

6-15-2023

Working Paper No. 75, The Utopian Socialists Reconsidered

Aden Quenemoen
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/econ_workingpapers



Part of the [Economics Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Citation Details

Quenemoen, A. "The Utopian Socialists Reconsidered, Working Paper 75", Portland State University Economics Working Papers. 75 (15 June 2023) i + 21 pages.

This Working Paper is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Working Papers in Economics by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

The Utopian Socialists Reconsidered

Working Paper No. 75

Authored by: Aden Quenemoen

A Contribution to the Working Papers of the
Department of Economics, Portland State University

Submitted for: EC 460 “History of Economic Thought,”
15 June 2023; i + 21 pages

Prepared for Professor John Hall

Abstract: This inquiry seeks to establish that efforts to formulate utopian solutions to societal challenges are deserving of reconsideration, especially when the national and international solutions influenced by one Karl Marx and his followers appear to have reached their nadir as the Soviet experiment ended by the start of the 1990s. Such requires us to look back in time prior to Marx by considering contributions advanced by the likes of: Henri de Saint-Simon, Robert Owen, and Charles Fourier. What is stressed is that all three of these authors advanced novel ideas, with some of their ideas deemed important and enduring, while other ideas and suggestions could be rightly dismissed as farfetched. However, what is borne out is that each of the theorists under consideration provides a window into early socialist thought; with an orientation towards real world solutions to the economic and social climate that was profoundly influenced by the rise of industrialism. As the ideas of these three thinkers are reconsidered, what shall be borne out is that their thoughts, proposal, and solutions do indeed share certain commonalities. Nevertheless, their efforts also remain quite distinct—even unique. What can be noted is that when regarding utopian socialism, the making of broad generalizations proves difficult and fails to capture the uniqueness of the contributors and the distinctness of the ideas advanced. (220 Words)

Journal of Economic Literature Classification Codes: B14, B31, P32

Key Words: Charles Fourier, Henri de Saint-Simon, New Lanark, Phalanx,
Robert Owen, Utopian Socialism

This inquiry seeks to establish that efforts to formulate utopian solutions advanced by Henri de Saint-Simon, Robert Owen, and Charles Fourier need to be reconsidered. A reconsideration and reappraisal of these efforts seems warranted given that this topic has tended to remain neglected in the History of Economic Thought. What we can note is that a careful examination of these theorists reveals the diversity of doctrines that culminated in distinct approaches to socialism. Certain ideas presented in this inquiry may seem laudable while others will certainly come across as farfetched and even absurd. Each of these theorists, however, provides a window into early socialist thought and the economic climate of the 19th century. In his short book *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific* [1880], Friedrich Engels provided a consideration of these three men in order to distinguish their ideologies from the “scientific socialism” that he advanced with his collaborator Karl Marx. While Engels ([1880] 1908, 58) seemed to find great merit in the work of the utopians, he states that the crude conditions of the era in which they lived inevitably caused them to generate theories that could be considered crude. As the decades passed and Marxism became the dominant socialist theory, the efforts of these thinkers were overshadowed, and little has been written about them in recent years. In order to elucidate the importance of the utopians, I shall begin by examining the ideas advanced by Saint-Simon. Next, I shall consider Owen’s social vision informed by his experience as an architect of

cooperative communities. Finally, I shall examine the strange yet influential work of Fourier. As the ideas of these thinkers are reconsidered, it will become clear that while they share certain commonalities, they are quite distinct. Indeed, it is difficult to make broad generalizations about utopian socialism.

Henri de Saint-Simon (1760-1825)

Few today have read the work of Saint-Simon and it could also be noted that he achieved little public recognition in his lifetime. However, after his passing in 1825 numerous essays and articles attracted many dedicated followers. In his book, *Great Economists before Keynes*, Mark Blaug (1986, 209) explains that while Saint-Simon's work was lacking in clarity and coherence, his disciples systematized and modified his ideas, and a movement was formed under his name that intrigued leading intellectuals of the era; such as John Stuart Mill and Thomas Carlyle. Many of Saint-Simon's writings were translated and edited by Keith Taylor in a collection titled *Henri de Saint-Simon (1760-1825): Selected Writings on Science, Industry, and Social Organization*. In the introduction, Taylor (1975, 50-52) states that Saint-Simon's followers introduced ideas that were much more radical than those advocated by Saint-Simon himself such as a critique of private property and notions involving the emancipation of women; moreover, the appeal

of his ideas became much more widespread when a distinct ideology of socialism emerged in the 1830s and 1840s.

