

Discrit: Season One Atlanta | 2018

Session Seven - Techno-Utopias

D

Index

Looking

Jacolby Satterwhite - 'Reifying Desire 6' (2013)

Mika Rottenberg - Various Works

Caroline Woolard - 'Our Goods'

Courtney Stanton and Darius Kazemi - 'Feel Train'

Various - 'Allied Media Conference'

(Bonus) Janelle Monae - 'Dirty Computer' (2018)

Reading

Frederick Engels - 'The Development of Utopian Socialism'

Sam Wallman - 'If They Could Pay Us Less, They Would'

Erin Duffy - 'Female Entrepreneurship in the Digital Economy: Worker Subjectivities Refracted Through an Instagram Filter'

Discrit: Season One Atlanta | 2018

Looking

Jacolby Satterwhite - 'Reifying Desire 6'

Excerpt from 'Reifying Desire 6' -

<https://bit.ly/2rkrhSb>

Interview - <https://frieze.com/article/body-talk-0>

Mika Rottenberg - Various Works

<https://vimeo.com/79121840>

Caroline Woolard - 'Our Goods'

<http://ourgoods.org>

Courtney Stanton and Darius Kazemi - 'Feel Train'

<https://feeltrain.com/blog/hello-feel-train/>

Various - 'Allied Media Conference'

<https://www.alliedmedia.org/about/story>

Extra Credit -

Janelle Monae - 'Dirty Computer'

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jdH2Sy-BINE>

D

Reading

Frederick Engels -
'The Development of Utopian
Socialism'

Sam Wallman -
'If They Could Pay Us Less, They
Would'

Erin Duffy -
'Female Entrepreneurship in the
Digital Economy: Worker
Subjectivities Refracted Through
an Instagram Filter'

(1:14 to 13:50) - <https://bit.ly/2rnjXEA>

Frederick Engels
Socialism: Utopian and Scientific

I
[The Development of Utopian Socialism]

Modern Socialism is, in its essence, the direct product of the recognition, on the one hand, of the class antagonisms existing in the society of today between proprietors and non-proprietors, between capitalists and wage-workers; on the other hand, of the anarchy existing in production. But, in its theoretical form, modern Socialism originally appears ostensibly as a more logical extension of the principles laid down by the great French philosophers of the 18th century. Like every new theory, modern Socialism had, at first, to connect itself with the intellectual stock-in-trade ready to its hand, however deeply its roots lay in material economic facts.

The great men, who in France prepared men's minds for the coming revolution, were themselves extreme revolutionists. They recognized no external authority of any kind whatever. Religion, natural science, society, political institutions – everything was subjected to the most unsparing criticism: everything must justify its existence before the judgment-seat of reason or give up existence. Reason became the sole measure of everything. It was the time when, as Hegel says, the world stood upon its head [\[1\]](#); first in the sense that the human head, and the principles arrived at by its thought, claimed to be the basis of all human action and association; but by and by, also, in the wider sense that the reality which was in contradiction to these principles had, in fact, to be turned upside down. Every form of society and government then existing, every old traditional notion, was flung into the lumber-room as irrational; the world had hitherto allowed itself to be led solely by prejudices; everything in the past deserved only pity and contempt. Now, for the first time, appeared the light of day, the kingdom of reason; henceforth superstition, injustice, privilege, oppression, were to be superseded by eternal truth, eternal Right, equality based on Nature and the inalienable rights of man.

We know today that this kingdom of reason was nothing more than the idealized kingdom of the bourgeoisie; that this eternal Right found its realization in bourgeois justice; that this equality reduced itself to bourgeois equality before the law; that bourgeois property was

proclaimed as one of the essential rights of man; and that the government of reason, the *Contrat Social* of Rousseau, came into being, and only could come into being, as a democratic bourgeois republic. The great thinkers of the 18th century could, no more than their predecessors, go beyond the limits imposed upon them by their epoch.

But, side by side with the antagonisms of the feudal nobility and the burghers, who claimed to represent all the rest of society, was the general antagonism of exploiters and exploited, of rich idlers and poor workers. It was this very circumstance that made it possible for the representatives of the bourgeoisie to put themselves forward as representing not one special class, but the whole of suffering humanity. Still further. From its origin the bourgeoisie was saddled with its antithesis: capitalists cannot exist without wage-workers, and, in the same proportion as the mediaeval burgher of the guild developed into the modern bourgeois, the guild journeyman and the day-laborer, outside the guilds, developed into the proletarian. And although, upon the whole, the bourgeoisie, in their struggle with the nobility, could claim to represent at the same time the interests of the different working-classes of that period, yet in every great bourgeois movement there were independent outbursts of that class which was the forerunner, more or less developed, of the modern proletariat. For example, at the time of the German Reformation and the Peasants' War, the Anabaptists and [Thomas Münzer](#); in the great English Revolution, the [Levellers](#); in the great French Revolution, [Babeuf](#).

