



Dr. Beverly Rosa Williams '68  
424 Ferncliff Drive  
Birmingham, AL 35213

*A  
Excellent  
Challenging*

UTOPIAN THOUGHT AS A FACTOR IN SOCIAL CHANGE

by

Beverly Ann Rosa

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the

Requirements for a Bachelor of Arts Degree

Sociology Department

Salve Regina College

Newport, Rhode Island

May 6, 1968

The wolf shall dwell with the lamb: and the leopard shall lie down with the kid. The calf and the lion and the sheep shall abide together: and a little child shall lead them. The calf and the bear shall feed, their youngs ones shall rest, together: and the lion shall eat straw like the ox.

Isaiah 11:6-7

The Biblical verses quoted above are a symbolic expression of utopian thought, a social phenomenon which has existed from at least the beginning of recorded social thought. It is the aim of this paper to examine in depth the origins, nature, and function of utopian thought from the sociological point of view. More specifically, it is the thesis of this paper that utopian thought is a causal factor in the occurrence of the phenomenon of social change. Before this can be proven, however, it is necessary to present a general orientation to the subject. This will first of all involve a definition of the term "utopia" and the placing of the concept of "utopian thought" in its theoretical framework of the sociology of knowledge. Secondly, the concept of "social change" will be defined and its relationship to utopian thought discussed. This introductory section of the paper will be concluded with an historical view of utopian thought in which emphasis will be placed on Jesus Christ, Francis Bacon, John Humphrey Noyes, and Edward Bellamy, those utopian thinkers to be discussed in depth in the next section. Chapter two, as I now envision it, will involve the presentation of empirical data in support of the thesis of this paper. The ideas of the four above-mentioned utopian thinkers as they relate to



the institution of the family and the role relations within it will be discussed. Following this discussion, an attempt will be made to show the effect which these ideas had on future family life. Chapter three will center on an evaluation of the effectiveness of utopian thought as a vehicle for the communication of social ideals. With this outline set forth as a guide, I will now proceed with the aims of this paper.

Before one attempts to prove the relationship between any two phenomenon, it is necessary that the meaning of the concepts employed is clear. The first concept with which I am dealing is that of utopian thought, more specifically, that of "utopia." According to the literal definition, "utopia" signifies "the land of no place" from the Greek "ou" meaning "not" and "topos" meaning place.<sup>1</sup> More fully, it is defined by Webster as

a name invented by Sir Thomas More and applied by him to an imaginary island which he represents as enjoying the utmost perfection in laws, politics and social conditions as contrasted with the defects of those which then existed.<sup>2</sup>

From this introductory notion, the term "utopian" has come to be an expression of "one who believes in the perfectability of human society; a visionary; one who proposes or advocated plans, especially plans usually regarded as impracticable, for social improvement."<sup>3</sup> For our purposes, however, we shall rely on a definition of "utopia" that interpretes this phenomenon from a more strictly sociological point of view. Through the influence of Karl Mannheim, there has developed the view of Utopia as "a particular type of intellectual outlook and thought pattern... ..now designated as the utopian mind or utopian spirit."<sup>4</sup>



When used in this latter context, the term "utopian" assumes the following meaning:

any process of thought which receives its impetus not from the direct force of social reality but from concepts, such as symbols, fantasies, dreams, ideas and the like..... Viewed from the standpoint of Sociology, such mental constructs may in general assume two forms: "ideological" if they serve the purpose of glossing over and stabilizing the existing social reality; "utopian" if they inspire collective activity which aims to change such reality to conform with goals.<sup>5</sup>

In the remainder of the paper, "utopia" will be used to signify that which is expressed in the above definition.

By accepting Mannheim's interpretation of "utopia", we are placing ourselves within the theoretical framework of the sociology of knowledge. This branch of sociology, in which Mannheim is one of the major theorists, maintains that the nature of a society's knowledge is influenced by the social context in which it arises.<sup>6</sup> Thus knowledge, although transcending society, is an extension of society. If one is to understand the full implication of this area of sociology, the term "knowledge" "must be interpreted very broadly. . . . since studies in this area have dealt with virtually the entire gamut of cultural products (ideas, ideologies, juristic and ethical beliefs, philosophy, science, technology)."<sup>7</sup> Present day definitions of this discipline give it the broadest possible scope, for they extend the concept to include the notion that the "social substructure and cultural superstructure are a unity."<sup>8</sup>

The sociology of knowledge, as a discipline, in a sense owes its roots to Emile Durkheim with his notion of society as a reality sui generis, a notion which introduces the concept of society being more than the total of its individual parts.



