

4-2006

Introduction to Socialism's Muse

Naomi J. Andrews

Santa Clara University, nandrews@scu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarcommons.scu.edu/history>

 Part of the [Feminist, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Commons](#), [History Commons](#), and the [Political Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Andrews, N. (2006). Introduction. In *Socialism's Muse* (pp. xiii–xxx). Lexington Books.

Copyright © 2006 Lexington Books. Reproduced by permission of Rowman & Littlefield. All rights reserved. Please contact the publisher for permission to copy, distribute or reprint.

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts & Sciences at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in History by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact rscroggin@scu.edu.

Introduction

Our political goal is the same as theirs [men's]. But our point of view is different, we should each have our distinctive characteristic. Under the broad flag of socialism, the politics of women can march at the front with the politics of men.

La politique des femmes, 24 June 1848¹

The Parisian spring of 1848 must have been an incredibly heady time for men and women of the left in France. In the process of overthrowing the opportunistic constitutional monarchy of Louis Philippe and his capitalist ministers, socialists and republicans, in a sometimes surprising coalition, were able to take power and begin to shape a new version of republican government. Unlike the first republic, however, this would be a social republic, one as much characterized by its socialist values as it was by its republican and democratic ones.² That was the theory, at least. In the events as they came to pass, of course, republicanism and socialism were both losers in this equation, pushed aside by the unexpected consequences of the democracy they had helped to institute. Nevertheless, for a brief window in time the possibility for dramatic change, for the realization of the *république démocratique et sociale* must have seemed unprecedentedly tangible.³ During the limited tenure of the provisional government, February through April 1848, a series of radical measures were passed, including the abolition of slavery, the declaration of the right to work, the limitation of the work day to ten hours, and, perhaps most importantly, the declaration of universal manhood suffrage. The latter two measures, in particular, reflected the marriage of republican and socialist agendas, as well as the pivotal role played by politicized workers in the making of the revolution. This moment of promise, however, proved to be an illusory opportunity undone by the politics of democracy.⁴

Socialists and republicans were not the only losers in the political settlement that characterized the short life of the Second Republic. Absent from the roster of victories even in the early days is any mention of equality or civic rights for women. From the vantage point of more than a century and a half of French history this may not seem surprising; women, after all, only got the vote in 1944 in the nation that first enacted universal manhood suffrage. To the women feminists of the revolutionary spring, however, surprising it indeed was.⁵

Women feminists expected to have a role in the making of the social republic, a role that would reflect their importance to the family and to society at large. For the preceding two decades they had been told, in innumerable ways, of their centrality to the remaking of society along more pacific and egalitarian lines; given the central place that the romantic socialist movement had designated for *la femme* in its brave new world, surely women would have a role in the new political order of 1848. This was, after all, a provisional government with a socialist contingent, longtime allies and friends of the women feminists.⁶

The following year, in 1849, when socialism itself was in retreat before the establishment National Assembly elected by universal manhood suffrage, Jeanne Deroin, herself a former Saint Simonian and contributor to *La tribune des femmes* established in 1832, still had faith in the socialists. She made clear in her letter to the electoral committee of the *Club des Démocrates-Socialistes* the extent to which feminists saw socialists as their allies in the political battles of the day:

Citizens, you are democrat-socialists, you want the abolition of the exploitation of man by man and of woman by man; you want the complete and radical abolition of all the privileges of sex, of race, of birth, of caste and of wealth; you sincerely desire all the consequences of our great principles: liberty, equality, fraternity. It is in the name of these principles which brook no unjust exclusion that I present myself as a candidate for the legislative assembly, and that I come to ask you for your support.⁷

In the event, although they supported the principle of sexual equality, the socialist club did not support Deroin's bid for the legislative assembly, considering it a waste of their votes.⁸ Despite their support for the theoretical equality of the sexes, women's rights were far from the center of the leftist agenda by 1848. The social republic that was emerging during that spring was one that defined the "social" more narrowly than the feminists might have expected.⁹ Whereas in the early 1830s the very notion of the social had had a distinctly gendered connotation, including as it did women *and* workers, by 1848 the once joint agenda had been fragmented into an autonomous women's movement and an increasingly organized working-class movement, championed by the socialists who had encouraged its formation.¹⁰ Although a certain alle-

giance to the ideal of sexual equality lingered in the socialist agenda until 1848, in the light of political possibility it came to seem largely theoretical.

The disappointment of feminist aspirations in 1848 nevertheless demands more thoroughgoing explanation than its impracticality in politically charged times. We must not lose track of the fact that during the July Monarchy a truly remarkable intellectual revolution took place. For the shy twenty years of Louis Philippe's reign the formerly unthinkable became relatively commonplace: women's equality came to be a central tenet of the most *avant-garde* intellectual and political movement of the day, romantic socialism. Given its integral importance to the earliest pronouncements of socialist philosophy, the totality of feminism's neglect during the moment of political opportunity afforded to socialism by the events of 1848 is, indeed, surprising. In fact, there are two phenomena that require explication: Before it could be neglected in 1848, feminism had to be seen as a possibility in the first place. Addressing these issues begins with questions: what made feminism thinkable in the early days of the 1830s, and what forces then rendered it untenable in 1848?¹¹

This book begins addressing these questions by looking not at the feminism of the socialist movement, but at the terms in which romantic socialist doctrine itself was defined. It is my argument that both the possibility and the disavowal of women's social and political equality were rooted in the gendered understanding of the individual and of society through which socialism launched its critique. Beginning from this perspective, I argue that the feminism that emerged within the socialist world view was made plausible not by any especial adherence to women's equality, but rather by the deployment of an idealized notion of womanhood itself, one that was intimately connected to the vision of the good society socialists espoused.¹² Socialists rejected a world in which the struggle for existence was engaged by atomized, isolated creatures, "rapacious wolves" in Pierre Leroux's language, and embraced a more harmonious vision of human reality, one rooted in cooperation and in a common sense of purpose and identity.¹³ Woman in early socialism came to stand as the antithesis of all that socialists despised in their contemporary world, and as the symbol of that to which they aspired. By definition an outsider to the corrupt realm of the public sphere, woman came to symbolize an alternative to that competitive terrain. Socialists exalted this alternative in quasi-religious terms, and in the process came to espouse something that looked very like feminism to both contemporary and retrospective eyes. But of course all of this was taking place during the July Monarchy, a period during which socialists increasingly saw the political realm as sterile and inaccessible. Woman's place in a republican political order was not particularly relevant to the socialist critics of the prevailing bourgeois one. It was only when socialists and republicans redefined the political realm on their own terms, in the spring of 1848, that

women's political rights really came to be a possibility and thus a point of contention.

