A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF TWO 'SOCIALIST' UTOPIAS: *LOOKING BACKWARD* AND *NEWS FROM NOWHERE*


A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY


BY


YASEMİN KOÇ


IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION


JULY 2008

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

_____

Prof. Dr. Raşit Kaya
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

_____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Cem Deveci
Supervisor

**Examining Committee Members**

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Cem Deveci        (METU, ADM)        _____
Assist. Prof. Dr. Kürşad Ertuğrul  (METU, ADM)        _____
Assist. Prof. Dr. Barış Parkan     (METU, PHIL)       _____

**I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.**

Name, Last name :
Signature         :

# ABSTRACT

A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF TWO 'SOCIALIST' UTOPIAS: *LOOKING BACKWARD* AND *NEWS FROM NOWHERE*

Koç, Yasemin

MS., Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Cem Deveci

July 2008,  165 Pages

This study examines two 'socialist' utopias of the late 19th century: W. Morris's *News from Nowhere* and E. Bellamy's *Looking Backward.* The major concern is to question the validity of title 'socialist' for these two texts. The reference points for such an analysis are: modernity, Marxism of the late 19th century and the practice of discipline. In this context, the intention is to find out ruptures and continuities with respect to the central ideas of socialism and basic premises of modernity. The study explorates that there are serious points of rupture in these two texts with respect to the major premises of modernity, because in Morris's utopia there is a romantic search for restoring communism of the 14th century, in Bellamy's text there are typical reactionary modernist suggestions concerning the nature of typical socialist societies. In that sense, due to the disassociation between socialism and modernity in these two texts, it is very problematic to classify these utopias as socialist. The study also questions whether the sources of such disassociation are embedded in Marxism itself. In response to such question, the study argues that this is the case to a great extent.

Keywords: Socialist utopias of the 19th century, William Morris, Edward Bellamy, *News from Nowhere*, *Looking Backward*

# ÖZ

## İKİ 'SOSYALİST' ÜTOPYANIN ELEŞTİREL BİR İNCELEMESİ: *GERİYE BAKIŞ* VE *HİÇBİRYERDEN HABERLER*

Koç, Yasemin

Yüksek Lisans, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Cem Deveci

Temmuz 2008,  165 Sayfa

Bu çalışma, geç 19. yüzyılın iki 'sosyalist' ütopyasını (W. Morris'in *Hiçbiryerden Haberler*'i ve E. Bellamy'nin *Geriye Bakış*'ını) incelemektedir. Temel kaygı, metinler için 'sosyalist' etiketinin geçerliliğini sorgulamaktır. Böyle bir analizin referans noktaları: modernite, geç 19.yy Marksizmi ve disiplin pratikleridir. Bu bağlamda, amaç, sosyalizmin merkezi fikirlerine ve modernitenin temel önermelerine göre kopuşları ve süreklilikleri ortaya koymaktır. Çalışma, iki metinde de modernitenin temel önermelerinden ciddi kopuş noktaları olduğunu ortaya çıkarmıştır, çünkü Morris'in ütopyasında 14. yüzyılın komünizmini kurmaya yönelik romantik bir arayış varken, Bellamy'nin metninde tipik sosyalist toplumların doğasına yönelik tipik reaksiyonel modern öneriler bulunmaktadır. Bu durumda, iki metindeki sosyalizm ve modernite arasındaki uyumsuzluk nedeniyle, bu ütopyaları sosyalist olarak sınıflandırmak oldukça sorunludur. Çalışma aynı zamanda böyle bir uyumsuzluğun Marksizmin kendisinden kaynaklanıp kaynaklanmadığını de sorgulamaktadır. Bu soruya cevap olarak, çalışma, uyumsuzluğun kaynağının büyük ölçüde Marksizmin kendisinden kaynaklandığını öne sürmektedir.


Anahtar Kelimeler: 19.yy sosyalist ütopyaları, William Morris, Edward Bellamy, *Hiçbiryerden Haberler*, *Geriye Bakış*

To My Mother

# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Cem Deveci who guided me throughout my thesis and helped me to clarify my mind. By the help of his creative and insightful advices I could shape my ideas and thesis. I am very grateful to him and feel lucky to be one of his students during this stressful and tiresome process. I would like to add that he has not guided me only during the thesis writing process, but he has been an inspiration for me throughout my undergraduate degree. I would like to express my heartful thanks to him for leading me to think analytically and critically.

I would also like to express my gratefulness to Pınar Sayan who has been with me for 13 years and who helped me to ease my mind while I was confused and depressed while writing my thesis. I would also thank her for her valuable advices to shape my thesis, the brain-storming was the best. Her greatest contribution has always been emotional, thank you for being there all the time and thank you for letting me know that you will always be by my side.

And I am thankful to my sister Pelin and all my friends who never gave up supporting me and who have always helped me to cheer up in this process. Finally, I am grateful to my grandfather who had passed away 5 years ago, without his guidance during my childhood and teens I would never achieve what I have achieved up to now. I would like to thank him for introducing me with his great books and theories and growing me up with them. I wish he could read this thesis.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# CHAPTER I

# INTRODUCTION

*A map of the world that does not include Utopia is not worth even glancing at, for it leaves out the one country at which Humanity is always landing. And when Humanity lands there, it looks out, and, seeing a better country, sets sail. Progress is the realisation of Utopias.*

O.Wilde

*The Soul of Man Under Socialism*

The literary utopian tradition[1] is composed of different genres such as; classical, early modern, modern, socialist, anti-utopian and dystopian. The major works can be listed as: *The Republic* of Plato, *Utopia* of T. More, *City of the Sun* of Campanella, *New Atlantis* of Bacon, *Oceana* of Herrington, *Walden Two* of Skinner, *Christianapolis* of Andreae, various works of H. G. Wells, *The Coming Race* of Bulwer-Lytton, *1984* of G. Orwell, *A Brave New World* of A. Huxley, and *We* of Zamiatin. In all of these works, reflections and impacts of different ideologies and world-views can be found. Thus, it is plausible to claim that utopia has been an attractive form of culture for different ideologies and world-views throughout the course of history. In that sense, I would like to focus on the appropriation of the form of utopia by socialism. In this study, I would like to concentrate on the 'socialist utopias' of the late 19th century.

