In order to form it, it was necessary to fight the monarchy and the nobility; for absolute monarchy and the nobility were two causes of perpetual war.

This spirit fought them through the progress of reason and through the influence of commerce and industry, enemies of that violence and unrest that drive away wealth; it also fought them with revolutions.

At the same time a doctrine of peace replaced a doctrine of war.

In order to judge now to which of the peoples or governments will remain the direction of this unitary force, whether it will be used for a long time to come in wars of intervention contrary to the perfection of societies, or whether it will be applied more and more to this very perfection, we have nothing better to do than to carefully consider how the union was formed, and what it is today, because *the present is pregnant with the future*.

§ 3.

In recent centuries, War was the necessary consequence of the organization of States.

We will be excused from proving that even after the age of private wars and after these struggles of a crowd of little princes whose states ended up composing the great monarchies, Europe continued for three centuries to be agitated by endless wars.

The kings having put themselves everywhere in the place of nations, it was necessary that the politics of nations be mobile and passionate like them. Besides, royalty was warlike by nature. Reputation was considered necessary for the prince. A king, said Richelieu, must risk everything, his fortune and his greatness, rather than allow his reputation to be damaged. Each new reign therefore placed on the people a tax of glory for the benefit of the sovereign. On the other hand, the fear that the monarch inspired abroad was regarded as a means of government at home. Furthermore, it was important to an authority that was often poorly established to occupy with foreign wars idle, courageous subjects, who remembered too well the independence of their fathers. Blood relations and inheritances were another source of debate. Finally add the errors of judgment and the

personal vices of the princes. We have seen some who took glory from the number of their perfidies. For others, the art of ruling consisted above all in the activity of an alert brigand, always in business with his neighbors. "Whatever the circumstances," said one Leopold, "let us seek to expand, and form great projects." It was by following this maxim that the House of Austria exhausted its strength and brought about its decadence. "Alone against all" was the motto of Louis XIV: he asserted it for a long time, but Europe had its turn. Thus, according to kings and ministers, the politics of nations tended towards heroism, madness or villainy; there were vile behaviors and noble behaviors: but always passion led everything; we worshipped strength; in this regard the kings had written their thoughts even on their cannons.⁸

After the kings, or rather before them, the great cause of the wars of Europe was the nobility. The nobility sought war voluntarily, while the people had to be dragged into it by force. War was its element, its life; it believed itself obliged to wage war out of conscience. Did it not hold the fiefs on this condition? Virtue, then, was courage. From the Pole to the Mediterranean, all of Europe had the same organization. Everywhere a military caste dominated, and everywhere this caste was the volcano that agitated the empires. The bitter wars of the North can be explained like those of the South. Only in the South the wars depended more on the monarchy, in the North on the nobility.⁹

⁸ *Ultima ratio regum.*

⁹ In countries of Slavic origin, in Poland, in Russia, the nobility had granted themselves the exclusive right to own land. Poland had its *diets* and its *pospolites* until the end, and until the middle of the Sixteenth Century all the Northern States were elective. It is true, as for Russia, that its nobility appears to us today so pale before the autocracy, that it seems that it never had any activity of its own, and that we cannot consider it as having been once a forceful principle of foreign war and conquest; but it is an illusion that comes only from the fact that we took care of this empire very late. It is enough, in fact, to go through its annals, or even just to recall the scenes that preluded the rise of the Romanovs, to see in Russia, before the reform of Peter, an essentially military nobility, having its share of action and of government, dominating from time to time the royalty in its stormy diets, in short almost in every way similar to the Polish nobility. There, as elsewhere, waging war was the privilege and duty of the noble. The law even obliged every Russian gentleman to enter the service and to remain there as long as his strength permitted him; becoming disabled, his son took his place. This is how armies were recruited; this is how, with an income that never exceeded five million rubles, the czars always had numerous soldiers to oppose their numerous enemies; and it is even thanks to this national habit that Peter was able, without danger, to enlist as simple dragoons and simple sailors all the gentlemen under thirty years of age. Now, these nobles, these men of conquering race, upon leaving the service, were entitled to rewards: to some came the governments, the *vaivodies*; to others there remained the inferior jobs, districts of land, lakes full of fish and the crown villages. A *strelitz* had only four rubles a year's pay; but privileges or abuses compensated him. So here again the nobility kept the war going, just as the war in turn kept the nobility alive. Basically, there was no real social revolution in Russia; only the throne has grown, only the nobility has lost its political dignity: what do we see today in this empire? Five hundred thousand nobles or agents of the emperor and twenty-five million serfs, the land and authority vested in a class of men forming the eighteenth part of the nation.