Given the important place *la femme* had in their social utopia, it is ironic that it was this very association of woman with the heaven on earth to come under socialism that doomed her chances for full inclusion in the social republic of 1848 and afterward. In addition to the political impossibility of feminism in the contested political atmosphere of 1848—republican hostility to women's rights had by no means disappeared, even had the socialists been more supportive—there was a philosophical impossibility that underlay the political one. The individual granted universal suffrage in March of 1848 was, after all, a masculine individual. Moreover, although this suffrage was clearly a victory for the democratic agenda of the socialist movement, it marked a clear break with the previously central feminist agenda. Woman, icon of the socialized world of the anti-individual, was inherently incapable of approximating the independent individuality of the newly enfranchised citizen. In the process of exalting all they considered her to stand for, socialists also effectively ruled woman out of the public sphere they gained for themselves and other men in the spring of 1848.¹⁴

The “feminism in French socialism” has long been chronicled by historians of both movements. Early historians of feminism told the stories of the two movements as integrally related—in part to impart relevance to the very history they were writing—however, as the history of women and of feminism has come into its own, their histories have increasingly been told separately, as if they were two discrete movements.¹⁵ Historians of feminism and the women's movement acknowledge feminism's origins in the utopian socialist movement, but as their larger goal is generally a recuperative one, focused on chronicling the emergence of an autonomous women's movement, the intellectual context of feminism in socialism is not at the center of their projects. Having discussed those origins in largely biographical terms, these histories generally move on in pursuit of feminism's development apart from socialism.¹⁶ With the advent of the more theoretically oriented gender history, historians have begun to analyze the movement in more textual terms, but these effort have largely been limited to the Saint-Simonian movement.¹⁷

Feminism and socialism are even less adequately integrated in the histories of the latter movement. To the extent that historians of socialism do recognize the feminist content of the socialist movement, it is often attributed to the fringe mentality of socialist thinkers and not viewed as an integral aspect of the movement. This is part of a larger trend in the historiography of socialism which tends to see “utopian” or romantic socialism as a precursor to the right-thinking Marxism of the later nineteenth century. When the story is told from this perspective the more idiosyncratic, not to say romantic, aspects of that

earlier socialism are dismissed as eccentricities or irrelevancies. Feminism, not too surprisingly given the attitude of that Marxist academic establishment to women's issues, comes naturally to be included in the list of "absurdities."¹⁸

Those eccentricities have proved of more interest to literary and intellectual historians concerned with the romantic movement that formed the backdrop to early socialism. Areas of inquiry such as androgyny and the occult inescapably touch on the feminist agenda of the movement and thus are more fully considered in literary scholarship than elsewhere. Nevertheless, feminism is generally seen, even in these works, as a sideline to the primary interest, which is usually in the larger romantic literary movement.¹⁹

This book begins from the assumption that the two movements cannot be so easily untangled. Though given voice by isolated individuals during the French Revolution of 1789, feminism saw its first organized theorization emerge from the very cradle of romantic socialism, the Saint-Simonian movement, and even the most cursory reading of early Saint-Simonian and Fourierist writings yields a wealth of feminist pronouncements. From its inception romantic socialism drew an enduring analogy between the state of society and that of women: The amelioration of the state of the former was understood to depend on that of the latter.²⁰ Seen from this perspective, separating the feminist from the socialist is not only difficult, but nonsensical. Instead of trying to tease out distinct discourses from the philosophical writings of early socialists, this book focuses on the way in which gender shaped socialism's definition of the good society and the way that influence conditioned the feminism that emerged from its midst.

Gender is now understood by historians of liberalism to play a vital role in the definition of the public sphere, the individual and the very notion of citizenship itself.²¹ Determining both the terms of inclusion and exclusion, gendered categories have defined the nature of the individual upon which liberalism rests: it is proclaimed universal yet always dependent on the exclusion of "the sex" for its definition.²² My analysis of romantic socialism draws directly on this feminist literature, arguing that the terms in which socialism defined its opposition to individualism were critically shaped by gender categories. Socialism was expressed in feminized terms to counter the implicit yet pervasive masculine individual; the language of the feminine was the most powerful available to reject the *égoïsme* socialists saw and deplored in their world. In taking up the language of the feminine, romantic socialists drew on very old literary and religious themes to exalt *la femme*, and in equating her with canonical representations of the Virgin Mary, they glorified a femininity that stood outside of the corrupt public realm they sought to redefine.

It was this very adoption of the language of the feminine by romantic socialists that opened the conceptual door to their brand of feminism.²³ Feminism's renewal in the early nineteenth century had a different quality than that

of the Revolutionary period, in part because of the significant number of male thinkers who championed the cause of *la femme*. In the process of using metaphors of femininity to stand for their ideal social world, these thinkers came to identify with women, the symbol of the disenfranchisement they themselves experienced in the wake of the failed revolution of 1830.²⁴ The cause of women became closely allied in their writings with the cause of the new world they envisioned. It was out of this milieu that a truly activist feminism emerged in the early 1830s to contest the status of women under the Napoleonic civil code, and to argue for her equal humanity, rights, and needs in French society.²⁵ Socialism, however, had not necessarily had in mind the enfranchisement of *les femmes* when it glorified *la femme*, a discrepancy that proved to be fundamental to the divergence of socialism and feminism by the time the revolution of 1848 broke out.