---

[1] Yalçınkaya (2004: 3) states that the concept 'utopia' is used in four different senses. The first one refers to a literary genre (utopian genre), the second one refers to a theoretical perspective (utopian theory), and the third one refers to an approach (utopian approach). The final one refers to the daily usage of the term; all dreams and plans which are impossible to be realized in the daily lives of individuals. I refer to the 'utopian genre' with the terms utopia and utopianism in that sense in this study.

At that point, I would like to mention the fact that I will refrain myself from examining the 'Utopian Socialism', I will not study the works of Owen, St. Simon and Fourier. I will neither analyse the 'utopia' formulation of the Frankfurt School, which was studied alongside with the notion of ideology formulated by E. Bloch, W. Benjamin and K. Mannheim. I will also exclude the 'utopian communities' established in the USA. In addition, other literary utopias-early modern utopias, anti-utopias, dystopias feminist utopias, technological utopias, ecological utopias, and city utopias-will be out of the scope of my thesis.

Thus, I will elaborate two utopian texts in detail; *"News from Nowhere"* (1890) by British author William Morris and *"Looking Backward"* (1887) by American author Edward Bellamy. These two texts have major importance because of the genre that they represent. I have chosen these two texts as they represent what is called the 'socialist utopian' tradition of the 19th century. They also stand in between two utopian genres; modern utopias with the notion of progress and anti-utopias with the message of the 'future as nightmare' as a result of scientific and technological progress. In that respect my major question will be: "is it possible to talk about a distinct utopian genre of 'socialist utopias'?" My main attempt is to find out, by examining and comparing these texts, the main reason that led these authors to formulate socialism in the form of utopia just after Marx and Engels had published their thesis of 'scientific socialism' as distinct from 'utopian socialism' in 1880.

I will try to find out the basic intention of these authors deriving from these texts: whether this can be a rupture from the 'historicism' of Marxism, or did these authors feel the lack of a description concerning the aftermath of revolution or were these works formulated as attempts to make socialism appealing to public in a literary form? While trying to find answers to these questions, I will also try to explorate certain inconsistencies resulting from the authors' attempts to employ socialist ideals in the form of utopia. As I will try to demonstrate, at least in the case of these two texts, the idea of socialism and utopian construction do not fuse into each other so easily.

In order to find out possible answers to these questions, I will examine the texts with respect to their designs concerning: the nature of labour (if there is any), the design of city and country, the relation with nature, the role of education, daily lives of inhabitants (language, way of dressing, shopping, degree of crime etc.), notion of freedom, the composition of society (whether there are classes or not), perception of history, art, nature of property, role of law, judiciary, legislative and executive, status of women, role and nature of politics, nature of economy, nature of government (if there is any), notion of nation, role of military, and science and technology (if there is any). To sum up, these texts will be examined comparatively with respect to the options of 'evolution and revolution', 'pastoral life and mechanical life' and 'modernity and socialism'.

I argue that in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, socialists began to appreciate the form of utopia. My main purpose is to find out the basic reasons that brought socialism and literary utopia tradition together. I will also try to

find possible incompabilites between the literary utopian tradition and the ideal of socialism cultivated by the socialist tradition that result from the lack of a clear picture of the aftermath of the revolution. In that sense, I will also examine and compare these two texts as the representatives of the 19th century socialist utopias, with respect to their notions of transition to a utopian order, the regulation of daily lives in these utopias and the perception of socialism and modernity. When necessary I will refer to certain notions of Marx and Engels in order to find out the main points that made utopias attractive for these two 'socialists' as texts of political theory.

The main plot of these texts should be summarized in order to provide a general picture of these notions mentioned above. In the *News from Nowhere,* the narrator falls asleep and wakes up to a London in the future (21st century) and observes changes that have taken place after the Revolution. The first thing he realizes is the happiness of the people, then he notices the lack of buildings, this is because nature is important for the inhabitants and their daily lives are regulated according to these codes. Another thing he finds interesting is the nature of work and the fact that labour is not based on wages. Workers are not paid in return for their services, there is no money, each and every citizen is labourer, everyone is working, there are no class divisions, there are common workshops instead of large-scale factories, and there is no private property ownership. In addition, there is no trade, no market economy: this is the 'society of equals'. Also, there is no politics in the sense of state and administration as there is no parliament, no nation, and no ruling class. Instead, there is governing of people and 'communism'. There is also no school, no

education, but there are books for those who would like to read by their own consent, it is not compulsory to be educated. There is also no belief in history, that is to say, history of the country/nation is not known by inhabitants. Also, nothing is forbidden, for instance there is tobacco and alcohol and everyone can use them. There are museums and also, there is respect for art. There is no judiciary and laws as there is no crime. With respect to the administration, there is no centralization as all country is regarded as everyone's 'land'. Also, women are emancipated alongside with men. These people do not believe that there is a 'fixed' human nature to destroy or disturb the established order.

*Looking Backward* begins with a narrator who wakes up in the future too, but this work is very much different from *News from Nowhere* on its reflection and appropriation of 'socialism'. This time, the interlocutor gives a general picture of the 19th century's US in the beginning and then falls asleep and wakes up in Boston in the year 2000. The text is generally based on dialogues as reflecting the tradition of Plato. The first issue considered in the text is the 'labour problem'. It is stated that it has evolved as a result of the industrial conflicts within the society and has been resolved on its own. This has been realized through a process carried out at the national level. The nation has been transformed into a monopolistic capitalist and this has been realized peacefully in an evolutionary way. In this utopian society, there is no war, also no military power, there are also no political parties and politicians. Nation has become employer and all citizens have become its employees according to the needs of industry and their abilities. There is a quota system for citizens to participate in the labouring process. All nation is organized in the form of the

'Industrial Army'. There is education and not all employees are manual workers, but some are intellectual labourers. There is no free market economy, there is the central-national distribution of goods based on credit system, and there is no money. There are also art, music and literature as important parts of daily lives. Also women are emancipated, for instance house work has been carried out in public centres and women participate in the daily public life with men on equal basis. This model of state is not only realised in the US but in some other (Western) countries as well, in that sense there is an 'eternal peace' among those nations. There is private sphere with respect to houses and the family system. Even if there are no politicians, there is the President of the US or the General of the Industrial Army of workers. He rises among the workers, he does not belong to a different class as there is none. However, there is division among the workers based on their experience and education. There is crime and thus there are courts and also punishments. There is judiciary, but there is no legislation. In addition, this society is marked by large-scale use of technology and is based on industrialization.