These were theoretical enunciations, corresponding with these revolutionary uprisings of a class not yet developed; in the 16th and 17th centuries, Utopian pictures of ideal social conditions; in the 18th century, actual communistic theories (Morelly and Mably)^[2]. The demand for equality was no longer limited to political rights; it was extended also to the social conditions of individuals. It was not simply class privileges that were to be abolished, but class distinctions themselves. A Communism, ascetic, denouncing all the pleasures of life, Spartan, was the first form of the new teaching. Then came the three great Utopians: [Saint-Simon](#), to whom the middle-class movement, side by side with the proletarian, still had a certain significance; [Fourier](#); and [Owen](#), who in the country where capitalist production was most developed, and under the influence of the antagonisms begotten of this, worked out his proposals for the removal of class distinction systematically and in direct relation to French materialism.

One thing is common to all three. Not one of them appears as a representative of the interests of that proletariat which historical development had, in the meantime, produced. Like the French philosophers, they do not claim to emancipate a particular class to begin with, but all humanity

at once. Like them, they wish to bring in the kingdom of reason and eternal justice, but this kingdom, as they see it, is as far as Heaven from Earth, from that of the French philosophers.

For, to our three social reformers, the bourgeois world, based upon the principles of these philosophers, is quite as irrational and unjust, and, therefore, finds its way to the dust-hole quite as readily as feudalism and all the earlier stages of society. If pure reason and justice have not, hitherto, ruled the world, this has been the case only because men have not rightly understood them. What was wanted was the individual man of genius, who has now arisen and who understands the truth. That he has now arisen, that the truth has now been clearly understood, is not an inevitable event, following of necessity in the chains of historical development, but a mere happy accident. He might just as well have been born 500 years earlier, and might then have spared humanity 500 years of error, strife, and suffering.

We saw how the French philosophers of the 18th century, the forerunners of the Revolution, appealed to reason as the sole judge of all that is. A rational government, rational society, were to be founded; everything that ran counter to eternal reason was to be remorselessly done away with. We saw also that this eternal reason was in reality nothing but the idealized understanding of the 18th century citizen, just then evolving into the bourgeois. The French Revolution had realized this rational society and government.

But the new order of things, rational enough as compared with earlier conditions, turned out to be by no means absolutely rational. The state based upon reason completely collapsed. Rousseau's *Contrat Social* had found its realization in the Reign of Terror, from which the bourgeoisie, who had lost confidence in their own political capacity, had taken refuge first in the corruption of the Directorate, and, finally, under the wing of the Napoleonic despotism. The promised eternal peace was turned into an endless war of conquest. The society based upon reason had fared no better. The antagonism between rich and poor, instead of dissolving into general prosperity, had become intensified by the removal of the guild and other privileges, which had to some extent bridged it over, and by the removal of the charitable institutions of the Church. The "freedom of property" from feudal fetters, now veritably accomplished, turned out to be, for the small capitalists and small proprietors, the freedom to sell their small property, crushed under the overmastering competition of the large capitalists and landlords, to these great lords, and thus, as far as the small capitalists and peasant proprietors were concerned, became "freedom *from* property". The development of industry upon a capitalistic basis made poverty and misery of the working masses conditions of existence of society. Cash payment became more and more, in Carlyle's phrase [See Thomas Carlyle, *Past and Present*, London 1843], the

sole nexus between man and man. The number of crimes increased from year to year. Formerly, the feudal vices had openly stalked about in broad daylight; though not eradicated, they were now at any rate thrust into the background. In their stead, the bourgeois vices, hitherto practiced in secret, began to blossom all the more luxuriantly. Trade became to a greater and greater extent cheating. The “fraternity” of the revolutionary motto was realized in the chicanery and rivalries of the battle of competition. Oppression by force was replaced by corruption; the sword, as the first social lever, by gold. The right of the first night was transferred from the feudal lords to the bourgeois manufacturers. Prostitution increased to an extent never heard of. Marriage itself remained, as before, the legally recognized form, the official cloak of prostitution, and, moreover, was supplemented by rich crops of adultery.