Durkheim relates this idea when he says, "When individual minds are not isolated but enter in close relation, . . . they work upon each other; from their synthesis arises a new kind of psychic life."<sup>9</sup> Yet Durkheim, too, was aware of the implications which this latter notion had for the realm of knowledge and ideas. In the course of his investigation of the forms of classification in primitive societies, he set forth the premise that the origins of the categories of thought lay in the group structure and the group relations. In his search for the social bases of thought, he was specifically interested in the periodic recurrence of social activities (ceremonies, feasts, and rites), the clan structure, and the spatial configurations of group meetings.<sup>10</sup>

A second theorist worthy of note is Karl Marx because of the influence which he had on the writings of Mannheim. Basically, Marx maintained that economic conditions within a society have a definite role of predisposing society for the emergence of certain types of thought. That aspect of the economy to which he ascribes the greatest influence is the mode of production. His theory is also very much involved with the notion of social classes: ideas which arise in a society express the interests of the differing social strata. A third theorist, Max Scheler, made a definite contribution to the field of the sociology of knowledge by his introduction to this study of an emphasis on the role which impulses and emotions play in the emergence of thought in a society.<sup>11</sup> Scheler also introduced the notion of potential ideas; for him, the existential factors of society interact with a realm of ideas which have the potential

for emerging into social thought and by this interaction determine which ideas shall actually emerge.

For Mannheim, thought is "a complex which cannot be readily detached either from the psychological roots of the emotional and vital impulses which underlie it or from the situation in which it arises and which it seeks to solve."<sup>12</sup> A most significant aspect of the situation of origin is that it is one of collectivity- -people as members of a group and adherers to the commands of both the collective unconscious and the conscious character of their group produce through their collective will "the guiding thread for the emergence of their problems, their concepts, and their forms of thought."<sup>13</sup> For our purposes, a deeper explanation of Mannheim's theory is pertinent, because he alone of the major theorists has specifically theorized on the social origins of utopian thought. Basically, for him, utopian thought arises out of the desire of the collective will for change as opposed to maintenance of the contemporary situation. In the words of Mannheim, "every age allows to arise those ideas and values in which are contained in condensed form the unrealized tendencies which represent the needs of each age."<sup>14</sup> He further maintains that in different historical periods, different forces, substances or images take on the utopian function. However, it is important to note that

this change in substance and form does not take place in a realm which is independent of social life. It could be shown rather. . . .that the successive forms of utopia, in their beginnings are intimately bound up with given historical stages of development, and each of these with particular social strata.<sup>15</sup>

Finally, it should be noted that utopias come into existence



and maintain themselves as a "unilinear filiation of one from the other" in which each is an "antagonistic counter-utopia" of the one which preceded; and, more significantly, a representation of the needs of one social strata struggling for ascendancy over another.<sup>16</sup>

A final notion which has significance for the study of the origins of utopian thought is Florian Znaniecki's concept of "the man of knowledge". According to Znaniecki, knowledge is in a realm which is completely separate from social reality; from this he maintains that there cannot be a valid sociology of knowledge. In the place of the sociology of knowledge, he advocates a sociology of the carriers of knowledge in which an emphasis would be placed on the study of the relation and interaction which these men of knowledge have with society as a whole.<sup>17</sup> Max Scheler, too, made note of this concept when he maintained that potential ideas will only emerge if mentally creative men get hold of them and introduce them into society.<sup>18</sup> This concept is especially pertinent to a study of utopian thought, because in this paper I will be dealing with individual men as the authors of specific utopian works. One could well pose the question of to whom the credit belongs for the ideas which they present. Is it society or it is their own perceptive and creative genius? Mannheim provides an answer to this question in which both sides are taken into account:

It is task of sociology always to show, however, that the first stirrings of what is new are in fact oriented towards the existing order and that the existing order itself is rooted in the alignment and tension of the forces of social life. . . . Even when a seemingly isolated individual gives form to the



utopia of his group, in the final analysis this can rightly be attributed to the group to whose collective impulse his achievement conformed. . . . However, the belief that the significance of individual creative power is to be denied is one of the most widespread misunderstandings of the findings of sociology. On the contrary, from what should the new be expected to originate if not from the novel and uniquely personal mind of the individual who breaks beyond the bonds of the existing order?<sup>19</sup>

With the examination of the concept of "utopia" complete, it is now necessary to define the concept of "social change" and relate it to utopian thought. The definition of social change which I have chosen to employ is by no means the only possible one, but it is the one which I feel expresses the concept in terms most applicable to the aims of this paper. Thus for our purposes, social change shall be viewed as a change in society's complex pattern of attitudes, values and perceptions which, in turn, alters the formal structure of society: its norms, roles and institutions.<sup>20</sup>

In the history of social thought, there have been devised many theories concerning the means by which changes within a society's way of life are brought about. In this paper we shall be dealing with what has come to be known as conflict theory of social change. The reason why this mode of social change was chosen over other major theory of this period, the equilibrium school, is twofold. First of all, I believe that conflict theory has more in common with the concept of "utopian thought"; this relationship will be shown later in the paper. Secondly, contemporary theorists have been placing a major emphasis on the importance of the role which conflict plays in society. The views of two contemporary theorists who relate conflict to social



change are pertinent here. Wilbert E. Moore maintains that

the conception of an "intergrated" social system, which informs much of the writing in contemporary sociology, is a model useful for many purposes, but it is clearly contrary to fact. The use of some such model provides a first approximation to the systematic tracing of consequences of given changes, but does not account for change itself. For the latter, a somewhat different analytical model is appropriate, namely one that permits identification with internal or immanent sources of change, including inherent strains. . . . Several types of inherent strains in ongoing societies are identifiable; among these is "the dialectic" conflict between normative alternatives.<sup>21</sup>

A similar view on the relation between conflict and social change can be seen in the theory of Ralf Dahrendorf: "All units of social organization are continuously changing, unless some force intervenes to arrest this change. . . . The great creative force that carries along change. . . is social conflict. . . (and) it is always the basis of constraint that is at issue in social conflict."<sup>22</sup> This notion of constraint as being at the core of social conflict has implications for utopian thought, especially when Dahrendorf views one aspect of constraint as the attempt to enforce uniform value systems on a whole society.<sup>23</sup>

With these justifications of the use of conflict theory, it is now possible to examine the essence of the theory, itself. Basically, this theory maintains that all change within a society is, in part, the result of the struggle between two opposing elements. Although conflict theorists may agree on the basic tenet, they differ on the nature of these conflicting elements. A brief survey of the major developments in conflict theory will bring this to light. The roots of this theory extend back to the German philosopher, George Hegel, who developed the notion



of the dialectic. According to this notion, historical change can be interpreted in terms of the struggle between two contradictory elements and the subsequent fusion of the elements to form something new. In more specifically Hegelian terms, this is explained in terms of the "thesis" or affirmation of an historical element interacting with the "antithesis", the negation of the thesis, to create the "synthesis" of the two, a new historical element - one which is the best possible in that time period. For Hegel, the nature of the historical element is spiritual; thus, he deals in terms of the "idea" or thought and the "geist" of spirit. In his philosophy, the contents of the nonmaterial world of the geist proceed from the idea and nature; and historical change is accomplished through the conflict and synthesis of each community spirit (volkgeist) with the world spirit (weltgeist) to form the moving spirit of a given age (zeitgeist).<sup>24</sup>