In order to understand Saint-Simon's thought and to place it in context, it is helpful to know a bit about Saint-Simon himself. Taylor (1975, 13-15) explains that Saint-Simon was born into a prominent aristocratic family that owned a château with large estates as well as a residence located in Paris. This allowed him to meet distinguished Parisian intellectuals of the era such as Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Jean le Rond d'Alembert. Taylor explains that d'Alembert tutored Saint-Simon briefly, presumably influencing his enthusiasm for philosophy and scientific knowledge. Indeed, Saint-Simon's early intellectual engagement with the French Enlightenment ingrained in him an extraordinary freedom of thought which at times caused him to suffer. For example, when he refused to partake in communion—viewing it as a meaningless ritual—his father promptly sent him to prison. In 1778, he traveled to America to fight in the Revolutionary War, and although the time he spent there was brief, the experience had a profound impact on him. In his "Letters to an American" [1817], Saint-Simon (Taylor, 1975, 162-163) states that during his time in America, he found himself more occupied with political science than military tactics. He tells us that moving forward, it was his aim to study matters that would advance the human mind and improve civilization. Taylor (1975, 15-17) explains that Saint-Simon—after traveling to the West Indies,

Mexico, and Holland—was motivated to return to France during the French Revolution where he was offered an opportunity to declare his belief in the principles of equality, liberty, and fraternity.

Saint-Simon's experience living through the French Revolution instilled in him an acute awareness of the importance of social stability. Taylor (1975, 20) explains that while visiting Geneva, Saint-Simon published a booklet titled "Letters from an Inhabitant of Geneva to His Contemporaries" [1802-3], in which for the first time he outlined his notions of social reorganization. Addressed to humanity in general, the purpose of this work was to provide stability to a civilization threatened by anarchy and revolution. As such, he proposed a new social order based on the principle that industry and science are the greatest means of progress for humanity.

In this work, Saint-Simon (Taylor, 1975, 71) divides society into three distinct classes. The first comprises "savants" or those who advance human progress through science, art, and liberal ideas. The second consists of property owners who provide no innovation for society. Everyone else—those who rally around the notion of equality—comprises the third class. Saint-Simon (Taylor, 1975, 66) suggests nominating the savants to leadership roles on a yearly basis and allowing them to use their authority as they see fit. Saint-Simon (Taylor, 1975, 71-72) addresses the propertied class by stating that their superior knowledge allows

them to combine their powers against the more numerous third class. With this point in mind, he suggests that it's in their interest to allow the savants into their ranks, explaining that the French Revolution was secretly instigated by the artists and scientists. Saint-Simon (Taylor, 1975, 77-81) clarifies that in his proposed organization of society the savants would be endowed with "spiritual power" and the propertied class with "temporal power." These two classes would exercise their power independent of one another and everyone would be allowed to elect leaders. He goes on to describe a dream or apparition in which God instructed him to form a "Counsel of Newton"—essentially a church—in which spiritual power would be exercised by the savants. He states that there would no longer be a religion in which ministers are given the authority to elect leaders. Taylor (1975, 20-21) provides some helpful context when he tells us that while these proposals may seem eccentric or even ridiculous to the modern reader, various attempts to establish new religions that would supplant Catholicism were made throughout the French Revolution. In alignment with the ideology of the revolution, Saint-Simon's "Religion of Newton" was intended to provide a doctrine of reason.

Class distinction is also apparent in Saint-Simon's later work. In his "Declaration of Principles" [1817], Saint-Simon (Taylor, 1975, 158-161) identifies two segments of society. The first consists of workers engaged in productive labor while the second—the "idlers"—live off the labor of others. He elaborates that

those engaged in productive labor form society in the truest sense and their only need is the liberty to be unrestrained in their work. Saint-Simon asserts that humans are inherently lazy, and this laziness is overcome simply because human needs must be fulfilled. Although the idlers share the same desires and needs as the laboring class, they fail to conquer their inherent laziness. He tells us that this parasitic class uses force to get their needs met through the labor of society. He goes so far as to refer to this class as thieves. Due to the threat of the idling class, workers are prone to be dispossessed of the produce of their labor. Although Saint-Simon doesn't elaborate on who constitutes the idling class in this work, he states that the primary concern of government is preventing idleness. In a later work titled "Physiology Applied to the Improvement of Social Institutions: Supplementary Notes" [1825], however, Saint-Simon (Taylor, 1975, 272) states that the current social organization grants the most significant level of esteem to idlers and varieties of work that are hardly beneficial for society. He states clearly that the nobles and bourgeoisie are the two classes held in highest regard even though their work provides little utility for society. These two classes, according to Saint-Simon, contain the most idlers.