In a word, compared with the splendid promises of the philosophers, the social and political institutions born of the “triumph of reason” were bitterly disappointing caricatures. All that was wanting was the men to formulate this disappointment, and they came with the turn of the century. In 1802, Saint-Simon’s Geneva letters appeared; in 1808 appeared Fourier’s first work, although the groundwork of his theory dated from 1799; on January 1, 1800, Robert Owen undertook the direction of New Lanark.

At this time, however, the capitalist mode of production, and with it the antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, was still very incompletely developed. Modern Industry, which had just arisen in England, was still unknown in France. But Modern Industry develops, on the one hand, the conflicts which make absolutely necessary a revolution in the mode of production, and the doing away with its capitalistic character – conflicts not only between the classes begotten of it, but also between the very productive forces and the forms of exchange created by it. And, on the other hand, it develops, in these very gigantic productive forces, the means of ending these conflicts. If, therefore, about the year 1800, the conflicts arising from the new social order were only just beginning to take shape, this holds still more fully as to the means of ending them. The “have-nothing” masses of Paris, during the Reign of Terror, were able for a moment to gain the mastery, and thus to lead the bourgeois revolution to victory in spite of the bourgeoisie themselves. But, in doing so, they only proved how impossible it was for their domination to last under the conditions then obtaining. The proletariat, which then for the first time evolved itself from these “have-nothing” masses as the nucleus of a new class, as yet quite incapable of independent political action, appeared as an oppressed, suffering order, to whom, in its incapacity to help itself, help could, at best, be brought in from without or down from above.

This historical situation also dominated the founders of Socialism. To the crude conditions of capitalistic production and the crude class conditions correspond crude theories. The solution of the social problems, which as yet lay hidden in undeveloped economic conditions, the Utopians attempted to evolve out of the human brain. Society presented nothing but wrongs; to remove these was the task of reason. It was necessary, then, to discover a new and more perfect system of social order and to impose this upon society from without by propaganda, and, wherever it was possible, by the example of model experiments. These new social systems were foredoomed as Utopian; the more completely they were worked out in detail, the more they could not avoid drifting off into pure phantasies.

These facts once established, we need not dwell a moment longer upon this side of the question, now wholly belonging to the past. We can leave it to the literary small fry to solemnly quibble over these phantasies, which today only make us smile, and to crow over the superiority of their own bald reasoning, as compared with such “insanity”. For ourselves, we delight in the stupendously grand thoughts and germs of thought that everywhere break out through their phantastic covering, and to which these Philistines are blind.

Saint-Simon was a son of the great French Revolution, at the outbreak of which he was not yet 30. The Revolution was the victory of the 3rd estate – i.e., of the great masses of the nation, *working* in production and in trade, over the privileged *idle* classes, the nobles and the priests. But the victory of the 3rd estate soon revealed itself as exclusively the victory of a smaller part of this “estate”, as the conquest of political power by the socially privileged section of it – i.e., the propertied bourgeoisie. And the bourgeoisie had certainly developed rapidly during the Revolution, partly by speculation in the lands of the nobility and of the Church, confiscated and afterwards put up for sale, and partly by frauds upon the nation by means of army contracts. It was the domination of these swindlers that, under the Directorate, brought France to the verge of ruin, and thus gave Napoleon the pretext for his *coup d'état*.



Hence, to Saint-Simon the antagonism between the 3rd Estate and the privileged classes took the form of an antagonism between “workers” and “idlers”. The idlers were not merely the old privileged classes, but also all who, without taking any part in production or distribution, lived

on their incomes. And the workers were not only the wage-workers, but also the manufacturers, the merchants, the bankers. That the idlers had lost the capacity for intellectual leadership and political supremacy had been proved, and was by the Revolution finally settled. That the non-possessing classes had not this capacity seemed to Saint-Simon proved by the experiences of the Reign of Terror. Then, who was to lead and command? According to Saint-Simon, science and industry, both united by a new religious bond, destined to restore that unity of religious ideas which had been lost since the time of the Reformation – a necessarily mystic and rigidly hierarchic “new Christianity”. But science, that was the scholars; and industry, that was, in the first place, the working bourgeois, manufacturers, merchants, bankers. These bourgeois were, certainly, intended by Saint-Simon to transform themselves into a kind of public officials, of social trustees; but they were still to hold, *vis-à-vis* of the workers, a commanding and economically privileged position. The bankers especially were to be called upon to direct the whole of social production by the regulation of credit. This conception was in exact keeping with a time in which Modern Industry in France and, with it, the chasm between bourgeoisie and proletariat was only just coming into existence. But what Saint-Simon especially lays stress upon is this: what interests him first, and above all other things, is the lot of the class that is the most numerous and the most poor (“*la classe la plus nombreuse et la plus pauvre*”).