As I will analyse and compare these two texts, *News from Nowhere* and *Looking Backward,* I will adopt an 'interpretative-textual' method for my thesis. These texts will be analysed with reference to the theory of socialism and modernity as they are regarded as the main examples of the 19th century 'socialist utopias'. As the two works are literary forms of art, I would like to mention that I will not examine them as novels, but as the texts of political theory. Thus, my analysis will focus on the political characters and notions reflected in these texts, specifically it will be carried out on socialism. In that

sense my basic question will aim to find out the reasons that made utopia appealing for socialism and also I will try to find out the possible reasons that led these two authors writing socialist utopias right after Marx and Engels had distinguished their theory ('scientific socialism' as they call it) from the so-called 'utopian socialism' as they name it. Perhaps, more importantly, I will try to find out the validity of the label 'socialist' for those utopias. As it has been indicated, these utopias are regarded as the representatives of modern socialist utopias. However, as I examine these texts in detail and write on them, I doubted both their socialist and modern features. At that point I would like to mention that I use the term 'modernity' in order to refer to "socio-economic transformation of Europe and the world following the Industrial Revolution of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the birth of democracy in the wake of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution of 1789, and the subsequent globalization of capitalism" (Antliff: 2002: 148). In that sense, I have argued in my thesis that Morris's *Nowhere* is more of a 'romantic communist' utopia rather than socialist and Bellamy's text is 'reactionary modern' with fascistic features. In that sense, I want to argue that these anti-modernist features in these 'socialist' utopias may be an inherent problem of socialism itself. That is to say, a socialist vision of the future may not be compatible with the basic premises of modernity and this may be a source of tension in the tradition of socialism itself rather than the utopias under consideration.

As it has been denoted, with the term 'socialism' as a political theory I refer mainly to the works of Marx and Engels. Within this context, in relation to the anti-modernist features detected in the utopias of Morris and Bellamy, I

would like to argue that these features stem from certain weaknesses within the Marxist theory of socialism itself. Perhaps, in relation to a vision of a communist and/or socialist society, Marxism too includes certain anti-modern as well as pre-modern features. As it will be explored in the thesis, even though Marx and Engels claim that they do not and will not describe a society after the revolution, there are some hints about a possible future communist and/or socialist society. One may argue that ideal society of socialism may well cultivate certain degree of anti-modernism and even conservatism. In that sense, while examining the two utopias in relation to socialism and modernity, the problems coming from Marxism will also be discussed.

The thesis consists of four main chapters. In the second chapter, I will base my analysis on the notion of change that created societies designed in these utopias. That is to say, I will argue that evolution (Bellamy) and revolution (Morris) determine the underlying political, economic and administrative structures in these utopias. In that way I will try to pinpoint their correspondence with socialist political theory. Basically, I will pose to these texts the following questions: "what are the basic principles of administrative organization?", "what is the role and relevance of politics and state?" and "how economic affairs are organized?" While revealing their relevance with socialist political theory, I will also try to find out the validity of calling these utopias 'socialist' based on these elements designed in these two works. This scepticism is important because, it may show the relation of these texts with modernity as well as Bellamy's and Morris's perception of the relation

between modernity and socialism in formulating their utopias in opposition to the 19<sup>th</sup> century's capitalism.

In the third chapter, I will focus on the lives of individuals in these utopias. I will ask the texts about the basic elements organizing daily lives of inhabitants, their relation with nature, the degree of urbanization, the notion of art and culture as well as history and use of technology and science. After providing answers to these questions, I will compare the two texts in terms of answers derived from the texts themselves as well as with socialism's definitions of and perception to these notions.

In the final chapter, I will examine these texts with respect to socialism of Marx and Engels. In that sense I will employ the themes of 'modernity', 'change and progress' and 'order and discipline'. The intention will be to determine the consistency of these texts with the basic premises of modernity. In other words, I will try to detect certain anti-modern premises in both of the utopias and I will argue that these premises move these utopias away from socialism. It should also be emphasized that the anti-modernist tendencies in these texts are disturbing because of the assumption of socialism. I want to argue that being anti-modern has been a price for these utopias in their attempts to envision socialist societies. This final chapter will also reveal whether these texts can be labeled as 'socialist' or not. In that sense, the analysis carried out in the previous chapters will also be re-considered. Thus, an overall picture about the relation between socialism and these utopian texts will be presented.

# CHAPTER II

# EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION AS DETERMINANTS OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND ECONOMIC STRUCTURES IN THE UTOPIAN TEXTS OF MORRIS AND BELLAMY

Morris and Bellamy design two distinct utopian societies and locate them into the future. These utopian societies are established following certain patterns of change and transition. In that sense, both Morris and Bellamy see the roots of change in the society of the 19$^{th}$ century under capitalism. However, these authors differ in their suggested patterns of change. In *Nowhere*, Morris suggests a revolution to abolish all structures and institutions of the previous centuries. On the other hand, in *Looking Backward*, Bellamy is in favour of an evolution which is assumed to cure the negative impacts of capitalism but not capitalism *per se*. Thus, in this chapter, I will argue that 'Revolution' in Morris's utopian text and 'Evolution' in Bellamy's utopian society determine the administrative and economic structures, as well as institutions, in the two utopias.