A second conflict theorist of whom we should make note is Karl Marx. As Hegel, his theory employs the dialectic (thesis, antithesis, synthesis) to explain the general process of change in a society. Yet unlike Hegel, he maintains that the conflicting elements are material rather than spiritual. More specifically, these conflicting elements are the two basic classes of society, one which represents the obsolescent system of production and the other the emerging order of production. Through the means of this struggle, social change occurs and society continually evolves toward perfection.<sup>25</sup> Also helpful in the development of a theory of conflict are the works of Jacques Novicow. According to this evolutionist, the core of change in society is the struggle for existence; while the element



involved as the means of change is one whose nature differs as society evolves. Therefore, he divided his theory into four major stages, each stage representing the emergence of a new type of conflicting element:

in the first stage, human struggle was chiefly physiological, resulting in the extermination of the enemy. Struggle became primarily economic in the second stage, though it remained combined with many phases of physical compulsion. In the third stage, conflict took on a predominately political character: struggle for political dominance both within states and between states. Conflict of an intellectual nature marks the final stage, sometimes taking the form of religious wars or revolutionary activity, but remaining essentially a struggle for the dominance of ideas.<sup>26</sup>

This brief survey should be sufficient to point out the relation of the conflict theory of social change to utopian thought; utopian thought which by its very nature introduces conflicting ideas into society is one source from which the "antithesis" of conflict could arise. Thus with Mannheim, we can say

There is a close bond which connects the social process itself with intellectual developments. . . . The destiny of an entire social scheme may depend upon the nature of the . . . reality transcending concepts originally embraced by these groups, upon the manner in which the original ideas have been assimilated into the social stream, and finally upon the ultimate outcome of the interaction between the utopian element and the other elements in the mind.<sup>27</sup>

A final notion with which I would like to deal in this area of the paper is the role of the individual in the process of changing society. As one sociologists has brought out, "social change means change in the individual."<sup>28</sup> Hilaire Belloc also gives support to this notion when he maintains that although material conditions are important in historical changes, the real causes are certain changes in the human mind.<sup>29</sup> Thus the human mind as affected by the group mind with its utopian



Manuel's division of it into three periods based on the dominate socio-psychological needs of the time. Finally, a survey of the major written works in the history of utopian thought of the Western world will be given. Throughout the presentation of these three approaches, the four utopian thinkers to be studied in depth will be placed in the historical perspective.

According to Karl Mannheim the first stage of utopian mentality in modern history is that of orgiastic chiliasm. During this period, orgiastic energies and ecstatic out bursts of the peasant classes begin to operate as a force for change in society. The orgiastic element is linked up with chiliasm due to the fact that these energies manifested themselves most commonly in the prophesying of the millennium done by such groups as the Hussites and the Anabaptists. The significance of this stage of utopian development is found in the fact that it did not find its source in the realm of ideas; instead, it arose from "deeper-lying vital and elemental levels of the psyche."<sup>32</sup>

The second stage in the modern development of the utopian mentality is called by Mannheim the liberal-humanitarian era. It is this stage which saw the emergence of the utopia in the form of the "idea" . In this period, however, the idea functions as a formal goal projected into the infinite future which regulates the present worldly affairs. Mannheim describes its role as one of critic and sees it as a toning down of the notion of sudden historical change which was present in the first stage of utopian mentality. He also differentiates it from orgiastic chiliasm on the grounds that it, unlike chiliasm, does not take the determinism view of social-historical change.<sup>33</sup> It is in



this stage of the development of the utopian mentality that the utopianism of Christ and Bacon primarily falls.

The third stage of utopian mentality manifests itself in what Mannheim calls the conservative idea. Ideally, the conservative mentality is lacking in utopian elements and is in complete harmony with the existing social order. However, Mannheim points out its utopian elements in the following statements:

only the counter-attack of opposing classes and their tendency to break through the limits of the existing order causes the conservative mentality to question the basis of its own dominance, and necessarily brings about among the conservatives, historical-philosophical reflections concerning themselves. Thus, there arises a counter-utopia which serves as a means of self-orientation and defense. . . . Thus conservative mentality discovers its idea only ex post facto.<sup>34</sup>

What Mannheim considers to be the central achievement of conservatism is that "in conscious contrast to the liberal outlook, it gave positive emphasis to the notion of the determinateness of our outlook and behaviour."<sup>35</sup>