Already in his Geneva letters, Saint-Simon lays down the proposition that “all men ought to work”. In the same work he recognizes also that the Reign of Terror was the reign of the non-possessing masses.

“See,” says he to them, “what happened in France at the time when your comrades held sway there; they brought about a famine.” [*Lettres d’un habitant de Genève à ses contemporains*, Saint-Simon, 1803]

But to recognize the French Revolution as a class war, and not simply one between nobility and bourgeoisie, but between nobility, bourgeoisie, and the non-possessors, was, in the year 1802, a most pregnant discovery. In 1816, he declares that politics is the science of production, and foretells the complete absorption of politics by economics. The knowledge that economic conditions are the basis of political institutions appears here only in embryo. Yet what is here already very plainly expressed is the idea of the future conversion of political rule over men into an administration of things and a direction of processes of production – that is to say, the “abolition of the state”, about which recently there has been so much noise.

Saint-Simon shows the same superiority over his contemporaries, when in 1814, immediately after the entry of the allies into Paris, and again in 1815, during the Hundred Days’ War, he

proclaims the alliance of France and England, and then of both of these countries, with Germany, as the only guarantee for the prosperous development and peace of Europe. To preach to the French in 1815 an alliance with the victors of Waterloo required as much courage as historical foresight.



If in Saint-Simon we find a comprehensive breadth of view, by virtue of which almost all the ideas of later Socialists that are not strictly economic are found in him in embryo, we find in Fourier a criticism of the existing conditions of society, genuinely French and witty, but not upon that account any the less thorough. Fourier takes the bourgeoisie, their inspired prophets before the Revolution, and their interested eulogists after it, at their own word. He lays bare remorselessly the material and moral misery of the bourgeois world. He confronts it with the earlier philosophers' dazzling promises of a society in which reason alone should

reign, of a civilization in which happiness should be universal, of an illimitable human perfectibility, and with the rose-colored phraseology of the bourgeois ideologists of his time. He points out how everywhere the most pitiful reality corresponds with the most high-sounding phrases, and he overwhelms this hopeless fiasco of phrases with his mordant sarcasm.

Fourier is not only a critic, his imperturbably serene nature makes him a satirist, and assuredly one of the greatest satirists of all time. He depicts, with equal power and charm, the swindling speculations that blossomed out upon the downfall of the Revolution, and the shopkeeping spirit prevalent in, and characteristic of, French commerce at that time. Still more masterly is his criticism of the bourgeois form of the relations between sexes, and the position of woman in bourgeois society. He was the first to declare that in any given society the degree of woman's emancipation is the natural measure of the general emancipation.

But Fourier is at his greatest in his conception of the history of society. He divides its whole course, thus far, into four stages of evolution – savagery, barbarism, the patriarchate, civilization. This last is identical with the so-called civil, or bourgeois, society of today – i.e., with the social order that came in with the 16th century. He proves “that the civilized stage raises every vice practiced by barbarism in a simple fashion into a form of existence, complex, ambiguous, equivocal, hypocritical” – that civilization moves “in a vicious circle”, in

contradictions which it constantly reproduces without being able to solve them; hence it constantly arrives at the very opposite to that which it wants to attain, or pretends to want to attain, so that, e.g., “under civilization poverty is born of superabundance itself”. [*Théorie de l’unité universelle*, Fourier, 1843 and *Le nouveau monde industriel et sociétaire, ou invention du procédé d’industrie attrayante et enaturelle distribuée en séries passionnées*, Fourier, 1845]

Fourier, as we see, uses the dialectic method in the same masterly way as his contemporary, Hegel. Using these same dialectics, he argues against talk about illimitable human perfectibility, that every historical phase has its period of ascent and also its period of descent, and he applies this observation to the future of the whole human race. As Kant introduced into natural science the idea of the ultimate destruction of the Earth, Fourier introduced into historical science that of the ultimate destruction of the human race.

Whilst in France the hurricane of the Revolution swept over the land, in England a quieter, but not on that account less tremendous, revolution was going on. Steam and the new tool-making machinery were transforming manufacture into modern industry, and thus revolutionizing the whole foundation of bourgeois society. The sluggish march of development of the manufacturing period changed into a veritable storm and stress period of production. With constantly increasing swiftness the splitting-up into large capitalists and non-possessing proletarians went on. Between these, instead of the former stable middle-class, an unstable mass of artisans and small shopkeepers, the most fluctuating portion of the population, now led a precarious existence.