§ 4.

System of equilibrium or political balance.

From the impetus of kings and nobles came the politics of recent centuries. You only have to browse some of the numerous works published on the art of negotiations to see that they focus almost entirely on this problem: "A nation being given, find out which are its natural allies and its natural enemies." Now it was often enough that two powers had a league of common borders, or both possessed a few ports and a few ships, for them to be declared *natural enemies*. Once this research was done, all the science of politics was reduced to doing good to its allies and all possible harm to its enemies. At that time, there was always in Europe what we called *the dominant power* and *the rival power*: they constantly monitored each other, crossed each other in all their actions; and this very rivalry was considered as the safeguard of the liberty of other States. The strongest never neglected an opportunity to humiliate the weakest; and this, in turn, everywhere maintained a useful jealousy against the predominant nation. Such was this famous theory of *equilibrium*, which, reducing all political science to knowing only one word, also flattered the ignorance and laziness of ministers, ambassadors and clerks. Still, it had taken a long time to get there; because from the Italian wars under Charles VIII, a time when the powers of Europe began to have ongoing relations with each other, until the moment when Elizabeth and the Dutch imagined the regular theory of counterweight and perpetual struggle, politics had been little more than a shapeless mixture of equally crude passions and views. Finally, when this admirable system had been found, Europe, for two centuries, resounded with words of equilibrium, liberty, tyranny; the blood continued to flow to restore the balance, which leaned sometimes to one side and sometimes to the other; the House of Austria, France and England, in turn dominant and rival powers, fought tirelessly, drawing into their sphere their natural allies and these courts, Machiavellian in essence, which were truly no one's allies, but always found themselves, at the end of the war, the allies of the one who had fought it most successfully. Thus we can say that throughout this long period war was the natural state of societies: they were inevitably pushed to it by the very nature of the monarchical and nobiliary principles that dominated within them.

Today these principles have received a notable weakening everywhere, and others, obviously destined to win, have arisen in their place. So a new order will be established sooner or later in the relationships between societies. If war then completely changed its object, or even became pointless, this would be no more surprising than what already happened in Europe at another age of society. Hadn't the real conquests, that is to say the real taking of possession of a country and the superposition of one people on another, already lasted several centuries? These conquests were correlative to a state of society in which all men were soldiers and where armies were nations; Did they not cease when

society had taken on another aspect? Since that time, there have been many battles fought, many provinces subjected: have we seen populations move, towns and countryside populated with foreigners, the vanquished driven out and dispossessed? No. Well! Just as the battle of nations was followed by the duel of kings, can the time not come when territorial conquests will disappear in their turn, when the social organization which gave birth to them will have finally died? But nothing is done except gradually and over centuries; we must have emerged from these transitional ages where society resembles the insect that metamorphoses: it no longer crawls on the earth, but it does not yet have wings with which to rise.

§ 5.

Doctrine of War then generally professed.

At least we are more advanced than our fathers; because today, although devoid of a positive doctrine, and still floating amidst the doubts that so many different political schools have left us, no one would establish as a principle that war is a salutary exercise for States, and that it is right to take flame and sword to one's neighbors for fear that they will do their business too well. But what no one today would say was, in the Sixteenth Century, in the Seventeenth Century and later still, an incontestable truth, not only in the eyes of a large number of statesmen and diplomats, but even in the eyes of philosophers. The most eminent geniuses admitted this necessity of empires to harm each other: it was an almost agreed point in science, a sort of political axiom. And, in fact, it had to be so; because, once again, Europe being organized for war, war became for it a natural state and a necessity.