## 2.1. The 'Revolution' and *News from Nowhere*

### 2.1.1. The Main Patterns of Change

The term 'revolution' appears in the very beginning of Morris's work; when the interlocutur (William or Guest) expresses his desire to know about

new society after the Revolution (Morris: 1995: 3). He is eager to find out newly established society's features and what matters to him at that point is to see the main changes that have taken place. From the beginning, the text signals that the interlocutor would like to experience a 'communist' society established through a revolution[2]. In this chapter, I argue that administrative, social and economic structures designed in Morris's utopia are resulted from the process and moment of the Revolution. In addition, I will try to show that what Morris tries to do is to offer an alternative to the situation of the 19th century and a change having roots in this society. While telling about the Revolution and changes following it, Morris uses a dialectical method, thus most of the information is provided in the form of a dialogue between William (Guest as they call him) and Hammond (the grandfather of the Waterman who provides information on this new society).

When William wants to know about the patterns of change, Hammond tells him that it resulted from widespread misery and alienation. Hammond also tells that it was not easy and was a long and violent process. It was realized through a civil war which is regarded as a "terrible period of transition from commercial slavery to freedom" (1995: 109). Thus, the transition was not peaceful. As William wonders, we may also would like to know the reasons that made this 'terrible period' persist until it ended up with a great rupture. As a response to that, firstly, Hammond states that it was the 'hope' that made

---

[2] With respect to the Revolution in Morris's utopia, Beaumont (2006: 199) argues that new society does not represent a total break from the old older but based on development of its failures. He is mistaken because, he only focuses on the evolutionary stage. In fact, in Morris's utopia, there are two stages; an evolution followed by a revolution. As Breton (2002: 53) claims, Morris accepts gradual development together with revolution and also Kinna (2000: 507) underlines the two staged revolution. And as Berneri (1969: 256) argues, in Morris's account, it is not possible to create a new system through an evolution, but it could only be created by a desire of freedom through a revolution.

11

people insist for change; a hope for a better world[3] (1995: 109). Thus, during the process of change the main motive was 'hope' for a better life and a 'utopian longing' for communism. Transition was not peaceful, the oppressed or enslaved class sought for war for the sake of 'eternal peace' (1995: 111). Secondly, Hammond claims that the other motives were the desires for equality, freedom and a realisation of a communal life for all (1995: 109-110).

In Morris's utopia, this period of 'civil war' was a transition from capitalism to communism with social democracy or state socialism in between. The intention was not only to fight against the inhumane conditions, but the very existence of capitalism itself (1995: 112). In addition, this struggle was fed by rapidly spreading ideas of communism and socialism (1995: 114). The first spark came from socialists. It can be claimed that Morris uses socialism as a transition to communism rather than the end. Socialism was adopted as a step towards equality and as a temporary solution. In his utopia, Morris regards socialism as 'unpractical' because, all machinery was in the hands of people who did not know what to do with them. It was believed that although the main purpose was to improve conditions of the labouring class (1995: 113), this would bring equality for whole society. However, Hammond argues that as those workers did not know what they were doing, the two layered structure of society remained by creating new poor classes. Thus, the condition of 'State Socialism' or the 'state ownership of means of production' made situation even worse for all, even for those who had gained the upper hand (1995: 111). So,

---

[3] The Revolution is guided by a hope for a better world and this hope is the basis of any utopian society as Bloch (1986: 5) argues "as long as man is in a bad way, both private and public existence are pervaded by daydreams; dreams of a better life than that which has so far been given him". He also claims that these dreams could be actualized by hope.

the oppressed classes, with the influences of socialists, established the 'dictatorship of proletariat' and acquired the ownership of the means of production. On the one hand, in *Nowhere,* there is 'state socialism', and on the other hand capitalism. It was believed that through an evolutionary process, in time, socialism would dissolve capitalism and state would 'wither away'. This 'prophecy' was not realized in Morris's utopia and it is claimed that this is because, proletariat did not know what to do when they gained the upper hand. It is claimed that the only positive outcome of this situation was the increased organisational abilities of workers. The workers established the Federation of Workers. Morris rightfully criticizes the lack of knowledge and skill of proletariat in his utopia after they took the power, but he does not mention the real problem. Firstly, the idea of change came from socialists (who I assume were the intellectuals), but they only told workers what they should do to change their situations. There is a step missing here, workers were not informed about the full process, they were not educated and there was no process of consciousness rising. Workers were only told that they were oppressed, but they already knew that. In addition, state socialism was tried to be realized while keeping capitalist relations. Even though workers knew what to do with their new power, capitalism would always put barriers on them. Therefore, situation got even worse because of the ill-organization of new system.

So, the Federation of Workers (Combined Workers) felt a need to get out of this situation. Hammond gives us a clue about the organisation of this Union. All federations were voting universally to decide what they would do

13

next, and at that point Morris seems to be introducing workplace and internal democracy into his utopian system. The Federation decided to establish the dictatorship of proletariat and take over all means of production and governing machinery: the period of 'Resolution'. However, this time process was not gradual and peaceful, but it was a violent war to bring the rapid change for desired conditions of life (1995: 114). The discontent continued until the final victory-the sharper and shorter remedy: Revolution or 'Great Change' or 'Equality of Life'. As a result of these civil wars, there have been peace and a general prosperity supported with freedom and equality. Therefore, the old order has been abolished and a structuring of a new society began (1995: 134). Thus, the Revolution took place in an evolutionary way at the beginning, and then as soon as the perfect conditions are achieved, the moment of the Revolution was realised (1995: 109). Then, the construction of a new world began, and this new world had been a total reversal of the old order. In this structuring process, commercialism and capitalism have been abolished in order to build desired conditions. Thus, it was aimed that the whole of the old structure would be leveled down to zero in order to re-build it and Hammond regards this as a 'second birth' (1995: 135). This 'leveling down to zero' sounds problematic, is it really necessary to destroy all outcomes of modernity together with capitalism, is there no positive outcomes to be kept? Is the Revolution directed against capitalism or modernity? At that point, the theory of revolution in Marxism should be mentioned in order to show that Morris's suggested 'leveling down' is very problematic even though his suggested path of Revolution is in line with Marx's socialist principles. Marx argues that:

In the development of productive forces there comes a stage when productive forces and means of intercourse are brought into being. The conditions under which definite productive forces can be applied are the conditions of the rule of a definite class of society, whose social power, deriving from its property, has its practical-idealistic expression in each case in the form of the state, and therefore, every revolutionary struggle is directed against a class which till then has been in power. Communist revolution is directed against the hitherto existing mode of activity, does away with labour, and abolishes the rule of all classes with the classes themselves. (Marx&Engels: 1998: 60)

In addition, Marx and Engels argue that "communist revolution removes division of labour, ultimately abolishes political institutions; guided by the productive forces" (1998: 403). Thus, Marx and Engels do not suggest the destruction of all the outcomes of modernity and even capitalism. I would like to argue that they claim that through revolution the labouring patterns under capitalism will be abolished together with private property and classes as well as state and government. So, the central problem of Marxism is the negative outcomes created by capitalism and the revolution is suggested to cure them.