Important elements of Saint-Simonian thought can also be found in his "Letters to an American" [1817]. In his sixth letter, Saint-Simon (Taylor, 1975, 164-168) explains that the French Revolution was motivated by desires for

equality; moreover, it reduced confidence in feudal and theological powers, and these principles could no longer link society together. He proposes using what he refers to as “industrial ideas” as a societal link to replace the principles of feudal and theological powers. Saint-Simon claims that these ideas could provide stability and thus prevent future revolutions. He goes on to contend that efforts should be directed towards an organization of society that favors industry, by which he means productive labor in all its forms. In such a societal organization, he elucidates, government would be limited to only that which is necessary for preventing productive labor from being obstructed. In his eighth letter, Saint-Simon states plainly that the only positive and reasonable aim of society is the production of goods that are useful; therefore, respect for producers and production is more beneficial than respect for property owners and property. He elaborates more on his views regarding government when he states that government involvement in industry—even when its aim is to promote it—necessarily causes damage. Finally, he states that because the only people who are useful in society are those who produce useful things, productive laborers should regulate the development of society.

Robert Owen (1771-1858)

Owen was a manufacturer from Wales who became highly influential as a social reformer during the Industrial Revolution. Blaug (1986, 181) explains that through

his writings and especially his hands-on work as an enlightened industrialist, trade union leader, and architect of cooperative experiments, Owen had a dramatic effect on 19th century Britain. Indeed, he tells us that for economists of the era such as David Ricardo, socialism was synonymous with Owenism. In his book *Teachings of the Worldly Philosophy*, Robert Heilbroner (1953, 109-110) offers useful biographical information about Owen. He explains that at 18 years of age, Owen borrowed 100 pounds and established himself as a small capitalist who manufactured textile machinery. Eventually, he responded to an advertisement placed by the proprietor of a sizable spinning establishment who was seeking a factory manager. Despite his lack of knowledge regarding spinning mills, Owen secured the job and by the age of 20, he was a prodigy in the textile world. Heilbroner goes on to explain that within several years Owen caught word of a batch of mills that were for sale in a shabby town called New Lanark. He tells us that Owen purchased the mills and proceeded to transform the community. Under Owen's guidance, New Lanark would soon become world-famous.

New Lanark provided hope that there was an alternative to the abhorrent working conditions and squalor of 19th century industrial life. Heilbroner (1953, 107-108) provides an evocative illustration of New Lanark following its transformation. He describes orderly rows of two room homes for workers and garbage neatly collected and prepared for disposal rather than strewn about the

streets. No children under 11 years of age could be found in the factories; moreover, older children that were employed in these factories worked fewer hours than was customary. Heilbroner explains that although several adults were expelled for vices such as chronic drunkenness, no one in New Lanark was ever punished. Children could be found working or playing in a schoolhouse rather than running amok in the streets. They would gather to dance and sing under the guidance of young women who were directed that the children should never be punished: they should be taught through example rather than admonition. Not only was New Lanark a cooperative refuge in an otherwise gloomy, harsh, and competitive Britain, but it was also undeniably profitable. In his description, Heilbroner makes it clear that Owen was a savvy businessman as well as a saint.

It was Owen's social philosophy—elucidated in his writings—that informed his practical work shaping the community of New Lanark. Owen's most notable work, "A New View of Society: Or, Essays on the Principle of the Formation of the Human Character, and the Application of the Principle to Practice" [1813] can be found in a collection titled *A New View of Society and Other Writings: Everyman's Library No. 799*, edited by Ernest Rhys. Owen (Rhys, 1927, 14) begins his First Essay in this work by explaining that approximately three-fourths of the populace living in the British Isles are either working class or poor; moreover, their characters are currently shaped without suitable direction or guidance. Owen tells

us that the characters of the poor and working class are often formed by circumstances that urge them along a path of misery and vice, impelling them to become dangers to society; meanwhile, the rest of society is trained in mistaken notions regarding human nature that perpetuate these social ills. Owen (Rhys, 1927, 21) elaborates further on these mistaken notions towards the end of the First Essay when he argues that the current society's education is such that it doesn't hesitate to spend millions detecting and punishing crimes while making no progress towards the course that would prevent these crimes from occurring in the first place. Owen (Rhys, 1927, 16) proposes a new perspective on human nature as an antidote to this social dilemma. He states that any character—good or bad, ignorant or enlightened—can be offered to society by the implementation of proper methods. This principle is the key component underlying Owen's philosophy. The basic idea is that humans are molded by their surroundings, and that they can be radically transformed through education.