By way of exploring the role that gender played in the shaping of socialism and feminism, this book examines the writings of a diverse group of romantic socialists, all of whom were active in the socialist milieu of the 1830s and 1840s and who, despite representing the range of socialist tendencies, also share the retrospective moniker of feminist.²⁶ Whether idiosyncratic prophets of the new world, or more traditional reformer-revolutionaries, the thinkers assembled here all put forth their vision for the religious and cultural renewal of France. Beyond their retroactive (or contemporaneous) identification as feminists, they share commonalities on the rhetorical level: they all drew on themes redolent of femininity, themes that traced an acute awareness of gendered categories into their visions of the good society. In some of their writings this took the form of overt feminism, in others, of imaginative schemes for the re-making of humanity on seemingly utopian grounds. Regardless of the context in which they expressed their views, however, categories we recognize as gendered lay at the heart of their reconfiguration of the human landscape, as much as they reflected their feminist views.

The world of romantic socialist thinkers was a truly eclectic one, benefiting from the liberalization of bourgeois society and cultural institutions at work during the July Monarchy.²⁷ In developing and elaborating an entirely new slant on human social organization, the men and women of the various *écoles* of socialism, not to mention those independent “prophets” of the new world, formed a social and intellectual network that encompassed both the flower of the French university system and the dregs of bourgeois society.²⁸ Ranging from journalists to priests *manqués* to artist and poets, the cohort was bohemian in both intellectual and social terms, departing from the conventions of polite society in their attempt to redefine the social contract upon which French society was based.²⁹ The group of writers discussed here ranges across this spectrum.³⁰ The most prominent among them is the relatively well-known

Pierre Leroux. Highly influential in his day among his fellow socialists, Leroux was a member of the National Assembly elected in 1848 and among the exiles banished by Louis Napoleon after the coup d'état of 2 December 1851. Throughout his long career as a journalist and politician Leroux maintained his commitment to the workingman and his plight in society, while striving always to articulate a new vision of a more unified, interconnected, and harmonious humanity. Leroux was an ardent promoter of the idea of a return to religiosity without the necessity of an institutional return Catholicism, and his *doctrine de l'humanité* was one of many attempts to reground religious faith on more material, earthly terms. He sought always a means of reconciling the Christian values he held to be fundamental to any right society with the realistic recognition of the need to ameliorate the condition of humanity as a practical goal. Leroux is one of the major *foci* of this book in large part because he was such a pillar of the socialist community as it developed during the July Monarchy.³¹

A less well-known but still relatively well-documented member of this community was the Abbé Alphonse-Louis Constant, who, along with his friend and fellow socialist Alphonse Esquiros, represent another path within the socialists ranks, the Christian republican socialists. So many labels may seem to overburden these two relatively obscure writers, but in their numerous works they brought to prominence—indeed notoriety given their wrangles with state—the deification of *le peuple* and the appropriation of the Christian catechism for socialist purposes, uniting the republican veneration for the first republic with socialist aims. In their similar works, *La Bible de la liberté* and *Evangile du peuple*, Constant and Esquiros (respectively) turned the deep cultural familiarity of Christian teachings to the ends of their radical politics. Revealing the “Word-Christ” as the engine of history’s forward motion, they elaborated in detail the connections between the revolutionary decades from 1789 onward and the revelation of God’s will on earth. Constant, moreover, brought together the traditional Catholic worship of the Virgin Mary with these politics, turning his millenarian vision into an apocalyptic feminism. Both were active in the political milieu of the July Monarchy, especially in 1848. In Constant’s writings we can see extraordinary illustrations of the feminist bent in romantic socialism; Esquiros’ career and marriage provide us with an ideal biographical backdrop to the larger issues of feminism and socialism discussed here.³²

This brings us to the much less well-known socialists Simon Ganneau (*Le Mapah*), Louis-Jean Baptiste de Turreil, and the Abbé Chatel.³³ All have been considered part of what we might characterize as the lunatic fringe of socialism. Ganneau and Turreil shared an intense fascination with the idea of androgyny and its unifying potential in the struggle to remake humanity. They manifested this fascination rather differently, although both were seen by their

contemporaries as ideal types of the messiah of socialism. Ganneau actually proclaimed himself the divine androgyne, thereby overcoming one of the central dividing lines in a hopelessly fragmented humanity, that of gender. For Turreil androgyne provided an ideal of social unity that, though unfulfilled in the here and now, promised to overcome the deep-seated divisions that he deplored in contemporary society. He thus described an elaborate utopia, Fourierist in many ways, that was predicated on the ultimate union of all of humanity into one undifferentiated, androgynous entity. For both Turreil and Ganneau God was an androgynous divinity, thus incorporating the best elements of men and women.³⁴ The Abbé Chatel is likewise relatively little known, though scholarship of late has begun to focus on his urban ministry, the *Nouvelle église catholique* established in 1835.³⁵ Chatel was a known follower of Leroux and a fellow traveler with Constant in his dissidence from the establishment Catholic Church of his day. His vision of a reinvigorated Christianity included a redefined contract between men and woman, one that would take seriously woman's moral superiority and sanctification.

In discussing this seemingly disparate group together I hope to emphasize both the arbitrariness of previous historiographical distinctions that have considered the offbeat ideas of many of these writers as consonant with the "absurdities" discussed above. Beyond that goal, however, I bring them together because of the commonality of their feminism, despite differences in their philosophies and careers.