## 2.1.2. The Abolishment of Private Property and Its Outcomes

The most important element or step in this re-construction process in Morris's utopia is the 'abolishment of private property', and this has direct implications on both administrative regulations and economic structure. With the abolishment of private property, poverty ended. Because, poverty was the product of class division; some were rich at the expense of others. Now, as there is no private property and wealth distinction, general poverty left its place to general wealth. Before the abolishment of private property, it is claimed that government was on the side of rich, and making them even richer at the

15

expense of poor by protecting rich from every possible interference. Hence, in the old system the wider part of society remained poor. Hammond regards this as tyranny of government, and government as a machinery putting hindrances on freedom and equality. As there is no government in this new system, people can be regarded as free and equal. The present system seems to be anarchy[4] as the necessity of political power and state are rejected but Hammond will make it clear that it is a communist society when he is talking about management of affairs (Morris: 1995: 81). While talking about love and marriage, the issue comes to 'divorce courts' and William learns that these courts have disappeared. Furthermore, Hammond states that the reason for existence of such courts was private property and regulating the way it could be shared. In the new society, private property has been abolished, thus courts have dissolved themselves as they are not used anymore. Consequently, in line with private property, 'sacred rights of property' were abolished and this led to the abolishment of courts or judiciary dealing with property quarrels (1995: 59). In addition, crimes ended to a certain extent and penal laws have disappeared since inhabitants of this utopian society did not need those laws anymore; "Thou shalt not steal had to be translated into, Thou shalt work in order to live happily" (1995: 83). William thinks that a society should be protected by punishment or fear of punishment. At that point Hammond refutes him by claiming that in this new society everyone regards each other as friend and they

---

[4] As there is no government in the Morris's utopia, with a superficial perspective Kateb (1963: 70) regards this system as 'democratic anarchy' and Roche (1995) states that system is closer to anarchism rather than socialism. However, as Mummford (1962: 183) mentions there is no 'political government', but there are mechanisms for arrangement and regulation thus a kind of an authority. As Osgood (1889: 1) states "the anarchist would banish all forms of authority and have only a system of the most perfect liberty".

do not need any fear or punishment to live in peace. It may be claimed that equal conditions created by the abolishment of private property have ended hatred and envy, and made each inhabitant to regard others as friends and neighbours and helped them to be in peaceful relationship with each other (1995: 84). Concerning punishment, Hammond also claims that it is not a useful method at all. First of all, it fosters anger of criminal and after paying his dues he may feel himself free to go out and commit a crime again. Thus, this is not a cure but only a temporary solution without any benefit to society and person who commits crime (1995: 85). Hammond claims that crime was a result of a class society with a state working for benefits of the rich classes. Yet, in new system there is no private property creating different classes and differences in wealth. Moreover, as there is no state favouring certain segment of society, crime has disappeared to a certain extent. Without any crime to be punished, William thinks that there would be no need for laws and Hammond verifies him by stating that civil and penal laws have disappeared in time. With the abolishment of private property, crime disappeared and courts and laws to protect property and punish crimes have withered away. In addition, it is claimed that besides inequalities in wealth, 'satisfaction of natural desires' (1995: 83) could not be realized in the old system, and the result was violence. With the 'sexual liberation' of women, this situation also ended. In addition, there are neither prisons nor prisoners and inhabitants of utopian society regard prisons as 'occasional man-slaying' (1995: 46).

The conversation about laws brings in the laws of economy into the discussion. William wants to learn about regulations of exchange, because, he

has been surprised many times as he found out that money is not used in new society. First of all, in the beginning of his first day, William wants to pay to waterman for his 'service', but he can not decide what amount to pay. The main reason of his indecisiveness concerns the way waterman dresses. As a habit of his own time, William makes a correlation between dressing and social status and he hesitates to pay waterman. In a little while William understands that he was right in hesitating but the reason was very different than he thought. When he offers money to waterman, William is surprised by his reaction, because waterman does not understand what William is trying to do when he shows waterman some coins. Finally when he understands, he tells William that he can not take gifts in return to his job. Waterman regards coins as 'gifts' or 'mementos of friendship' and states that; "this is my business, which I would do for anybody; so to take gifts in connection with it would look very queer" (1995: 11). William's second experience with currency surprises him again: this time it is payment for 'shopping'[5]. When the waterman and William arrive at a market William wants to 'buy' pipe and tobacco. First, William wonders why children working in the shop do not weigh tobaccos they are 'selling' to him. Also, when children give him the best of all their products he panics thinking that he is not able to pay for them. In addition, William does not want expensive goods as he loses them all the time (1995: 39). Then he

---

[5] With respect to the patterns of shopping in Morris's utopia, Beaumont (2006: 191-3) claims that even though this system 'lacks the commercial sophistication' of capitalism and there is no exchange based on money, there is a pattern of 'shopping' and this pattern refers to a 'pre-communist past'. He also states that, although the patterns of production are 'communistic', consumption is 'capitalistic'. Beaumont has a point to claim that there is 'shopping' in Morris's utopia as there are markets having variety of goods. Also, this is not a barter-exchange economy, one gets into a market and gets what he needs. However, this is not a 'capitalistic' pattern. All products are in a sense 'pooled' and anyone can get from this 'pool' when and what he wants. There is no direct exchange but a constant exchange as one produces.

remembers what waterman said about currency (1995: 37). About economy, Hammond tells that there are some regulations for market but they can not be regarded as law as market is regulated by general custom. There is no mechanism for enforcement of these regulations, and in opposition to case in laws no one suffers because of these regulations. This implies that, in new society, it is believed that laws harm the principle of equality. In order to protect equality, there should be no enforcement on regulations, but they should be carried out in line with general will and decisions. As William adds, if there would be laws in market, there would not be principle of equality and market would be an arena of pure competition as in the 19$^{th}$ century (1995: 86). The abolishment of private property ended or at least minimized poverty as there are no class divisions or rich-poor antagonism to create envy and hatred. On their way to Hammond with waterman, William looks around and asks the waterman about poor people and waterman thinks that he is talking about the ill people. When William says 'poor-rough' people, waterman still does not understand what William means because together with poverty, the term 'poor' has disappeared. In addition, the end of private property ownership ended centralisation both in economy and administration. There is no need for a central institution or authority to control production, distribution and consumption processes. Also, the administrative system has been transformed or dissolved so that one can not talk about centralisation anymore in Morris's utopian society.