After outlining the basic principles of his social philosophy in his First Essay, Owen proceeds in his Second Essay to elaborate on these principles further before demonstrating their advantages when put into practice. In this essay, he devotes particular attention to the education of children. Owen (Rhys, 1927, 22) argues that the fundamental defect of society lies in the fact that children are taught the sentiments and habits of their instructors and parents, yet children have no

control over these teachings that play such a vital role in shaping their character. He tells us that children have a “plastic” quality and that under wise management, they can be shaped into a reflection of rational desires and wishes; indeed, Owen argues that children can be shaped in unison to possess any character. Owen (Rhys, 1927, 23) goes on to suggest that when children are properly instructed in the fundamental principles of human nature that he outlines, they will become more understanding of the differences in the manners and sentiments of others. They will realize that others are shaped by factors that are beyond their control, and therefore these children will feel commiseration for their enemies.

As a way of demonstrating some advantages of his principles when put into practice, Owen (Rhys, 1927, 29-30) draws upon his experience transforming New Lanark. He explains that upon his arrival as the new director of the mills, the inhabitants of New Lanark were initially quite skeptical of him, and they resisted his plan to transform their community; moreover, these inhabitants were habituated to theft, drunkenness, and idleness. He determined that the situation in New Lanark provided the perfect opportunity to test the efficacy of his philosophy. Rather than resorting to legal punishment to deter theft, he introduced preventative regulations and reasoned with the inhabitants by instructing them that they could earn more through honest practices. As such, it became more difficult for individuals to commit crime and the satisfaction of good behavior was experienced. Owen (Rhys,

1927, 31), explains that drunkenness was handled in a similar fashion. Its ruinous effects were regularly stated at the suitable moment when individuals were suffering from the aftermath of their excesses; moreover, taverns and pubs were slowly removed from the surrounding area. As the benefits of abstinence and self-restraint became familiar to the inhabitants, drunkenness gradually disappeared. As for quarrels and disputes that could not be resolved by the individuals themselves, Owen would mediate and urge friendship and forgiveness. Divisiveness between religious sects was remedied by discontinuing the preference of one sect over another. Inhabitants were instructed that everyone believes the doctrines that they've been taught, and it's impossible to determine which sect is correct. Owen (Rhys, 1927, 32) explains that children were no longer employed in the mills until they reached the age of 12. Rather than work, these children were instructed in writing, reading, and arithmetic.

Based on his experience transforming New Lanark, Owen (Rhys, 1927, 35) states with conviction that his proposal is not theory or hypothesis and that his philosophical principles are universally applicable. He argues that these principles have the potential to reform even the most savage community and shape the youth of that community in any way that is desired; moreover, he contends that his principles could be applied with more ease on a larger scale. Owen (Rhys, 1927, 37) states plainly that any population that is trained rationally will behave

rationality and that individuals will prefer honest employment over that which is dishonest. He goes on to tell us that it's in the interest of all governments to provide this training and employment. In other words, it's clear from his writings in these essays that Owen's aspirations stretched far beyond New Lanark.

Heilbroner (1953, 110-112) explains that New Lanark was never a mere philanthropic exercise for Owen and that given the success of its transformation, he was determined to use his ideas to benefit the world. He tells us that during a period of economic distress in Britain, Owen proposed an extensive social reorganization around the formation of "Villages of Cooperation" to a committee composed of the Dukes of Kent and York along with a group of notables. Even though the committee ignored Owen's ideas, he inundated Parliament with expositions on his views until in 1819 a committee was formed to raise money for an experimental Village of Cooperation. Owen's views did not receive much support and the necessary money was never procured. Heilbroner (1953, 112-114) explains that Owen—never deterred—sold New Lanark and traveled to America to build his utopia. He bought a tract of land in Indiana and in 1826 made a "Declaration of Mental Independence" from irrational religion, private property, and marriage. Unfortunately, this experiment was not successful. Owen sold New Harmony, returning to England to become involved in the burgeoning trade union movement.