The new mode of production was, as yet, only at the beginning of its period of ascent; as yet it was the normal, regular method of production – the only one possible under existing conditions. Nevertheless, even then it was producing crying social abuses – the herding together of a homeless population in the worst quarters of the large towns; the loosening of all traditional moral bonds, of patriarchal subordination, of family relations; overwork, especially of women and children, to a frightful extent; complete demoralization of the working-class, suddenly flung into altogether new conditions, from the country into the town, from agriculture into modern industry, from stable conditions of existence into insecure ones that change from day to day.

At this juncture, there came forward as a reformer a manufacturer 29-years-old – a man of almost sublime, childlike simplicity of character, and at the same time one of the few born leaders of men. Robert Owen had adopted the teaching of the materialistic philosophers: that man's character is the product, on the one hand, of heredity; on the other, of the environment of the individual during his lifetime, and especially during his period of development. In the industrial revolution most of his class saw only chaos and confusion, and the opportunity of fishing in these troubled waters and making large fortunes quickly. He saw in it the opportunity of putting into practice his favorite theory, and so of bringing order out of chaos. He had already tried it with success, as superintendent of more than 500 men in a Manchester factory. From 1800 to 1829, he directed the great cotton mill at New Lanark, in Scotland, as managing partner, along the same lines, but with greater freedom of action and with a success that made him a European reputation. A population, originally consisting of the most diverse and, for the most part, very demoralized elements, a population that gradually grew to 2,500, he turned into a model colony, in which drunkenness, police, magistrates, lawsuits, poor laws, charity, were unknown. And all this simply by placing the people in conditions worthy of human beings, and especially by carefully bringing up the rising generation. He was the founder of infant schools, and introduced them first at New Lanark. At the age of two, the children came to school, where they enjoyed themselves so much that they could scarcely be got home again. Whilst his competitors worked their people 13 or 14 hours a day, in New Lanark the working-day was only 10 and a half hours. When a crisis in cotton stopped work for four months, his workers received their full wages all the time. And with all this the business more than doubled in value, and to the last yielded large profits to its proprietors.



In spite of all this, Owen was not content. The existence which he secured for his workers was, in his eyes, still far from being worthy of human beings. "The people were slaves at my mercy." The relatively favorable conditions in which he had placed them were still far from allowing a rational development of the character and of the intellect in all directions, much less of the free exercise of all their faculties.

“And yet, the working part of this population of 2,500 persons was daily producing as much real

wealth for society as, less than half a century before, it would have required the working part of a population of 600,000 to create. I asked myself, what became of the difference between the wealth consumed by 2,500 persons and that which would have been consumed by 600,000?" [3]

The answer was clear. It had been used to pay the proprietors of the establishment 5 per cent on the capital they had laid out, in addition to over £300,000 clear profit. And that which held for New Lanark held to a still greater extent for all the factories in England.

"If this new wealth had not been created by machinery, imperfectly as it has been applied, the wars of Europe, in opposition to Napoleon, and to support the aristocratic principles of society, could not have been maintained. And yet this new power was the creation of the working-classes."

Note, I. c., p.22.

To them, therefore, the fruits of this new power belonged. The newly-created gigantic productive forces, hitherto used only to enrich individuals and to enslave the masses, offered to Owen the foundations for a reconstruction of society; they were destined, as the common property of all, to be worked for the common good of all.

Owen's communism was based upon this purely business foundation, the outcome, so to say, of commercial calculation. Throughout, it maintained this practical character. Thus, in 1823, Owen proposed the relief of the distress in Ireland by Communist colonies, and drew up complete estimates of costs of founding them, yearly expenditure, and probable revenue. And in his definite plan for the future, the technical working out of details is managed with such practical knowledge – ground plan, front and side and bird's-eye views all included – that the Owen method of social reform once accepted, there is from the practical point of view little to be said against the actual arrangement of details.

His advance in the direction of Communism was the turning-point in Owen's life. As long as he was simply a philanthropist, he was rewarded with nothing but wealth, applause, honor, and glory. He was the most popular man in Europe. Not only men of his own class, but statesmen and princes listened to him approvingly. But when he came out with his Communist theories that was quite another thing. Three great obstacles seemed to him especially to block the path to social reform: private property, religion, the present form of marriage.