This sort of adoption of war by philosophers, as well as the formal or tacit consent which they gave for so long to slavery, undoubtedly offers one of the most remarkable examples of the weakness and variations of the mind. human. The fact is therefore curious to note. We will not lack authorities.

§ 6.

Agreement of Bodin, Bacon, Hobbes, etc., with Machiavelli.

“There are some,” says Bodin, “who imagine that continual peace is the state to which an empire must aspire; but this is an error;” and he proves it with a host of solid reasons drawn from the organization of the societies of his time. Now, on such a matter, Bodin is a serious authority. He was for moderns the father of political science, and for a long time the book of *the Republic* was authentic in Europe. He was, moreover, a mind of the first order. Without doubt Montesquieu is as concise and as clear as Bodin is diffuse and dull; but, fundamentally, they have more connections than is commonly believed: not only did

Bodin provide Montesquieu with his general division of governments and his false but important theory of the climate; he also inspired a large number of detailed ideas; he was his predecessor and his master in this method of comparing the institutions of all countries and all centuries which forms, for both, the basis of science; however tiring his erudition of minute details is, he also knows how to appreciate the value of facts and see the consequences of legislation in their essence. In a word, in many respects, Bodin gave form to the genius of Montesquieu: it is like a matrix, of a fairly base material, of sand or lime, but on which an imprint is deeply engraved, and which communicates it brilliant and full of relief to the precious metal it receives.

After Bodin, we will cite Bacon. Arriving almost at the end of his great work *on the Perfection of Sciences*, Bacon is astonished to have crossed the entire ocean of human knowledge, to have touched on so many discoveries made or to be made, and to have said nothing of a science that dominates all others, the science of government. But the Chancellor of England would fear compromising himself by writing on politics; his thoughts on this delicate subject would only appear after his death. All he could do for the present was to indicate some general principles of incontestable evidence. Well! Would you believe it? One of these principles is that the art of ruling does not consist only of making a State happy and flourishing: it must be enlarged; its borders must of necessity be extended. Besides, war, in itself, is a good thing; *it is a beneficial exercise*. In his love for figures and allegories, a love that never leaves him, Bacon compares the body politic to the human body: civil war is the heat that results from movement, and we know how useful this is to health. Bacon does more; he frankly teaches an art of fueling war, of making it almost permanent, while always having on his side, not justice, but the appearance of justice. "Take care of the military spirit of your nobility," he said; inspire in the people a lively national pride, make them ticklish on the point of honor, and then never let slip the slightest opportunity to put this warlike ardor to good use. It is impossible for one not to appear: if any damage has been committed on the frontier, if your ambassadors or your merchants have been insulted, say that the entire nation has been; don't wait for reparation, but race to arms. Furthermore, on all occasions, show a keen tenderness for your allies; let their insults be yours, take sides in all their quarrels: this was the art of the Romans." These precepts of Bacon recall those of Machiavelli.

In the Eighteenth Century people began to regard Machiavelli's doctrine as an astonishing scandal and himself as a sort of monster, a unique exception; until then there had not been so much clamor against him. Rousseau, struck by the contrast he believed he saw between Machiavelli's book and his life, was the first to resort to a subtle explanation: the apology for ruse and violence would have been satire; Machiavelli would have wanted to educate people by painting their tyrants. But this assumption was devoid of truth. Not only was it in good faith that Machiavelli gave his lessons in deceit, but this mixture of grandeur and moral baseness which astonishes us in him did not astonish his century; the Italian character was essentially composed of it; and Machiavelli only exposed and