This book is divided into three sections. Section one, entitled "Turning Points" explores the political and intellectual context in which socialism emerged as an identifiable affiliation. Chapter one, "Disillusionment and its Consequences: The Revolution of 1830 and the Emergence of Romantic Socialism," focuses specifically on the revolution of 1830 and the disappointment felt by men of the left at the betrayal of their aspirations by the ascendant bourgeois establishment that took power with Louis Philippe. In so doing it explores the way in which the failure of the revolution to meet their democratic and nascent socialist demands, coupled with the emerging organized power of the working classes, and against the backdrop of the rapid urbanization of France, helped to turn socialists away from realms of political action and toward a new terrain, one they called "the social." In turning away from political action they focused their attention at both a smaller scale, the individual utopian community, and at a larger scale, the renewal of all of humanity. This new agenda is the topic of chapter two, "New Territory: Socialism and Feminism in the 1830s," in which I lay out the landscape of early socialism, focusing in particular on the Saint-Simonians and their pivotal role in the formation of a whole cohort of socialists, many of whom remained adherents of woman's cause even while disclaiming the new moral order promoted by En-

fantin. This chapter also chronicles the emergence of the first independent feminist movement. The independence and autonomy of this movement was the first indication of the ultimate divergence of socialism and feminism that came to maturity in 1848.

Part II, entitled “Embodied Utopias” turns to textual examination of the writings of feminist socialists to show the important role gender had in the articulation of their socialist vision. In Chapter three, “*La femme Imaginé: Romantic Socialists Envision Woman*,” we see the definition and limitations of the idealized womanhood so central to their doctrine, whether seen as feminist or socialist, or both. In exalting the feminine these authors drew on age-old associations with the Virgin Mary and with Eve, while also attempting to re-define the hierarchy of moral value inherent in male/female sex roles in the nineteenth century. As a result of this agenda they both purified womanhood, absolving her of the stain of original sin, and simultaneously restricted the range of female archetypal roles to that of the saintly Virgin Mary. Chapter four, “*La Mère Humanité: Gender and the Human Community in the Works of Pierre Leroux and the Abbé Constant*,” shows the extent to which images of the female body were used to symbolize the ideal community in socialist thought. Focusing on the writings of Leroux and Constant in particular, the chapter traces the use of metaphors of the female body as they were used to conjure a unified, singular humanity. Chapter five, “Utopian Androgyny: Romantic Socialists Confront Individualism,” follows socialists contesting the unified, masculine individual inherent in the world they abhorred, employing the ideal of androgynous unity and the complementarity of the sexes as a way to counter-balance that hegemonic individual. Using androgyny as an exaggerated incarnation of the equal, companionate marriage, one based on the complementarity of the sexes, these writers evoked a vision of a unified society, one that could overcome the inherent divisions of the modern day world in which they lived.

Part III, entitled “Rhetoric and Reality,” attempts to bring together the rhetorical speculation of socialists with a more biographical look at the relations between the sexes in their world. Thus, chapter six, “Can a Dream Vote?: The Ambivalent Feminism of Romantic Socialists,” discusses socialists’ views on woman’s nature, her humanity, and her inclusion in the public realm. This chapter, which focuses in particular on the views of Leroux, Turreil, and the Abbé Chatel, explores the philosophical underpinnings of the feminism of romantic socialism, ultimately arguing that it was a contradictory, and in significant ways, limiting, feminism. Chapter seven, “The Feminist and the Socialist: Adèle and Alphonse Esquiros,” examines the marriage and intellectual partnership of two participants in the world of socialist feminism. Adèle and Alphonse were both active in the political hotbed of 1848, participating in the *club des femmes* with Alphonse-Louis Constant and his wife Noëmi, and wrote

for some of the ephemeral papers produced during that exciting time. Their marriage, ultimately, did not fare better than the Second Republic itself. This chapter attempts to situate the failure of that marriage in the context of the idealized womanhood so prevalent within socialism. The picture that emerges further complicates the picture we have of the feminism of romantic socialism.

Romantic socialism was both a deeply engaged politics and a mystically revered and reverent doctrine, but one always informed by the social and intellectual realities of the time which produced it. The socialist movement can ultimately only be understood as a marriage of a material and a spiritual agenda. Indeed, as argued throughout *Socialism's Muse*, the socialist critique operated on several registers at once. It was a thoroughgoing critique of competitive, modernizing French society, not simply of the dominant political structure. Socialists' feminism derived from their deeply felt sense of the connection among social, economic, and political rights. Inherent in their original agenda was the sense that the disenfranchised, workers *and* women, must have both an economic foothold and political representation in order to reap the benefits of their society. As the realms of the social and the political became increasingly discrete, and, moreover, gendered territories, woman's social need was continually recognized while her political disenfranchisement normalized. Reified through her constant identification with the heavenly realm socialists hoped to create on earth, *la femme* came to define both the reach and the limitations of the socialist vision.

NOTES

1. *La politique des femmes*, no. 1, 18–24 Juin, 1848, 1.

2. For an overview of 1848, see Maurice Agulhon, *The Republican Experiment, 1848–1852*, Translated by Janet Lloyd, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); Edith Thomas, *Les Femmes de 1848*, (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1948) is a useful overview of women's participation in the revolution. See below for further references on women's roles in the revolution. Also relevant to the alliance of republicans and socialists in the early days of the revolution is Jo B. Margadant, "Gender, Vice and the Political Imaginary in Postrevolutionary France," *American Historical Review*, 104, 5, 1461–1496, in which the gendered component of press depictions of the monarchy is explored. Among many other trenchant points is Margadant's depiction of the realm of the republican press as a masculine battlefield, one that had no room for women in the unfolding drama. In analyzing the seemingly inaccurate presentations of the dead of the Parisian public offered by the republican press, she notes that ". . . in the political imaginary of the populace of Paris, a woman's corpse still signified in February 1848 a war on the entire community, which in their own code of gendered honor in the public sphere justified, even required, retribution," 1494. Socialist adop-

tion of feminine imagery reflected their affinity for the cause of the working classes, and presumably, following Margadant, served to cement differences between the republican and socialist ranks in 1848.

3. Agulhon dates this window quite precisely to the period between February 24 and May 4, 1848. May 4 was the date on which the Constituent Assembly was elected and upon which the provisional government relinquished power. Agulhon, *The Republican Experiment*, 23.