The final stage of utopian mentality with which Mannheim deals is the socialist-communist utopia. This mentality is like the liberal mentality in that it places the consummation of its plans for change in the remote future; however, unlike the liberal mentality, socialism places that future at a much more specifically determined point in time. In addition the socialist utopia incorporates the feeling of determinateness with a utopia of the future. Mannheim maintains that these two elements are compatible: "socialism merges a progressive social force with the checks which revolutionary action automatically imposes upon itself when it perceives the determining forces in



history."<sup>36</sup> A final aspect of this fourth stage which is worthy of note is the explanation which Mannheim gives for the emergence of communism out socialism. According to him, one group within the socialists becomes dependent upon the maintenance of the status quo, because they have developed a vested interest in the existing order. Other groups for whom the existing order has not developed such importance become the adherents of the communist theory with its emphasis on "the overwhelming importance of revolution."<sup>37</sup> It is within this realm of the socialist-communist utopia that the utopias of Noyes and Bellamy primarily fall.

In taking an over-all view of the development of the utopian mentality, Mannheim finds that there is in each utopian stage elements remaining from the stage or stages before which have a relationship of reciprocal opposition with the dominant element of an age. In spite of this mixture, the dominant element remains strong enough to be noticeable; and an examination of these dominant elements throughout the modern period points out "a gradual descent and a closer approximation to real life of a utopia that at one time completely transcended history."<sup>38</sup>

Frank E. Manuel's presentation of the history of utopian thought differs markedly from Mannheim's in that it comes down from the level of the theory of ideas and deals in specifics rather than abstracts. His introductory remarks, especially the following one, make this difference apparent: ". . . the utopia may well be a sensitive indicator of where the sharpest anguish of an age lies."<sup>39</sup> From this, he proceeds to categorize utopian thought along socio-psychological lines. For Manuel, the term "utopian thought" seems to indicate actual written works which



follow the model of Sir Thomas More's Utopia since it is with More that he chooses to begin his history. However, despite this defect, I feel that his division of utopian works along psychological lines gives one an excellent understanding of the trends which the development of the utopian mentality has been following.

According to Manuel, the first stage of utopias extends from More to the age of the French Revolution and can be classified as the age of "utopias and calm felicity."<sup>40</sup> In these utopias it is assumed that the cause of social disorder is to be found in discord in the relationships between people. The utopian solution to this is the establishment of social arrangements in which the need for the expression of discord is eliminated. Utopian writers of this period advocate the setting up of laws and institutions which they believe will bring out the natural goodness of man (his desire for equality, desire for peace, and contempt for riches) as well as take advantage of his fear of pain and punishment. It is significant to note that the focal point of these first utopias is the institution of the state.<sup>41</sup> Christ's and Bacon's utopias can be seen as this type.

The second period in the development of the utopia spans the nineteenth century and is designated as "dynamic socialist and other historically determinist utopias."<sup>42</sup> In these works the state has been replaced by the economy as the focal utopian institution. It is through the economy that these writers hope to achieve their main goal: the satisfaction of individual uniqueness as opposed to the establishment of equality.<sup>43</sup> Thus the utopias of the nineteenth century stress the importance of having a person's occupation an expression of his personality. It is



in this category that one can place the utopias of Noyes and Bellamy.

The final period of Manuel's categorization of utopias is contemporary society, and to these he gives the name "psychological and philosophical utopias of the twentieth century."<sup>44</sup> Manuel maintains that as a response to the denial of a utopian hope by the theories of Darwin and Freud, contemporary western writers developed two new utopian styles: in opposition to Darwin there emerged the utopias which see man as evolving toward spiritual perfection while in opposition to Freud they were created utopias which depict an age of play and free sexuality.<sup>45</sup>

The last aspect of utopian thought with which this chapter will deal is a presentation of the history of utopian thought as it manifested itself in actual utopian writings. As Lewis Mumford brought out in his study of utopias, it is very difficult to exactly define what constitutes a utopian writing; works dealing with government, philosophy, ethics and religion as well as many works of fiction contain elements of the utopian mentality.<sup>46</sup> For the purposes of this paper, Joyce Hertzler's The History of Utopian Thought will be used as the basis for deciding which works should be included in this survey. His work, I feel, gives the best comprehensive view of the subject matter.