Charles Fourier (1772-1837)

While the theorists examined in this inquiry all display certain eccentric qualities, Fourier is without a doubt the most unusual; however, despite the bizarre elements of his writings, his work has had a significant influence on socialist thought.

Fourier's *The Theory of the Four Movements* [1808] appeared shortly after the French Revolution and it contains an odd assortment of ideas. Gareth Stedman Jones and Ian Patterson edited a republication of this book that was released by Cambridge University Press. Jones and Patterson (1996, vii) provide insightful information regarding Fourier's theories and their lasting influence in the introduction to this work. They explain that Fourier's book contains everything from a critique of the monotony of work and the injustices resulting from free competition to pronouncements about sexual intercourse between planets and prophetic assertions about the Earth's lifespan. Jones and Patterson (1996, x-xi) explain that to many later socialists, Fourier's unusual cosmology was an embarrassment, and they weren't quite sure how to assimilate his work. Engels attempted to fit Fourier's writings into an admissible socialist history by referring to him as a satirist and critic of bourgeois society. Earlier in the 19th century, however, Fourier's direct followers—the Fourierists—viewed him as the founder of socialist theory and a dignified humanitarian.

Jones and Patterson (1996, xii-xiii) explain that Fourier was born in Besançon, France, a region barely influenced by Enlightenment thinking. The Catholic Church employed most of the region's population and therefore had a profound influence on its culture. The oppressive and narrowminded culture of the Church instilled in Fourier a deeply rooted antagonism towards Catholicism; therefore, when Fourier criticized the ideals of the French Revolution it was not due to their condemnation of the Church, but rather for what he saw as flaws in the philosophical and religious alternatives they offered. Fourier's peculiar cosmology can be viewed as an effort to provide such an alternative. Jones and Patterson (1996, xxv-xxvi) argue that while conventional scholarship tends to ascribe the roots of socialism as a distinct ideology to the egalitarian concerns of the French Revolution and social ills stemming from the Industrial Revolution, Fourier's preoccupations were quite different. They go so far as to state that Fourier's socialism can be viewed as an effort to find an alternative to the Christian Church rather than capitalism.

In *The Theory of the Four Movements*, Fourier uses the term "philosopher" in a discernibly contemptuous manner and a cynicism about the ideals of the French Revolution is palpable throughout this work. When Fourier (Jones and Patterson, 1996, 6-7) speaks of philosophers, he clarifies that he means those who engage in the inexact sciences such as moralists, politicians, and economists. He

claims that despite their pretenses, these philosophers support and propagate prejudices; moreover, given their inability to put theory into practice during the French Revolution, their moral and political enlightenment is nothing but an illusion. He claims that the moral and political sciences have been discredited and that a new science is required to alleviate social suffering. Fourier—motivated by social ills such as unemployment, poverty, slavery, and commercial monopolies—asserts that he took it upon himself to discover a new social science. Fourier (Jones and Patterson, 1996, 8) goes on to contend that “Civilization” is merely one phase in the development of society and that it was preceded by three other distinct societal formations. The first form he refers to as Savagery, the second Patriarchate, and the third Barbarism. Therefore, according to Fourier, it follows that the current state of society will give way to subsequent social orders that might be less injurious than Civilization.

Fourier explains that the initial science he uncovered was the “theory of passionate attraction.” He doesn’t seem to explicitly define what he means by passionate attraction in this book, but in the introduction Jones and Patterson (1996, xvii) provide a quotation from his work titled *Le Nouveau Monde Industriel* [1840] in which he describes it as a natural urge that precedes reflection and persists despite the objection of reason, prejudice, duty, etc. Fourier determines that since God allows humans to be much more powerfully influenced by the passions

than reason, passionate attraction must be the most accurate way to elucidate God's vision of social order. This fundamental component of Fourier's vision is an area in which he can be differentiated from Owen and Saint-Simon. Fourier's ideal society—rather than resulting from the human capacity for reason—was oriented around basic human desires and passions.