followed up universally received principles with more logic and vigor than any other. We refer, for proof, to the excellent dissertation which a young and able English critic, Mr. Macaulay, very recently inserted in the *Edinburgh Review*. But this critic was mistaken, in our opinion, in limiting this clever policy to Italy, which he opposes to another policy of less civilized nations, not frank and chivalrous, but brutal and blind, incapable of combinations and system. If Machiavelli was not a man apart in Italy, he was not an anomaly in Europe either. No doubt this perverse, but then salutary, doctrine should have been better understood by Italy, so enlightened and so unhappy, which had only the spirit to resist the force, besieged on all sides without, divided within, finally delivered to a sort of war of all against all. But the same situations give rise to the same opinions: foreign war was permanent throughout Europe; the whole of Europe was organized militarily; nowhere was there anything homogeneous; everywhere there are castes and corporations, religious and civil dissensions; However ignorant the populations were, spirit and finesse had at least penetrated the courts: is it surprising that the same doctrine was produced spontaneously everywhere, and that everywhere it also found skillful interpreters?

Besides, Machiavelli did not have a complete doctrine; he held on to the branches and did not go to the root of the tree. The man who gave this doctrine a philosophical foundation is Hobbes. His book *The Citizen* could be considered in some respects as a political pamphlet for the benefit of the Stuarts and the absolute Monarchy against constitutional government and the division of powers, which was then taking on a completely new development in England; but it is written in a general form and based on abstract principles: it is the *Social Contract* of the time.

Hobbes assumes that man is the enemy of man (*homo homini lupus*), and that war is the natural state of all society. He then seeks how men can move from the state of mutual war to the state of peace: everything that is useful to achieve this goal will be legitimate. He discovered a certain number of rules which he demonstrated were necessary to achieve this, and which he called natural laws. But Hobbes is too good a logician and too consistent with his fundamental principle to want these laws to be obligatory in themselves: they are still only abstract formulas. Since each man has and should only have his own interest as his motive, why would he sacrifice something for a peace that is not guaranteed? The state of war therefore only ceases by the creation of a *sovereign*, which must be *absolute* if it is to fulfill the purpose for which it was created. The sovereign thus becomes the basis, I dare not say of morality, but of order. This is how this reasoner brings the just out of the useful. This detestable theory was not only calculated to make men wicked, and consequently to maintain internal war within States instead of establishing peace; it still allowed war to exist in its own right between societies. Indeed, when we come to the relationships between societies, the cornerstone of the system is missing. Hobbes can well say to the men who make up a State: "Be at the bottom of your heart treacherous, envious, rogues, such as nature made you: the law is there, sovereign and always just." But he cannot say the same thing to the States; for between them there is no

constituted *sovereign*: peace is therefore not guaranteed; natural laws are therefore not obligatory; this notion of the Just that Hobbes brings out solely from intelligence and logic does not exist, since there is no place for the act of intelligence which creates it: man therefore remains with the interest for law and guide, and the war continues.

War! The law of war! This was then the foundation of all political philosophy. Bodin, Machiavelli, Hobbes, Grotius, Puffendorf are almost always unanimous in this regard. It was from this that in general they brought out everything, good and evil, the authority of the law and despotism, personal slavery and the rights of paternity. You go to war, you take prisoners, you would have the right to kill them; you take their freedom instead of taking their lives: they legitimately become your slaves. A child is born, which means that he falls into the power of his parents; they could abandon it and even kill it (because the natural state is a state of war); they make him live: he becomes their slave; their right to it is limited only by civil law and emancipation. This is what philosophers took for science; these are the wise lessons that they proclaimed for the greater good of Humanity. This is because the speculations of philosophers always have their roots in their century; No matter how much they isolate themselves and abstract themselves, it is always the world of their time that gives them the impetus.

§ 7.

Origin and development of the peaceful principle.