4. The consequences include the street fighting that accompanied the closure of the National Workshops and the subsequent election of Napoleon's nephew, Louis-Napoleon Bonaparte to the presidency of the republic in December 1848, both arguably the result of the election of a National Assembly distinctly hostile to the social republic. Agulhon, *The Republican Experiment*, 22–49.

5. Note for example the delegation of women that went to the Hotel de Ville to demand votes for women on March 22, just after the institution of the universal male vote. In the immediate event Marrast put the question off for decision by the National Assembly. See Claire Goldberg Moses, *French Feminism in the Nineteenth Century*, (Albany: State University of New York, 1984), 140. See also the anonymous pamphlet dated nonspecifically 1848, *Liberté, égalité, fraternité*, which argues, among other points, the following: "If the constitution claims to embrace and defend all interest, it must call woman to the electorate and to candidature, because it has been amply demonstrated that the simple nature of man cannot comprehend all the needs of another nature, regardless of his solicitude as father, brother, son or husband." 2.

6. While it is true that the provisional government only included two socialists, Louis Blanc and the worker Albert, this fact disguises the important role of the socialist contingent, especially among the working classes, in making the revolution. A better indication of their importance can be seen in the choices made in by-elections in June after the ends of the spectrum became more radicalized. At that time Pierre Leroux and Pierre-Joseph Proudhon were both elected to the National Assembly. Agulhon, *The Republican Experiment*, 55.

7. Cited in A. Ranvier, "Une féministe de 1848: Jeanne Deroin," *La Revolution de 1848: bulletin de la société de la révolution de 1848*, 1907–1908, 317–355, 335–336.

8. Moses, *French Feminism*, 146.

9. On the emergence of the category of the social in nineteenth-century French thought see Jacques Donzelot's many works, especially *L'Invention du social*, (Paris: Fayard, 1984); for its gendered component, see Denise Riley, *Am I that Name? Feminism and the Category of 'Woman,'* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1990), chapter three.

10. Philippe Buchez is a great example of this tendency. See Bernard Moss, *The Origins of the French Labor Movement, 1830–1914*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976). Although speculative, it seems to me that gender played a role in the eventual transfer of socialist attention to the cause of the (male) worker. By 1848 the working-class man was increasingly politicized, educated, and self-possessed; he was considered property owning by the social republic, in that his labor was deemed a form of property, and he was an active citizen after March 2. In addition the discourse on women was increasingly ruling them out of the category of ouvrier. The male worker thus

came to approximate the masculine individual that underpinned the liberal social order, a more comfortable fit than woman could manage even to those who thought they opposed the dominant order. Women's incommensurability with the model of the citizen continued to impose a barrier to her full enfranchisement. See on the ideal of the bourgeois man, Dorinda Outram, *The Body and the French Revolution*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989). Outram connects the exclusion of the working classes and women from the political order in the first French Republic to the rise of fascism later on; however, she does not specifically address the enfranchisement of the workers in 1848. Relevant here also is Joan Wallach Scott, "'L'ouvrière! Mot impie, sordide . . .': Women Workers in the Discourse of French Political Economy, 1840–1860," in Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 139–166, and Laura Frader, "Engendering Work and Wages: The French Labor Movement and the Family Wage," in Laura L. Frader and Sonya O. Rose, eds., *Gender and Class in Modern Europe*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996), 142–165.

11. In *The Cultural Origins of the French Revolution*, Roger Chartier explores the question of the "conceivability" of political revolt. His approach points in particular to the way in which a new mode of understanding can radically change what is thinkable in a society. Feminism was not an entirely new concept during the early part of the nineteenth century, but it became far more widespread among intellectuals during this time, and was a particular hallmark of the romantic socialist movement. This commonality points toward something in the world view of these socialists that made feminism possible, not to say logical. Roger Chartier, *The Cultural Origins of the French Revolution*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 1991.)

12. Women's politically strategic use during the July Revolution and Monarchy are by no means limited to the socialist camp. For an illuminating look at the role of gender in the political culture of the period see Jo Burr Margadant, "Gender, Vice, and the Political Imaginary in Postrevolutionary France," *American Historical Review*, 104, 5, December 1999, 1461–1497.

13. Pierre Leroux writing in 1832 or 1833, cited by Steven Lukes in *Individualism*, (New York: Blackwell, 1973), 10.

14. In her recent book *Le cens de la famille: Les femmes et le vote, 1789–1848*, (Paris: Editions BELIN, 2002), Anne Verjus argues that the notion of the abstract individual did not come into evidence and thus usage until after the revolution of 1848 whereby all adult men were granted suffrage. Drawing on her extensive review of the legislation on voting from the first Republic on down, she describes the degree to which voting rights were always vested in a the social entity of the family, represented politically by the male head of household, but not assuming his absolute individuality and independent political rights. Her evidence for this is persuasive, especially that which demonstrates the inclusion of women's assets in the *cens* according to which voting rights were granted. Following her argument, the notion of an abstract individual, unmoored from any familial representative burden was not enshrined legally until the universal manhood suffrage of 1848, in this she takes issue with Joan Scott, *Only Paradoxes to Offer* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996), and Pierre Rosanvallon, *Le Sacre du citoyen* (Paris: Gallimard, 1992), who argue the longstanding gendered nature of the political individual in French republican discourse. I would suggest that the legal context

of voting rights was just one of the ways in which the abstract individual was in evidence. As I argue here, socialists were responding to a larger cultural milieu by which the atomized individual was enshrined as the foundation of economic and social rights, not to mention incipient political ones. From another perspective, Whitney Walton demonstrates the ways in which feminism could be articulated without necessarily endorsing women's equal political rights. *Eve's Proud Descendants; Four Women Writers and Republican Politics in Nineteenth Century France*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000), 2. For an extensive and substantive critique of Verjus' perspective see Karen Offen's review, *H-France Review* Vol. 3 (September 2003), No. 104.