~~The~~ The history of major utopian writings is believed to have begun with the teachings of the Hebrew prophets from eleven B.C. to four B.C. Hertzler considers the teachings of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah to be the most significant and representative.<sup>47</sup> From these works, that which is important from our point of view is what Hertzler speaks of as



"the indomitable optimism which led them to speak of an abiding and unfaltering faith in the ultimate triumph of righteousness and justice," for it brought rise to an ethical, social, political, and cultural rehabilitation."<sup>48</sup> For Mannheim, the Hebrew prophets played another significant role in the development of the utopian mentality:

their enunciation of the doctrine that collective evil is not to be exorcized through ritualistic magic and that any change in social destiny must be wrought on the basis of individual responsibility marked the completion of the process whereby the mere expression of religious ecstasy became an ethical criticism of society.<sup>49</sup>

Closely related to the writings of the prophets are the teachings of the Apocalyptists, Jewish and Christian writers whose works appeared between 210 B.C. and 1300 A.D.. Like the prophets, perhaps even more so, they can be placed in Mannheim's stage of orgiastic chiliasm, for "while they breathe of religious fervor and pious learning, they are fanciful, ornate, unreal and highly emotional."<sup>50</sup>

At the same time that the prophets were spreading their utopian message, there was farther to the west another group of people from whom utopian thought emerged; these people were the Greeks. According to tradition, as early as the eight or ninth century B.C., one Lycurgus designed for Sparta a novel government and social order. At approximately the same time, the Greek poets Hesoid and Homer sang folk songs with utopian elements which were, according to one author, the last of a long line of those transmitted by tribal bards.<sup>51</sup> This notion of song as being a medium for the spreading of utopian thought is one which will be brought up again in the discussion of present day utopias. Perhaps the most well known of Greek utopian writings is Plat's Republic.



However, when speaking of Plato as a utopian writer, one is technically in error. According to Mannheim, although utopian fiction as a literary genre made its appearance with Plato, the Republic was in reality an attempt to contribute to the maintenance of a "static and hierarchically ordered social and political system."<sup>52</sup> This becomes clear through Hertzler's discussion of the work:

it appeared at a time when the dissolution of Greek political life was taking place. The popular philosophy of the times proclaimed the exaltation of the individual to the detriment of the state. . . .(Thus) with Plato, everything individual and particular falls away. Private property and domestic life, education and instruction, the choice of rank and possession, the arts and sciences, all these must be placed under the exclusive and absolute control of the State. <sup>53</sup>

When seen in this light, Plato's stress on the virtue of justice as a means of stability and well-being becomes ideological rather than utopian.

The logical succession to Plato in the history of utopian writing is the utopian teachings of Jesus Christ. Unlike Plato's case, "the transformation of the will to change society into a deep inward force was furthered by the work of Jesus."<sup>54</sup> In the words of Hertzler, the contribution of Jesus is brought down to specifics:

Jesus was both sociological and revolutionary in his point of view. He was interested in people and their relationships. . . .He fought all that belittles and degrades human beings, all that breaks up society into opposing classes and clashing creeds, and attempted to cultivate all that makes for realization of. . . . the divinely ordained social order, with its pure, noble and beneficent life. Because of this spirit which burned in him he expected a great reversal of the world's standard of values.<sup>55</sup>

The utopian values of which Jesus spoke were: devotion to the welfare of one's fellow man, self-sacrifice and unselfishness,



humility, individual responsibility, sociability (disregard of the laws of propriety), and forgiveness.<sup>56</sup> Very much related to Christ's teachings is the utopian work of St. Augustine, City of God, which speaks of the time when Christ's Church will replace the state as the governing social institution.