I am wrong. There are always a few daring minds who completely detach themselves from their century. Thanks to these men of paradox, there has perhaps never been, perhaps never will be, a principle which, before being born as a fact, has not arisen in human intelligence. But when a social principle has not at least begun to take root as a fact, when its time is still distant, when it is in contradiction with the reigning fact, that is to say with the social organization of the time, it is not usually the scholars, the enlightened observers, the men of fact, who discover it and adopt it: these want to take things where they are, want to continue the chain; so that principles that are too advanced fall into the domain of adventurous, romantic, or infinitely inventive minds; and they only succeed in asserting them on the condition of being artists. This explains how minds much less vigorous than Bacon, much less learned than Bodin, had, on the question that concerns us, ideas much higher than theirs.

§ 8.

Thomas More, Fénelon, the abbot of Saint-Pierre.

Above all, three men succeeded one another, a century apart, whose glory is to have embraced with ardor and faith the principle of peace, to have preached it as the law of

societies, considering war only as an infraction of the order: Thomas More, Fénelon and the abbot of Saint-Pierre.

As different as they are in form and exterior, these three men resemble each other: they are, so to speak, of the same family: spirits who do not hold to the earth, who seem not to know the world of their time, whatever role they may have played there; who, so to speak, love Humanity madly, and are constantly nourished by the dream of its absolute perfection. For the force of thought, and considering the time in which he lived, the first is perhaps the most remarkable; but while he failed in cold and boring fiction, the second produced a beautiful poem. Both had felt the need to take refuge in the region of art; but the last, who had more audacity and good nature than talent, did not take the same precaution. As they all three had funds of a similar nature, it seems that the same law governed their destiny. The same originality of thought, the same liveliness of heart which first made them succeed in the world, then and promptly made them fall into disgrace. One, who became Chancellor of England, died a martyr, not of Catholicism, but of religious freedom, which his century did not understand. The second, called to form a king, quickly lost his credit, was treated by the master and by the courtiers as a strange and dangerous mind, did not see his glory, and only became popular at his death thanks to his artistic forms and the very veil with which he had enveloped his thoughts. The third did not climb so high; but, having entered the Academy, he was excluded, and, burdened with the anathemas of power, he still had the misfortune of passing for a madman in the eyes of the wise men of his time. The kings, if they were aware of his famous Project of perpetual peace, would only laugh about it, which, moreover, was the greatest happiness that could happen to people whose chains had been riveted for a long time; and when Jean-Jacques later recreated this strange theory, it appeared, having become clearer under his pen, even more romantic. Who would have said that, less than a century later, a czar of Russia in turn becoming its publisher, it would be sworn by all the kings of Europe under the name of the Holy Alliance, but then would the kings not be powerful enough to maintain it for their benefit, and the people not quite strong enough to seize it? These nevertheless were the fathers of the doctrine that triumphed. By a just or rather an unjust return, posterity, in adopting them, initially treated more than severely those who had had another doctrine. Today, calm and better educated, we no longer denigrate Hobbes and Machiavelli; but our admiration does not regulate our sympathy, and the heart will always prefer the author of *Utopia* to the author of *Leviathan*, Fénelon to Machiavelli.

Why does Fénelon appear to us with a physiognomy that is both so gentle and so striking among the great men of his time? It is because in fact he had a unique originality; it is because his political doctrine was not that of his time; it is because he contrasted with all those eloquent or eloquent prelates, but rather biblical than evangelical, who, in the funeral oration, prided themselves on skillfully exposing a plan of campaign and boldly became painters of battles, who had always delicate praises for the conquerors, invocations for war and *Te Deums* for victory. It has been noted that of so many thousands of sermons

that the Seventeenth Century and the beginning of the Eighteenth Century produced, there are barely two or three in which war is condemned and condemned: "O Bourdaloue!" exclaims Voltaire, "you have done a very bad job on impurity, but none on these murders, varied in so many ways, on these plunders, on these brigandages, on this universal rage which desolates the world." Moreover, should we make it a crime for Christian speakers? Mistakes take so long to die! And the proof is that this disastrous doctrine of war deposited its venom even in *the Spirit of the Laws*. Montesquieu, so human, had the wisdom to replace the right of aggression with *the right of natural defense*; but he had the weakness to admit that the latter sometimes led to the necessity of attacking without having been provoked. It must be said to the honor of the end of the Eighteenth Century that of all Montesquieu's errors, this was the most fought for; it was especially so by Voltaire, who, in the absence of any other cult, had to the highest degree the religion of Humanity and universal tolerance.