15. See Marguerite Thibert's *Le Féminisme dans le socialisme français de 1830–1852*, (Paris: Giard, 1926), although it clearly predates the advent of women's history as a theorized sub-discipline of history, the book nevertheless remains one of the most thorough and nuanced presentations on the subject. There are a number of other histories of this ilk, most especially the various works by Edith Thomas, *Pauline Roland, socialisme et féminisme au XIXe siècle*, (Paris: Marcel Rivière, 1956); *Les femmes de 1848*. More recently Susan Grogan's work takes a similarly integrated approach to their history, though still from the vantage point of feminism. Susan Grogan, *French Socialism and Sexual Difference*, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992). Noted above, Moses, *French Feminism in the Nineteenth Century* and Moses and Leslie W. Rabine, *Feminism, Socialism and French Romanticism*, (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1993); "Saint-Simonian Men/Saint-Simonian Women: The Transformation of Feminist Thought in 1830's France," *Journal of Modern History*, 54, no. 2, 1982, 240–67; "Equality' and 'Difference' in Historical Perspective: A Comparative Examination of the Feminisms of French Revolutionaries and Utopian Socialists," in *Rebel Daughters*, Melzer and Rabine, eds., (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992). Grogan most directly addresses the interconnections between socialism and feminism. In her survey of the works of Charles Fourier, the Saint Simonian movement and Flora Tristan, she explores the ways in which these socialists defined the role of women and critiqued contemporary relations between the sexes. Grogan makes two central points. First, these questions of gender relations and roles were central to the formation of a new society; rather than being accidental byproducts as we see in Marxist socialism, they were seen as among the primary means of changing the current social order. Fixing the inequalities between the sexes was key to getting from civilization to harmony. Second, while these questions were central to the new order, they did not necessarily entail a profound change in the social structure. *Enfantin* may have posited a female messiah, but he did not change his day-to-day behavior vis-à-vis women, as Claire Goldberg Moses points out in "Saint-Simonian Men/Saint-Simonian Women . . ."

16. Another reason for this might be the proclivity of women's historians toward chronicling feminism as a political movement rather than an intellectual or philosophical intervention in politics. The two approaches are not incompatible, but the intellectual history approach to feminism is less frequent, especially in the first few generations of women's history writing. This is even more the case in the context of American feminist historiography than in the French context. See Tiffany Wayne, *Woman Thinking: Feminism and Transcendentalism in Nineteenth-Century America*, (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2005), introduction, for a discussion of this issue in the American context.

17. The bulk of the literature on romantic socialist feminism is focused on the Saint-Simonian movement, a result of the plethora of primary documentation available on the movement. On Saint-Simonian women and their feminist activities, see Michèle Riot-Sarcey, *La Démocratie à l'épreuve des femmes*, (Paris: Albin Michel, 1994), as well as the following: Laure Adler, *À l'Aube du Féminisme: Les Premières Journalistes, 1830–1850*, (Paris: Payot, 1973); Laure Adler, "Flora, Pauline et les autres" in Jean-Paul Aron, ed. *Miserable et glorieuse, la femme du XIXe*, (Paris: Fayard, 1980); Elizabeth C. Altman, "The Philosophical Bases of Feminism: The Feminist Doctrines of the Saint-Simoniens and Charles Fourier," *Philosophical Forum*, 7–8, 277–291; Angélique Arnaud and Caroline Simon, *Une Correspondance Saint-Simonienne 1833–1838. Textes recueillis et présentés par Bernadette Louis*, (Paris: cotes-femmes editions, 1990); Maria Teresa Bulciolu, *L'École Saint-Simonienne et la femme. Notes et documents pour une histoire du rôle de la femme dans la société saint-Simonienne, 1828–1833*, (Pisa: Goliardica, 1980); Marie Cerati, "Elisa Lemonnier," in *Femmes Extraordinaires*, (Paris: Editions de la Courtille, 1975), 34–85; Louis Devance, "Femme, famille, travail et morale sexuelle dans l'idéologies de 1848," *Romantisme*, 1976, 13–14, 79–103; Lydia Elhadad, "Femmes prénommées: les prolétaires saint-simoniennes redactrices de *La femme libre*, 1832–1834," *Les Révoltes Logiques*, 4–5, 1977, 62–88, 29–60; Lydia Elhadad and Geneviève Fraisse, "L'Affranchissement de notre sexe: une lecture du dedans ou du dehors," *Les Révoltes Logiques*, 2, 1976, 105–120; Leslie F. Goldstein, "Early Feminist Themes in French Utopian Socialism: The Saint-Simoniens and Fourier," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, no. XLIII, 1982, 91–108; Marguerite Grepou, *Une croisade pour un meilleur amour. Histoire des Saint-Simoniennes, Récit*, (Paris et Bruxelles: editions Sodi, 1968); Joan S. Moon, "The Saint-Simoniennes and the Moral Revolution," *Proceedings of the Consortium on Revolutionary Europe*, 1976, 162–174; Moon, "The Saint Simonian association of working class women, 1830–1850," *Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Meeting of the Western Society for French History, Las Cruces*, 1977, 274–281. Recently, feminist literary scholars have turned their attentiveness to questions of language to the study of the Saint-Simonian movement. Kari Weil and Leslie Wahl Rabine have both used contemporary literary theory to explore notions of gender and sexual difference. Kari Weil, "The New Paris of the Saint-Simoniens" in *Feminism, Utopia and Narrative*, ed. Sarah Webster Goodwin and Libby Falk Jones, (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1990); "A Spectacle of Faith: Saint-Simonianism and Gender at the Dawn of the Industrial Revolution," and "From General Will to Masculine Desire: Sexual Politics in the Paris of the Saint-Simoniens," unpublished manuscripts; and Leslie Wahl Rabine, "Essentialism and its Contexts: Saint-Simonian and Post-Structuralist Feminists," *differences* 1, (Summer, 1989): 105–123; and Rabine's introduction to Moses and Rabine, *Feminism, Socialism and French Romanticism*, 85–144.