Between Augustine's City of God and the next major utopian work, there was a period of nearly one thousand years which were not conducive to the birth of new ideas; it was a time of the maintenance of social structures- -feudalism, nobility, and the hierarchial Church- - and an age of ideology.<sup>57</sup> The appearance of Sir Thomas More's Utopia was extremely significant, for it was an "expression of an wave of intellectual and social release" of the Renaissance.<sup>58</sup> More is only one of a group of several utopian writers of this period who as a group are referred to as the humanists; in addition to More's Utopia, there appeared Johann Valen Andrae's Christianopolis, Francis Bacon's New Atlantis, Thomas Campanella's City of the Sun, and James Harrington's Oceana. In the words of Hertzler,

these utopias attempted to portray a land and a people released from the bonds of artificiality and scholastic formalism, from the thralldom of ignorance, superstition degeneration and man-made tyrannies, and living their life without extreme or noticeable restrictions of law, yet in reasonable harmony and order.<sup>59</sup>

Since Francis Bacon is one of the four utopian writers whom have been chosen for study in chapter two, some introductory notions concerning his work (which may be considered somewhat representative of the whole humanist period) are in order. Mannheim sees Bacon's work as an expression of "an aggressive faith in the liberating role of science."<sup>60</sup> In addition to his theory of the



importance of scientific research, Bacon presents the concept of the "social will" consciously ordering human intellectual expansion and social progress. Also worthy of note are his emphasis on the importance of the family, his presentation of a theory of eugenics and his stress on education. Elements which are not of major importance in Bacon's work but which should be mentioned in order to provide a representative view of the humanistic era are social equality and political reform.

The period following the French Revolution brought rise to another type of literary utopia, one ordered toward the single political goal of utopian socialism.<sup>61</sup> In this stage, the utopian mentality is manifested in Abbe Morelly's Code de la Nature Francios Noel Babeuf's Society of the Equals, Henry Saint-Simon's Nouveau Christianisme, Charles Fourier's L'Association Domestique-Agricole, Etienne Cabet's Voyage to Icaria, Louis Blanc's Organ<sup>z</sup>ization du Travail, and Robert Owen's Book of the New Moral World. Although none of these utopian visions were similar in details, they shared a set of common fundamentals among which were the belief that God, or Nature, has made all things to serve the happiness of mankind, the belief that with proper environment and education man would be perfect, the favoring of the abolition of private property, and the advocating the establishment of some form of social religion.<sup>62</sup>

It was the doctrines of utopian socialists which were in large part responsible for the establishment of experimental communities in America. The nineteenth century saw the birth of over one hundred communities with a total membership of more than one hundred thousand.<sup>63</sup> Those of which note will be made



are the ones which relate back to the socialist writers mentioned above. Due to the efforts of Robert Owen, the Preliminary Society of New Harmony was formed in 1825 in Indiana and by 1830 there had been a total of nineteen Owenite communities. Although they were all short-lived, they left a legacy of educational reforms and innovations. Also established in the Owenite tradition were Jasian Ballou's Hopedale Community (Milford, Mass., 1841) and John A. Collins' community of Skaneateles (New York, 1843). The identifying mark of these communities was their repudiation of religion. The doctrines of Fourier were brought to America by his disciple Albert Brisbane; of forty experiments, the most successful was the North American Phalanx located in New Jersey. There as well as in the Wisconsin Phalanx and at Brook Farm (Massachusetts) Fourier's theory of attractive industry (arrange the work structure according to the individuals' attraction to one another) brought in large financial gains. Under Etienne Cabet, a communistic society of Icaria was formed first in Texas (1848) to be followed by five changes in location due to economic failure and factionalism. Of all the Icarian communities, the one in Nauvoo, Illinois and the one in Corning, Iowa succeeded in setting up a communistic structure which functioned with some economic success.

The experimental community which will be discussed in more depth is John Humphrey Noyes' settlement of Oneida. Although influenced by Fourierism and the community at Brook Farm, the Oneida community "really issued from a conjunction between the Revivalism of Orthodoxy and the Socialism of Unitarianism."<sup>63</sup> Founded in New York near the Canadian border in 1848, Oneida