The second element in Morris's utopia is equality-the 'equality of life'. Hammond states that this is a 'society of equals' without class divisions and

privileges and wealth inequalities and this principle has direct implications on government. When waterman talks about cottages used as storage, he mentions slavery and its extinction. This gives us a hint about equality among inhabitants in this society (1995: 30). It is underlined that no man should be exploited by another. There should be no employer, land-owner etc. to get a share from labourers' product in terms of money or in any other way (1995: 74). This equality has revealed itself even in the planning of city: there are no slums of the 19th century, 'poor' are not 'imprisoned' to the worst parts of the city and, city does not have two parts anymore. In addition, the 'centres of manufacture' have been abolished. In the 19th century, these places of manufacture were built as separate spaces from the rest of the city in a sense to imprison labourers and the poor-and these were more or less the same people. This is evident since, in Morris's utopia, production is carried out anywhere producers like to produce, there are no pre-determined places for production such as factories. There are 'Banded-workshops', but to work in them is voluntary (1995: 68-71). The new order is based on equality and in this atmosphere of equality everyone has a desire to work.

Equality is realized in the international arena as well. There is no claim of 'world domination' anymore and no act of colonisation and claim of imperialism (1995: 98-9). The nations are regarded as equals and their relations are established on this basis. The docks are still used as buildings but their function has changed dramatically. They are not serving to the world market anymore, which has probably dissolved at that time. In addition, new society aims to avoid centralisation in economic activities both in national and

international arenas. There is no centre to distribute goods produced (1995: 70). There is no longer a system of competing nations. In William's account, this situation of peace and its static regulation would make world a boring place and there would be no differences and varieties coming from nations. Hammond opposes him by saying that they safeguard variety, especially the variety within daily affairs of nations' inhabitants both in the domestic and at the international arena. Hammond also criticizes the idea of nation, by regarding it as an attempt to bring non-homogeneous groups together with coercion. For him, nation is nothing but an artificial bond between people. Hammond claims that they gave up the idea of nation, or the attempt to homogenize heterogeneous groups. As a result, there is now more variety as they can become visible. Thus, these conditions of equality and variety together bring peace to the world order in Morris's utopian society (1995: 88).

### 2.1.3. How Society is Arranged and Managed?

As a good observant of architecture, William wants to know about each and every building he comes across, and he is amazed by their beauty. Yet, when he sees the old and ugly buildings of the Houses of Parliament, he is surprised and would like to know why Nowhereians still keep them. This is more than a question of function, he is not interested in the purpose they are used for, but only why they are standing still. Thus, this is not a concern for government or type of government, but merely an aesthetical one. However, this interest will change when he meets Hammond. Then William will want to

know about the government. Even this conversation on the Houses gives him a clue about government of this utopian society when waterman tells William that he has read about a 'strange game' played in these buildings. Thus, it is implied that these buildings are not used as government buildings anymore, and also parliamentary liberal democracy may not mean anything to the inhabitants of new society. William is astonished when he hears that they use these buildings for storage and as markets (1995: 34).

William's attempts to make speculations about the new system ends when he meets Hammond who knows about 19th century's social, political and economic structure and who can provide direct answers to William's questions. So, when William meets Hammond, he would like to know about the state and government after the Revolution. William's first question is about government, as he could not derive any solid conclusions from what he has seen around: old government buildings remain but used as storage and market, there is no capital city, there is no central administration and there are no local units. William directly asks whether the system is now republicanism, democracy or dictatorship and he still wants to know about the governmental buildings and institutions. It can be said that William is disappointed when he hears that parliament is not a collection of people located in a building. Hammond says; "the people is our parliament and we do not have anything that you would call a government" (1995: 77). In Morris's utopia, governmental structure is regarded as a tool of tyranny and without it man would be free. Thus, the question to be asked is not about the parliament buildings, but how matters are managed in this type of a system. There is certainly a system to arrange the life

of people but this system does not work in the form of administration or government. In addition, Hammond states that the Congress/Parliament of the 19th century was nothing but a 'body of fools' (1995: 44). He argues that in the 19th century, Parliament was working for the benefits of upper classes and it was creating a delusion for the rest of the society of having a say in governing the state. Hammond tells William that there is no more a need for a huge body of government to deal with each and every detail. As to use Althusser's terminology, inhabitants of this society do not need 'repressive apparatuses' of state such as police, navy and army. The system is based on equality, and coercion does not have a place in it. The new regulations are the anti-thesis of the previous system of administration and government. Hammond claims that in the 19th century, government was a tool of dominant classes and even if there was a parliament it did not work for the benefit of people. It was just creating an illusion of representation for people in order to keep them at peace. He concludes that government was neither parliament nor people but Law-Courts and these courts were supported by repressive tools of state (1995: 78). Also, the major task of government was to protect rich from poor and weak (1995: 79). Hammond also states that these courts were far from being 'just', they were acting in line with the benefits for upper classes. For him, this was a result of class society and private property. Hammond regards parliament as a machinery using force over people in order to realize its aims with a cooperation of 'law courts' and police (1995: 79). The government was not dealing with defense, it was again an illusion, it was protecting its citizens to keep its workers for itself. Moreover, he tells William that the system of 19th

century had caused a general misery and poverty by protecting only a certain segment of society. Hammond seems to believe that a society can be wealthy if and only if all live under equal conditions-equal conditions of wealth which means material equality. In this account, wealth should not be concentrated in hands of a few, rather should belong to all (1995: 80). However, it should be mentioned at that point that even if there is no government, this utopian system is not anarchy. There is still a kind of an authority in Morris's utopia. Therefore, the state and government are abolished with the Revolution, but what about the regulations and arrangements? It is claimed that now they are carried out by 'general agreement':