§ 9.

Conclusion.

That was the end of this Sixteenth Century doctrine. Two great literary ages had enlightened men and polished their morals. Eloquence and poetry had analyzed and brought out all the feelings of the human heart. We no longer saw only the bad side of our nature. The *just*, the *right* were manifested; and although the doctrine of *the useful* had passed from political science into metaphysics, although psychology persisted in explaining man through sensation and in organizing society on the basis of interest, of course, those who continued Hobbes in this way, without really noticing it, escaped their theory by a happy inconsistency; and the others, that is to say the strongest geniuses, were not imprisoned in this system, and obeyed their century. Political economy was born, and audaciously announced a new order of societies; its work made even more contemptible the cowardly and clever policy that placed the prosperity of a nation in the impoverishment of its neighbors. As the French language began to be universally spread, a true union had taken place among enlightened men of all nations. Then Turgot rose to the doctrine of an indefinite perfectibility; and Condorcet ended the century by depositing this doctrine in an imperfect but sublime book, where truths and errors are abundantly spread, where history is at every moment unknown, and which is nevertheless the first faithful history of Humanity. The events that followed seemed to give a painful denial to science, and yet they confirmed it. What did they prove in fact, if not the force of ideas? The Empire itself, after all, was only the victorious equal of the coalition formed against it, and wandering in triumph throughout the whole of Europe. But the spirit of war and conquest, in the Nineteenth Century, in opposition to morals and the distribution of wealth, below the lights, outside all doctrines, could only be an accident; and when the storm had passed, the peaceful principle reappeared with the authority of a new example. Publicists hastened

to reconnect the broken chain; The Nineteenth Century opened with the writings of Madame de Staël, with the book by Mr. Benjamin Constant on the spirit of conquest, and with some fine works by Saint-Simon on the philosophy of history.

Let us admire how this life of Humanity develops which, in its irresistible course, leads and modifies theories of intelligence as well as institutions, opens new points of view and often reveals madness where we only saw of wisdom. Certainly, this nobility and this monarchy, whose work was to gradually create empires, did not even have a presentiment of the social order that their work was to bring about. It was for themselves that they underwent so much fatigue and peril. But as their conquests extended, their strength grew exhausted; all these peoples that they had violently united were to end up, under their tutelage and under that of an equally conquering, equally brutal clergy, by truly merging into nations; the same habits, the same religion, the same language would reign over large territories: how rapid civilization would then become! A truth discovered would be instantly discovered for millions of men; a noble sentiment would make millions of hearts beat at once! Equality had to come from this; the soul of the popular masses had to become the soul of the nations. Well! It is no less certain that the new principles whose reign has begun within will one day emerge outside, and will regulate the relationships between societies. But, once again, it takes time for people to see and adopt the consequences of their most cherished opinions. Have we not seen our Revolution, after having inscribed on its first flag the abolition of conquest, forget itself in the wake of a conqueror and, by a strange contradiction, modern freedom take as a sign this Rome tainted by aristocracy, patronage and servitude? Conquest is centralization. Why would we want France to govern its neighbors, when we loudly demand that Paris not govern our provinces? If freedom of commerce is to be established throughout Europe, the large nations will have, in respect of wealth, no advantage over the small ones. Political economy is preparing a universal monarchy more durable than those that Charles V and Napoleon needlessly wanted to found on violence. Decentralizing empires, establishing in each province, in each city its own activity, and at the same time breaking down the barriers that separate nations, this is what freedom, science and industry aim for: so that, if their triumph was complete, we could say of the great society of men what Pascal said of the universe: *Center everywhere, circumference nowhere.*

PIERRE LEROUX