Fourier (Jones and Patterson, 1996, 15-17) proceeds to argue that his theory of passionate attraction is consistent with geometry and the material attraction explained by Leibniz and Newton. He goes on to theorize that the properties and attractions of minerals, vegetables, and animals might be harmonized on a similar level to those of the stars and man. Moving forward from this notion, Fourier claims to have discovered another science “the analogy of the four movements.” He contends that once he had discovered these two sciences, they allowed him to understand many of the former mysteries of nature. Fourier disparages earlier thinkers for not uncovering these sciences, arguing that the range of his discoveries is less astounding than the stupidity of the scientists who came before him. Fourier's peculiar cosmology is without a doubt difficult to interpret, but it clearly informs the workings of his ideal society.

Notably, Fourier claims that his theory of passionate attraction inevitably leads to “agricultural association.” Fourier (Jones and Patterson, 1996, 10-11) defines agricultural association as a means of organization in which many families

and individuals come together to produce agricultural output. Fourier states that 20 to 40 individuals are hardly sufficient in this form of organization, rather a minimum of 800 are required for what he calls “natural” or “attractive” association. By these expressions, Fourier means a community whose constituents are motivated to labor by self-esteem, competition, and incentives that are consistent with self-interest. Notably, in contrast to many socialist theorists, the desire for wealth played an important role in his utopia. To those who may voice skepticism about the possibility of creating an associative unit composed of many families, Fourier (Jones and Patterson, 1996, 12) explains that the enticement of pleasure and wealth will reconcile varied interests and contrasting desires. He claims that the strongest desire of humanity is the desire for profit and when individuals realize that producing in an associative community yields a much larger profit and varied pleasures, they will move past rivalries and cooperate with one another. He contends that no coercion or laws would be necessary for this associative production to extend everywhere across the globe due to humanity’s powerful urge for pleasure and wealth. Fourier (Jones and Patterson, 1996, 14) states briefly that a given canton cultivated through association is called a “Phalanx”—a term that arises repeatedly throughout his work.

Conclusion

This inquiry has sought to establish that efforts to formulate utopian solutions advanced by Henri de Saint-Simon, Robert Owen, and Charles Fourier need to be reconsidered. In his early work, Saint-Simon divided society into distinct classes and proposed a social order in which savants would be endowed with spiritual power while temporal power would remain in the hands of the propertied class. Class distinction is also apparent in his later work in which he divided society into productive laborers and idlers. Saint-Simon believed that industrial ideas should replace feudal and theological powers following the French Revolution and that government should be limited to preventing productive labor from being obstructed. Owen on the other hand elucidated a social philosophy that was informed by his experience implementing cooperative communities. The basic principle of his philosophy was that humans are shaped by their surroundings, and that they can be radically transformed through education. Owen believed that this principle was universal and that it could be used to build a more cooperative world. In contrast to both Saint-Simon and Owen, Fourier proposed an ideal society that would be oriented around human passions and desires. He claimed that he had discovered sciences that revealed to him the mysteries of nature, and that one of these sciences—his theory of passionate attraction—would inevitably lead to what he called agricultural association. Fourier’s agricultural association can be defined

as a mode of organization in which individuals and families cooperate in agricultural production. The basic unit of his agricultural association can be identified as the Phalanx.

Upon reconsideration, it becomes clear that Saint-Simon, Owen, and Fourier each offered a distinct vision for reorganizing society. While their theories are often lumped together under the moniker of utopian socialism, still their thinking and their proposals diverge along several lines. Fourier's "cosmology" and Saint-Simon's "Religion of Newton" could seem absurd to readers of today; however, what might be considered extreme, utopian thinking is not without certain merits. If nothing else, we can thank the Utopian Socialists for their earnest, their bravery at advancing ideas, their optimism, and their creativity; that today offer insights into the tumultuous time in which these social oriented thinkers lived and advanced their thoughts.

Bibliography

Blaug, Mark. 1986. *Great Economist Before Keynes*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Engels, Friedrich. [1880] 1908. *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Company.

Fourier, Charles. [1808] 1996. *The Theory of the Four Movements*, edited by Jones, Gareth and Patterson, Ian. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Heilbroner, Robert. 1953. *The Worldly Philosophers: The Lives, Times, and Ideas of the Great Economic Thinkers*. New York: Touchstone.

Owen, Robert. *A New View of Society: Or Essays on the Principle of the Formation of the Human Character and the Application of the Principle to Practice*, found in *A New View of Society and Other Writings: Everyman's Library, no. 799*, edited by Rhys, Ernest. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co. Inc., [1813] 1927: pp. 5-90.

Taylor, Keith. 1975. *Henri Saint-Simon: Selected Writings on Science, Industry, and Social Organization*. New York: Routledge.