grew in size from 87 members living in two log houses to 306 members dwelling in a large brick mansion of common housing. A section of the population of Oneida eventually set up another community at Wallingford which had reciprocal economic relations with the original group: Oneida concentrated mainly on industry, while Wallingford paid greater attention to farming. In spite of the separation, members moved freely from one settlement to the other and shared a common community life. This common life was based on two major principles developed by Noyes: the belief that Christ's second coming had already occurred and thus men were free from the bonds of sin; and the belief that God meant men and women to live together in a holy community of free love. From the latter, there developed a system of complex marriage, male continence, and eugenics. It is significant to note that criticisms from the outside were prevented from disrupting the community solidarity because of the charisma which the person of Noyes possessed.<sup>64</sup> Other aspects of the community life worthy of note are their use of mutual criticism as a medium of all discipline, their indulging in all forms of recreation, embellishment, and cultural activities, their rotation of work assignments and changing of the order of daily affairs in order to avoid monotony, and their experiments in faith healing and diet. Oneida survived in its pure form until 1880 when internal dissension brought about a breakdown of the system of free love and community living.

The last series of works manifesting the utopian mentality with which we will deal are those which Hertzler designates as "the Pseudo-utopias".<sup>65</sup> His introductory remarks concerni<sup>g</sup>



this notion best express its meaning:

with the perfecting of theories of history and the growth of the idea of development or evolution, real utopias ceased to appear, for men now had a conception of social growth and development, and were not confronted with the necessity of picturing a perfect substitute for but of making improvement in present society. . . Modern utopias differ from the others discussed in that there is in them the feeling of forthcoming attainment. They deal with men as they are and use familiar means, and the perfect consummation of their ideas seems to be just around the corner, an entirely realizable process, developing out of the near past and the present. There is in them little that could be construed as the product of unbridled and fantastic imagining, <sup>66</sup>

In his examination of this period, Hertzler limited his study to the three works which he felt were the most representative: Edward Bellamy's Looking Backward (1889), Theodor Hertzka's Freeland- -A Social Anticipation (1890), and H.G. Well's Modern Utopia (1905). Since I will be dealing with Bellamy's work in Chapter two, I will present some introductory notions to Looking Backward and then conclude this chapter with a brief discussion of the manifestation of the contemporary utopian mentality.

In Looking Backward, Bellamy, one of the few major utopian writers of American origin, presents a picture of American society as it will be in the year 2000. According to Mumford, "Bellamy makes the solution of labor organization and the distribution of wealth the key to every other institution of his utopia."<sup>67</sup> The utopian notions in this work which <sup>ARE</sup> worthy of note are: the nationalization of the economy, universal compulsory industrial service for both men and women, national organization of labor by the government, national educational system extending through college, communal retail, housekeeping, and food service provided by the national government, abolition of money (each



person is paid for his services by an equal allocation of needed goods), and the allotment of much leisure time in which to enjoy the arts and develop social relations.

Because Hertzler's The History of Utopian Thought does not cover the period of time from the beginning of the twentieth century to the present, it is necessary to add a little to his schema. By using the categories which Manuel set up his discussion of the psychological history of utopias, one is made aware of at least two contemporary trends. The first of these are the utopias which see "benign spirituality"<sup>68</sup> as the future of mankind; among the proponents of such a utopia are Teilhard de Chardin, Julian Huxley, Herman J. Muller, and Arnold Joseph Toynbee. In the other category of utopias are those who see society evolving toward a period in which freedom from psychological repression and insecurity will enable mankind to freely express the instinctive energy of the id. Writers dealing in this realm are Wilhelm Reich, Erich Fromm, Norman Brown. It seems more likely that the future society will see an integration of these two trends for a creation of a more psychologically and spiritually "whole man".

Contemporary society is also seeing the birth of a protest movement among the ranks of its youth. What one observer of this movement calls the "Rock Revolution."<sup>69</sup> is in actuality the expression of youth's utopian mentality through the medium of popular music. In brief, the utopian ideas which their music is attempting to introduce into society are those of universal peace and love, free sexuality, and individual freedom from social norms which seems to border on nihilism. Finally, the



contemporary social scene is also characterized by writings on such utopian schemes as the creation of "New Towns" which combine city and suburban living in one area, the establishment of communities under sea and on other planets and the moon, the creation of more perfect human offspring through the manipulation of genes, and the extension of human life for an indeterminate period of time through the freezing of the living human organism.