> A man no longer needs an elaborate system of government, with its army, navy, and police, to force him to give way to the will of the majority of his equals, than he wants a similar machinery to make him understand that his head and a stone wall can not occupy the same space at the same moment. (1995: 77)

The regulations in Morris's utopian society are carried out on the basis of the 'will of majority' and this procedure is regarded as a model similar to democracy based on independence. William reminds Hammond that there may be differences between opinions as a result of variety and it would be difficult to come to an agreement and variety may even result in conflicts. Hammond admits the problem of differences, but he adds that they never result in conflicts and contradictions in new society. This is because, decisions about regulations are taken with the will of majority on basis of equality and freedom. So, it can be claimed that there are 'safety-belts' in Morris's utopia to preserve equality and freedom by preventing conflicts. There is also a distinction between public and private affairs. The principle of majority is used

24

for public matters, matters that concern public at large, but on private matters decision is up to that private person. Thus, there is a process of policy making operating on three levels in *Nowhere*: 'communes', 'wards' and 'parishes'. Inhabitants decide about an issue, negatively or positively, on a meeting (that they call as 'Mote'). It is mentioned that this system refers to an order before bureaucracy. A person makes his proposal on a certain issue and it is discussed among inhabitants and decision is made (1995: 90). In order to arrive a decision the gap between positive and negative votes must be wide, otherwise the process is repeated two more times. This system is close to direct democracy (1995: 91). As it has been remarked, in *Nowhere,* there is no government[6], but regulations are carried out by public at large reflecting the features of 'pre-bureaucratic' authority based on common consensus. Also, with the abolishment of government, inhabitants are not named as 'citizens'. Rather, they are fellows, friends, brothers/sisters[7] of each other now (1995: 44), since they are friends, there is no ruler-ruled distinction (1995: 84). In that sense, it can be claimed that this is the end of alienation of man to his 'species'. With respect to 'alienation', Marx claims that, under capitalist mode of production:

> Object produced by labour, its product, now stands opposed to it as an alien being, as a power independent of the producer. Product is objectification of labour. Worker is deprived of the most essential things not only of life but

---

[6] It should be underlined that even though there are no organizations as 'government' and 'state' in Morris's utopian society, there are regulations of daily life and they are carried out by decentralized units (Berneri: 1969; McCulloch: 1984; Stansky: 1983; Vaninskaya: 2003).

[7] Thus, Morris designs a society based on communal relations and the sense of fellowship (Beaumont: 2004; Boos: 1984; Davis: 1996; Liberman: 1986; McCulloch: 1984; Thomas: 1964; Vaninskaya: 2003).

also work. Worker is related to the product of his labour as to an alien object. (1964: 122)

In addition, Marx argues that "alienation appears not merely in the result but also in the process of production, within productive activity itself. Alienation of activity and activity of alienation. Work is external to worker, it is not part of his nature" (1964: 124). Thus, "since alienated labour; (1) alienates nature from man; and (2) alienates man from himself, from his own active function, his life activity; so it alienates him from the species" (Marx: 1964: 127). So, as the capitalist relations of production has been removed in Morris's utopia, 'the alienation of man to his labour' and as a result to his species has been ended. In addition, this utopian system is not an anarchy but communism signifying the end of 'artificial coercion' (Morris: 1995: 96). It should also be underlined that in Morris's utopian text there is neither state, nor civil society, nor market. Rather, all these areas have been melted into each other and their functions have been carried out collectively.

After seeing London and changes happened with respect to its older status of administrative centre, William wonders about other units of administration. As it has been noted, there are decision making units in localities. However, as their functions are not explained, it is not clear whether there is still a system of decentralized local administration. William finds out that during winters inhabitants of this utopian society meet in 'Mote House' and during summers they meet in fields. However, he does not know how these units function and their role in the governing of whole state of affairs (1995: 26). Depending on his observations, William holds that London can still be

regarded as centre; if not political but as a cultural capital. Thus, we may conclude that there is no centralized administration in Morris's utopian society (1995: 36). In addition, towns, villages and cities have been dissolved into each other towards a pastoral way of life. This implies that even though there are still local units, there is neither centralized nor decentralized administration as units are not separated from each other (1995: 72).

It has been emphasized that in Morris's utopia, there is no government, but there are some regulations. However these regulations are not very clear as Hammond claims that they are 'too complex' to explain. Thus, instead of telling about them one by one, Hammond tries to introduce them in comparison with the 19th century (1995: 82). At that moment one could wonder about Nowhereians' perception of politics, and with respect to that there is only one, short, and clear answer provided by Hammond; "we are very well of as to politics-because we have none" (1995: 87). He claims that they do not have politics. This may mean that they do not have a parliament, political parties and politicians. However, as there are regulations of affairs it may be claimed that there is actually politics in this system. In my mind, Hammond uses 'politics' to refer to state and government affairs and in that sense there is none. When we consider daily life, and regulations, we can claim that there is still political activity in new society. Also, 'politics' may be used to refer to conflicts and their resolutions, and to 'banish' politics from the system may be another 'safety-belt' for this system.

### 2.1.4. 'Labour as Joy'

The third element in Morris's utopic society is 'freedom': freedom from oppression, tyranny, exploitation, artificial coercion and alienation. In *Nowhere,* men are free because as they work, they produce 'life'. As to use Marx's terminology, this means that 'self-alienation' has ended in Morris's utopia. Nowhereians do not work for any rewards such as wages but to be 'happy'; "the reward of labour is life" and "pleasure of creation" says Hammond. Hammond tells that there is no individual exchange in new economic system and as everyone is equal there is no competition. In addition, as money is not in use, there is no motive[8] of profit for any producer.