He knew what confronted him if he attacked these – outlawry, excommunication from official society, the loss of his whole social position. But nothing of this prevented him from attacking them without fear of consequences, and what he had foreseen happened. Banished from official society, with a conspiracy of silence against him in the press, ruined by his unsuccessful

Communist experiments in America, in which he sacrificed all his fortune, he turned directly to the working-class and continued working in their midst for 30 years. Every social movement, every real advance in England on behalf of the workers links itself on to the name of Robert Owen. He forced through in 1819, after five years' fighting, the first law limiting the hours of labor of women and children in factories. He was president of the first Congress at which all the Trade Unions of England united in a single great trade association. He introduced as transition measures to the complete communistic organization of society, on the one hand, cooperative societies for retail trade and production. These have since that time, at least, given practical proof that the merchant and the manufacturer are socially quite unnecessary. On the other hand, he introduced labor bazaars for the exchange of the products of labor through the medium of labor-notes, whose unit was a single hour of work; institutions necessarily doomed to failure, but completely anticipating Proudhon's bank of exchange of a much later period, and differing entirely from this in that it did not claim to be the panacea for all social ills, but only a first step towards a much more radical revolution of society.

The Utopians' mode of thought has for a long time governed the Socialist ideas of the 19th century, and still governs some of them. Until very recently, all French and English Socialists did homage to it. The earlier German Communism, including that of Weitling, was of the same school. To all these, Socialism is the expression of absolute truth, reason and justice, and has only to be discovered to conquer all the world by virtue of its own power. And as an absolute truth is independent of time, space, and of the historical development of man, it is a mere accident when and where it is discovered. With all this, absolute truth, reason, and justice are different with the founder of each different school. And as each one's special kind of absolute truth, reason, and justice is again conditioned by his subjective understanding, his conditions of existence, the measure of his knowledge and his intellectual training, there is no other ending possible in this conflict of absolute truths than that they shall be mutually exclusive of one another. Hence, from this nothing could come but a kind of eclectic, average Socialism, which, as a matter of fact, has up to the present time dominated the minds of most of the socialist workers in France and England. Hence, a mish-mash allowing of the most manifold shades of opinion: a mish-mash of such critical statements, economic theories, pictures of future society by the founders of different sects, as excite a minimum of opposition; a mish-mash which is the more easily brewed the more definite sharp edges of the individual constituents are rubbed down in the stream of debate, like rounded pebbles in a brook.

To make a science of Socialism, it had first to be placed upon a real basis.

Next: [Dialectics](#)

Notes

1. This is the passage on the French Revolution:

“Thought, the concept of law, all at once made itself felt, and against this the old scaffolding of wrong could make no stand. In this conception of law, therefore, a constitution has now been established, and henceforth everything must be based upon this. Since the Sun had been in the firmament, and the planets circled around him, the sight had never been seen of man standing upon his head – i.e., on the Idea – and building reality after this image. Anaxagoras first said that the **NOUS**, Reason, rules the world; but now, for the first time, had men come to recognize that the Idea must rule the mental reality. And this was a magnificent sunrise. All thinking Beings have participated in celebrating this holy day. A sublime emotion swayed men at that time, an enthusiasm of reason pervaded the world, as if now had come the reconciliation of the Divine Principle with the world.”

[Hegel: “The Philosophy of history”, 1840, p.535]

Is it not high time to set the anti-Socialist law in action against such teachings, subversive and to the common danger, by the late Professor Hegel?

2. Engels refers here to the works of the utopian Socialists Thomas More (16th century) and Tommaso Campanella (17th century). See *Code de la nature*, Morelly, Paris 1841 and *De la législation, ou principe des lois*, Mably, Amsterdam 1776.

3. From *The Revolution in Mind and Practice*, p.21, a memorial addressed to all the “red Republicans, Communists and Socialists of Europe,” and sent to the provisional government of France, 1848, and also “to Queen Victoria and her responsible advisers.”

[Table of Contents](#) | [Utopian Socialism](#) | [Fourier Archive](#)



If They Could Pay Us Less, They Would

The Minimum Wage is Under Attack


by Sam Wallman

Posted May 1st, 2017





THE MINIMUM WAGE HAS BEEN A BASIC SAFETY MECHANISM FOR WORKERS SINCE THE EARLY 1900'S.





THE VERY NOTION OF THE MINIMUM WAGE IS NOW CONTESTED.





-WE COULD VIRTUALLY
WIPE OUT UNEMPLOYMENT
COMPLETELY BECAUSE WE
WOULD BE ABLE TO OFFER
JOBS AT WHATEVER
LEVEL!