18. In an unpublished article, "Utopian Socialism Reconsidered: Science and Religion in the early Socialist Movement," Gareth Stedman-Jones proposes a new approach to the study of utopian, or romantic, socialism. He calls in this article for a more integrated approach, one that takes account of the historically specific and peculiar aspects of the movement, as well as its contribution to latter day socialism. For examples of the "party line" Marxist history in the west see G. D. H. Cole, of *Socialist Thought: The Fore-runners, 1789–1850* (London: Macmillan, 1967), 56. Cole refers to the religious activities of the Saint-Simonian movement as "absurdities," while George Lichtheim, *The*

Origins of Socialism (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969), 241, ff. 16, differentiates between the rationalist members of the group (among whom he includes Saint-Simon himself) and the mystics. Stedman-Jones notes, “[t]he resulting history was teleological because the usual method of dealing with the theories of the three founders [Fourier, Saint-Simon, Owen] was to extract a core of prophetic scientificity and hold this apart from its allegedly superficial encasement of fantasy and illusion; the encasement could be attributed to the psychological peculiarities of the founders themselves . . . the ‘scientific’ core itself, on the other hand, was divorced from its own conceptual context and read as a series of fragmentary utterances belonging to a future theory yet to be born.” (3). On this topic also see Jonathan Beecher, *Victor Considerant and the Rise and Fall of Romantic Socialism*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), introduction.

19. Intellectual and literary historians, in contrast to social historians, have paid better attention to the diversity of the movement, but still with scant regard for questions of sex and gender, in part because the vast bulk of this literature was written before the 1980s. An exception is Paul Bénichou’s exhaustive work on the period, *Le temps des prophètes*, (Paris: Gallimard, 1977), which does discuss at length the female messiahs and feminism of the movement. Nevertheless, while Bénichou’s wonderful work does include these subjects in its discussion, his approach does not analyze the central tenets of the movement with an eye toward gender. For literary studies of romantic socialism and of mystical romantic thought, see: Alexandrian, *Le Socialisme romantique*, (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1979); George Boas, *French Philosophies of the Romantic Period*, (New York: Russell & Russell, 1964); Frank Paul Bowman, “Religion, Politics and Utopia in French Romanticism,” *Australian Journal of French Studies*, 11, no. 3, 1974, 307–324; *Le Christ Romantique*, (Geneva: Droz, 1973); *French Romanticism: Intertextual and Interdisciplinary Readings*, (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990); Leon Cellier, *L’Épopée humanitaire et les grands mythes romantiques*, [2. ed.], (Paris: Société d’édition d’enseignement supérieur, 1971); D. G. Charlton, *Secular Religions in France, 1815–1870*, (London: Oxford University Press for the University of Hull, 1963); D. G. Charlton, ed., *The French Romantics*, 2 volumes, (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984); D. O. Evans, *Social Romanticism in France, 1830–1848*, (New York: Octagon Books, 1969); D. O. Evans, *Le Socialisme romantique: Pierre Leroux et ses contemporains*, (Paris: M. Rivière, 1948); Herbert James Hunt, *Le socialisme et le romantisme en France; étude de la presse socialiste de 1830 à 1848*, (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1935); Frank Manuel, *The Prophets of Paris*, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962); Roger Picard, *Le romantisme sociale*, (New York and Paris: Brentano’s Books, 1944); Auguste Viatte, *Les Sources occultes du romantisme*, (Paris: Champion, 1965); *Victor Hugo et les illuminés de son temps*, (Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1973). I would like to single out Bowman’s works in particular for his keen sensitivity to the beauty and reason that masquerades as lunacy in French romanticism. “Religion, politics and utopia,” in particular, wonderfully evokes the fine line between vision and madness in these writings. For sources on androgyny see Chapter 5.

20. Charles Fourier was the first to articulate this idea, but it quickly spread within the ranks of socialist philosophers. Altman, “The Philosophical Bases of Feminism.”

21. See, Wendy Brown, *Manhood and Politics*, (Totowa, New Jersey: Rowman & Littlefield, 1988); Carol Pateman, *The Sexual Contract*, (Stanford, California: Stanford

University Press, 1988); On the French case, see Geneviève Fraisse, *Reason's Muse*, trans. Jane Marie Todd, (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1994); Joan Landes, *Women and the Public Sphere in the Age of the French Revolution*, (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1988); Claudia Moscovici, *Gender and Citizenship*, (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000); Dorinda Outram, *The Body and the French Revolution*, (New Haven, Connecticut; Yale University Press, 1989); Joan W. Scott, *Only Paradoxes to Offer*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996).

22. Joan W. Scott argues that feminism has its origins in liberalism, and that it is a result of the claims to individual rights articulated by that creed. This origin is problematic, however, she argues, because while liberalism proclaims the rights of the abstract individual, that individual is anything but abstract. The individual is constructed in gendered terms and is dependent upon the presence of a female other against which its individuality is articulated. "... maleness was equated with individuality, and femaleness with otherness in a fixed, hierarchical, and immobile opposition (masculinity was not seen as femininity's other). The political individual was then taken to be both universal and male; the female was not an individual, both because she was nonidentical with the human prototype and because she was the other who confirmed the (male) individual's individuality." Scott, *Only Paradoxes to Offer*, 8.

23. Moses, "'Equality' and 'Difference' in Historical Perspective."

24. In the context of the day, of course, they were nearly as *politically* disenfranchised as were women. Laura Engelstein shows the way Russian liberals during the second half of the nineteenth century worked out their own powerlessness in the face of autocracy through identification with and championing of the serf, and later of the peasant, cause. Arguably an element of the French socialist advocacy of the cause of women and workers was informed by the same sort of power relations. *The Keys to Happiness*, (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1992), 239.

25. Women feminists made use of the same exalted language, but always toward the goal of claiming greater practical rights in society. Grogan, *French Socialism and Sexual Difference*, 55–68; Moses, *French Feminism*, 61–89; Scott, *Only Paradoxes to Offer*, 57–90.