AT THE
SAME
TIME...








WE ARE LIVING IN SOME MYTHIC,
SHOWDOWN TIMES.




DEPENDING
ON WHERE
YOU SIT,



A \$15
AN HOUR
MINIMUM
WAGE










IT IS ALSO PRETTY REASONABLE WHEN YOU CONSIDER THAT WEALTH INEQUALITY ON PLANET EARTH IS THE WORST IT HAS EVER BEEN IN HUMAN HISTORY.











**"AFRICANS
WANT TO WORK, &
ITS WORKERS ARE
WILLING TO WORK
FOR LESS THAN
TWO DOLLARS
A DAY."**


**- AUSTRALIAN MINING
TYCOON GINA RINEHART,
WHO EARNS \$2 MILLION
AN HOUR, AND MAKES
MORE IN ONE SECOND
THAN A FULL-TIME
MINIMUM WAGE
WORKER MAKES**

WORKER MAKES
IN A WHOLE WEEK.

THE WEALTHY SEEM TO BELIEVE
THAT WORKERS SEEKING A LIVING
WAGE ARE THE UNREASONABLE ONES.










LIKE EVERYTHING IN THE WORLD,
WHAT YOU THINK OF THE MINIMUM WAGE
DEPENDS ON WHERE YOU SIT AT THE TABLE.





THE MINIMUM WAGE IS INTENDED TO BE AN ASSURANCE OFFERED BY THE GOVERNMENT, THAT THE RATE AT WHICH LABOUR WILL BE EXTRACTED FROM PEOPLE'S BODIES & MINDS

WILL BE COMPENSATED
AT A BASE LEVEL.

IT FORMS PART
OF A KIND OF
SOCIAL CONTRACT
BETWEEN CITIZENS
& THE GOVERNMENT



-WITH THE
GOVERNMENT
PROMISING
THEY WILL
ENSURE THAT
THE RATE OF
EXPLOITATION
DOESN'T GET
TOO BUCK WILD.

IN LOTS OF
COUNTRIES, THE
MINIMUM WAGE
CLICKS INTO
OTHER BASIC
PROTECTIONS
AT WORK:



THE IDEA IS THAT THESE PROTECTIONS FORM A KIND OF FOUNDATION.




TO KEEP IN MIND,
NONE OF THESE PROTECTIONS
WILL KEEP YOU FROM FALLING

FROM THE SKY.

THE THING IS THAT NO
OR SAFETY NETS APPEARED
THIN AIR.

NONE FELL

NONE WERE
PRODUCED
BY THE
MACHINES
THAT WE
OPERATE



NOT ONE OF OUR
CONDITIONS WAS
GIVEN OVER
VOLUNTARILY...

"BY THE
BOSSES OR
LEADERS OF
THE BUSINESS
LOBBY
GROUPS.

THEY
WERE EARNED
BY WORKERS &
THEIR UNIONS

STANDING UP
TO MAKE THINGS
BETTER FOR THE
NEXT GENERATIONS!"


COLIN VERNON,
GEELONG TRADES
HALL, AUSTRALIA.





WE HAVE THESE RIGHTS BECAUSE WE IMAGINED THAT THEY COULD EXIST, AND WE HAD THE PATIENCE & CLARITY TO ORGANISE TOWARD THEM.

"BECAUSE OF THE TENACITY & UNITY OF WORKERS & THEIR STRENGTH REALISED THROUGH UNIONISM."



"- BUT THE VISION AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF OUR FOREBEARS ARE ONLY HELD IN TRUST BY US."

"OUR DUTY IS TO PROTECT
THEM AND CONTINUE
THE FIGHT."

- MATT KUNKEL,
ORGANISER,
VICTORIAN
TRADES HALL,
AUSTRALIA.

THROUGHOUT
HISTORY,
PEOPLE HAVE
BEEN KILLED
FIGHTING FOR
SUCH WAGE
RISES.







one of 66 striking coal mine workers and
their family members killed in Ludlow,
Colorado, in 1914.


AND PEOPLE
ARE STILL
DYING FOR
THESE RIGHTS
TODAY.




Héctor Martínez Motiño,


President of Workers of the National Autonomous University of Honduras. murdered in June 2015






THERE ARE CLUES
ABOUT TOMORROW.
THERE ARE TEA
LEAVES TO BE READ.







WHERE
YOU CAN
POST A
JOB AD



AND WATCH PEOPLE
UNDER-BID ONE
ANOTHER.

THE PERSON
WILLING TO
DO THE WORK




FOR THE
LEAST
AMOUNT
OF MONEY


GETS THE GIG.



WE SEE HYPER-CASUALISATION
SWEEPING ACROSS THE
INDUSTRIALISED WORLD

PRECARIOUS WORK






MILLIONS OF PEOPLE AROUND THE WORLD






WAKE UP
EACH MORNING

& CHECK
THEIR
PHONE
FOR A
TEXT



TELLING THEM WHETHER
OR NOT THEY HAVE A
SHIFT THAT DAY.

THIS IS THE
MODERN
EQUIVALENT



OF LINING UP ON THE
DOCKS



HOPING TO BE
CHOSEN AS ONE
OF THAT DAY'S
WORKERS.





NOT ONLY IS IT HARD TO PLAN
YOUR FUTURE WHEN YOUR INCOME
IS UNRELIABLE - IT IS ALSO MUCH
MORE DIFFICULT TO UNIONISE AND
FIGHT FOR A BETTER WORKPLACE
WHEN YOU HAVE NO JOB SECURITY.


AND BOSSES
KNOW IT.

"CASUAL WORK IS JUST SO FLEXIBLE!"






ON THE FLIP SIDE,



POSITIVE THINGS
THAT WERE PREVIOUSLY
UNIMAGINABLE.

...PLE




HAVE ALSO
COME INTO
VIEW




IN RECENT YEARS











THE MINIMUM WAGE IS OF COURSE, NOT A LIBERATORY MECHANISM-





IT CAN OFFER
STILL WORTH FIGHTING FOR.


SO TOO ARE CAMPAIGNS & SOCIAL MOVEMENTS THAT GO ABOVE & BEYOND A MINIMUM WAGE.





IF WE RIGHT

IF WE FIGHT
COLLECTIVELY...



...WE COULD ALSO
MAKE THE FACT
THAT ROBOTS ARE
STEALING OUR JOBS...


... SOMETHING TO
CELEBRATE...



... RATHER
THAN
MOURN.

WHEN THE

WHEN THE
INDUSTRIAL
REVOLUTION BEGAN IN
THE LATE 1700'S,



WE WERE TOLD
WE WOULD ALL
SHARE IN THE
SPOILS OF THE
MECHANISED
WORLD -

THAT WE WOULD
ALL HAVE TO WORK
LESS.



IT IS WITH THIS IN
MIND THAT SOME
PEOPLE ARE TODAY
FIGHTING FOR A 4
DAY WORK WEEK.







PEOPLES UNCONDITIONAL
RIGHT TO "LIFE, LIBERTY,
AND THE PURSUIT OF
HAPPINESS."


-FRANCES
COPPOLA,
ECONOMIST

"IF WE
WERE FREE
FROM THE VAMPIRE
THAT SUCKS AWAY
OUR TIME & STEALS
OUR DIGNITY,
WE COULD WALK
TALL AND FEEL
PROUD OF OUR
WORK-

AND
FEEL PROUD
THAT WE
CONTROL
OUR OWN
DESTINIES"

-TIM NELTHORPE,
FARM WORKER
UNION ORGANISER


AFTERALL,




PEOPLE CARRYING OUT
THEIR WORK HAS NOT
ALWAYS FELT LIKE THIS.












IF PREVIOUSLY
UNIMAGINABLE
THINGS CAN
BECOME OUR
REALITY...



THEN
MAYBE
ANYTHING
IS POSSIBLE
FOR US
WORKERS
TOO.


RUMBLE



OF WHOM
THERE ARE
SO MANY,




WHO JUST
MIGHT BE
ABLE TO
WRITE THE
FUTURE



WITH OUR
OWN PENS,

NOW THAT
EVERYTHING
IS BEING
UNWRITTEN.



Rise and Shine.
The World is Doomed.
The Nib, delivered to your inbox every AM.


Email address

Sign Up

France's Election Might Decide the Fate of Europe


by Virginie Le Borgne and Ghadi Ghosn

Posted April 28th, 2017






ITS OUTCOME COULD DECIDE THE FATE OF EUROPE



THE TWO CANDIDATES ARE THE CENTRIST, EMMANUEL MACRON AND THE FAR-RIGHT CANDIDATE MARINE LE PEN.
NEITHER IS FROM THE TWO MAINSTREAM PARTIES THAT HAVE DOMINATED FRENCH POLITICS FOR DECADES, -A POLITICAL EARTHQUAKE.

A WEALTHY INVESTMENT BANKER
FORMER ECONOMY MINISTER



READ MORE

STICK IT TO HIM