26. There are, in addition to those discussed here, a number of other prominent socialists (all outside of the major Saint-Simonian and Fourierist *écoles*) who deserve inclusion in the larger category of feminist, Jean Reynaud, Pierre Leroux's friend and collaborator, Constantin Pecqueur, Flora Tristan among them. On Reynaud see David Albert Griffiths, *Jean Reynaud: Encyclopédiste de l'époque romantique d'après sa correspondance inédite*, (Paris, 1965). On Tristan, there are many hagiographical and literary biographies. Most relevant to this historian is Susan Grogan, *Flora Tristan: Life Stories*, (New York: Routledge, 1998). Pecqueur does not have a modern biographer, but older works exist, see in particular Gustave Marcy, *Constantin Pecqueur, fondateur du collectivisme d'État*, (Paris: Sirey, 1934). To my knowledge a thorough exploration of Pecqueur's feminist ideas has yet to be completed. In addition to these more prominent socialists, there are quite a few obscure writers and activists from this period, contributors to the vast pamphlet literature of the July Monarchy and the Revolution of 1848, whose works serve as evidence for the widespread importance of feminist ideas in the 1830s and 1840s. See for example: E. S. Glouton, *Le Christ du second avènement, annoncée par lui même*, (Paris: 1842); *Voix du ciel*, (Paris: 1840). Glouton believed himself to be the sec-

ond coming of Christ, and predicted as well the coming of the “fille du seigneur” with miraculous powers, 23. Also of interest is the pamphlet, *Les Femmes!* Par M. B***, lieutenant au 10^{me} regiment d’infanterie de ligne, (Bordeaux: 1841), which consists of an ode to women and to the complementarity of the sexes. The author makes particularly close connections between the erasure of egoism in contemporary society and the exaltation of *la femme*, 10. These are by no means the only such examples one could cite of this sort.

27. William Reddy’s several books on the period are illuminating of the larger cultural milieu. *The Invisible Code: Honor and Sentiment in Postrevolutionary France, 1815–1848*, (Berkeley: UC Press, 1997); *The Navigation of Feelings: A Framework for the History of Emotions*, (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001). Also interesting is Victoria Thompson, *The Virtuous Marketplace: Men and Women, Money and Politics in Paris, 1830–1870*, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000).

28. The Saint-Simonians were largely made up of graduates of the *École Polytechnique*, one of the elite universities of Paris, while many other members of the cohort discussed here were far less well or exclusively educated. See in particular Ganneau, the son of a hatter who never made it to university, as far as we know. For a fascinating discussion of the philosophical consequences of the exclusive nature of the French academic structure see Jan Goldstein, *The Post-Revolutionary Self*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005).

29. Grogan, *Flora Tristan: Life Stories*, beautifully renders the edgy world of the socialists. On the larger context of bohemian intellectual life during this period see Jerrold Seigel’s classic *Bohemian Paris: Culture, Politics and the Boundaries of Bourgeois Life, 1830–1930*, (New York: Penguin Books, 1986).

30. I am not the first scholar to group these thinkers together. See also Roger Picard, *Le Romantisme Social* (New York: Brentano’s, 1944); Viatte, *Victor Hugo et les Illuminés de son temps*; Frank Paul Bowman has written of several of them, including Constant, Esquiros, Leroux, Turreil and Chatel in “Religion, Politics and Utopia in French Romanticism.” In noting Esquiros’ preoccupation with the madness of prophets, Bowman comments, “the message of hope always seems a message of madness—a superb justification for all eccentricity, undoubtedly shared by the ‘founders of sects’ [among them Turreil, Ganneau, Chatel, Constant discussed below] we shall shortly discuss, some of whom were indeed rather evidently mad. But then, Esquiros might have been right.” 314.

31. Leroux was a favorite of the French socialists of midcentury who sought to demonstrate a more indigenous French alternative to Marxist socialism. Leroux’s interest in preserving the sanctity of the individual while recognizing the needs of the community resonated for a French communist party under the domination of Stalinist politics. See for example Henri Mougín, *Pierre Leroux*, (Paris: 1938).

For a recent assessment of Leroux’ interest in and influence on ideas of reincarnation in France and its connection to his socialism, see Lynn Sharp, “Metempsychosis and Social Reform: The Individual and the Collective in Romantic Socialism,” *French Historical Studies*, 27, 2, Spring 2004, 349–379.

32. Jacques P. Van der Linden, *Alphonse Esquiros: De la Bohème Romantique à la République Sociale*, (Heerlen and Paris: Nizet, 1948); and Anthony Zielonka, *Alphonse*

Esquiros (1812–1876): A Study of his Works, (Geneva: Slatkine, 1985) and Alphonse Esquiros (1812–1876): *Choix de lettres*, (Geneva: Slatkine, 1990). Constant has many biographers, but most of them are concerned not with his early adulthood during the period of the July Monarchy, but rather with his later incarnation as Eliphas Levi, the great master of the occult in late nineteenth century France. Most of his biographers are also devotees of his later philosophy. The most thorough of these is that of Paul Chacornac: *Eliphas Lévi: Renovateur de l'occultisme en France*, (Paris: Chacornac Frères, 1926). Chacornac's biography recommends itself because of the extensive reprints of primary documents that it contains. Scholarly assessments of Constant include those of Frank Paul Bowman, *Eliphas Levi, Visionnaire Romantique*, (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1976), and David Allen Harvey, *Beyond Enlightenment: Occultism and Politics in Modern France*, (De Kalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2005).

33. I also draw on the writings of disciples of several of these authors, in particular Auguste Guyard and Edmond Tissier, followers of Turreil and Leroux, respectively.

34. These two are less thoroughly researched by scholars, in part because of their relative obscurity even in their own day. On both see Viatte, *Victor Hugo et les illumine de son temps*, and Erdan, *La France Mystique Tableau des excentricités religieuses de ce temps*, (Amsterdam: 1858). Bénichou, *Le temps des prophètes*; Grogan, *Flora Tristan*.

35. Iorwerth Prothero, *Religion and Radicalism in July Monarchy France—The French Catholic Church of the Abbé Chatel*, (Ceredigion, UK: 2005).