William wonders what motivates workers who work all day long in joy and pleasure without any wrong doing. Hammond tells him that what labourers produce is life and this is the greatest motivation ever, in addition to the reward of creation. In *Nowhere,* motive to work is not economic but humane. It comes from life itself rather than being external to individuals (1995: 94). Hammond tells William that the sole aim of the Revolution has been to bring happiness to all and this happiness can only be provided by work held in pleasure. William wonders the way Nowhereians gained such happiness with the Revolution. Hammond tells him that it has been realized with the end of alienation, to both the process of production and the products. Now everyone is free to produce what he wants. Alienation has ended in the labouring process because now

---

[8] The change in material conditions has changed the motives of individuals in Morris's utopia. In that sense, Berneri's (1969: 258) argument on 'human nature' is relevant; he argues that, 'human nature' depends on the material conditions of any society, thus after the Revolution, motivations have been changed in line with the material changes.

everyone can choose what he would like to do, it is not imposed on him (1995: 72). In addition, everyone produces for himself and everyone, not for a market. In new system, production is voluntary and needs[9] are produced for their use with high quality as works of art. As Engels claims "in communist society it will be easy to be informed about both production and consumption, regulate production according to needs" (1975: 246). Wealth is equal and production is not motivated by economic concerns, thus work is not regarded as a burden. Work is not carried out to supply basic needs but to make life more pleasant. Labouring process has been transformed into art[10] and every product is regarded as a work of art (Morris: 1995: 137)[11]. Another point that makes labour a pleasure in *Nowhere* is the production process. In general, manual labour is used and this transforms labourers into artisans (1995: 95). So, people of *Nowhere* have total control over production process as well as consumption (1995: 100). The production is not only carried out as artisanship, but also in

---

[9] DeJouvenel (1966: 223-4) rightfully claims that Morris does not provide any satisfactory information with respect to production processes. He argues that this is mainly a result of some basic assumptions; that individuals' 'real' needs are limited, if the production of luxuries and artificial needs are stopped everyone will get enough; so he claims that in Morris's text there is not only 'less work' but also 'less production'. Over and over Morris states that labour is joyful and artistic in his utopia, but he avoids telling how this is realized in practice. Morris justifies the production of needs by relating it to 'voluntary' production. As Beaumont (2004: 44-5) states, deriving from Marx, and Engels, the general conditions of production determines the nature of products, and for Morris under free conditions what is produced is essentially 'social' and 'useful'.

[10] It is evident that for Morris, work should not only be pleasant and joyful, but also creative and 'artistic' (Beaumont: 2004; Berneri: 1969; Boos: 1984; Brantlinger: 1975; Buzard: 1997; Davis: 1996; Fox: 2002; Fyre: 1966; Harvey and Press: 1996; Mummford: 1962; Stephen: 2004; Stirling: 2002).

[11] As Cohen argues, "communism permits a prodigous flowering of human talent. Communism is the release of individual and collective productive capacity from the confinement of oppressive social structure" (1988: 137). And these talents are expressed in the form of 'artistic labour' in Morris's utopia.

the form of agriculture and it is regarded as one of the most joyful works (1995: 168).

When William sees a factory-like building he asks about its uses, and learns that this building functions as a factory since labourers gather in it, but it is called a 'Banded-workshop' and as production is collective, no energy is used. Labourers work together not to increase the efficiency of production, but to please themselves. It can be argued that the whole system has been established on the idea of self-satisfaction. In addition, workers can prefer to work alone or with other fellows; when one wants to work with others, they gather in 'Banded-workshops'. When labourers are collected together, they use manual labour because power-tools are used when they work alone, this work done collectively is regarded as pleasant (1995: 48-9, 185). In addition, in Morris's utopian society, manual labour has the highest value. Moreover, there is no specialization and strict division of work[12]. One can do more than one task; for instance, when William meets some people in the Guest House and asks one of them about his craft he responds William that he is in; mechanical weaving, machine printing and composing, mathematics, and also writes a book about history (1995: 21). This refers to the end of 'division of labour' as it has been claimed by Marx and Engels in the *German Ideology,* "in communist society, nobody has one exclusive sphere of activity but each can become accomplished in any branch he wishes, society regulates the general production and thus makes it possible for me to do one thing today and another tomorrow" (1998: 53). Also, jobs are classified according to their hardship and

---

[12] With respect to the lack of division of labour in Morris's utopia, Kinna (2000: 498) states that with freedom to choose, Morris believed, workers would be happier and produce better results. So, this is another method to make labour as joy.

joy. For example, children work in markets as it is regarded as an easy job and it is also accepted as educative for children. Working outdoors is regarded as 'joyful' when compared to indoor work because it promotes health (Morris: 1995: 11). Inhabitants of the utopian society consider work as a joy especially the work carried in nature. This also implies that there is distinction between 'indoor' and 'outdoor' work, and their degrees of joy are different from each other (1995: 13, 19).

In his attempts to find more about work patterns, waterman tells William that people produce what they want according to their own personal taste. This implies that, as no money is used in this system, there can not be a concern for profit, thus consumption is not necessary. There is not a necessary relation between production and consumption. People produce only to satisfy themselves and to make others happy. In addition, Nowherians' biggest fear is the 'risk' that one day there will be scarcity of works and they will not be able to produce anymore (1995: 47). This also means that everyone in this society undertakes a job and there is no place for 'idleness'. It is once again mentioned that there is no slavery or forced labour (1995: 41). Hammond uses the term 'easy-hard work' and defines it as a work that is tiresome but very joyful such as haymaking. Even though some works may be hard and tiresome they are accepted as easy because one undertakes this work voluntarily and derives pleasure from it (1995: 180). Labour appears as a natural instinct for the people of new society. They work as they live and this is the regular functioning of life for them. This is why they can not imagine a state of idleness (1995: 42).

In addition, clothing differs in line with taste not with wealth. Thus there is no relation between garments and social status and/or wealth one possesses (1995: 143). As there is no exchange economy and money is not used anymore, clothes are not related with the status of people. It has rather become a matter of taste, not a reflection of wealth (1995: 21, 27). Nowhereians also prefer comfortable clothes which do not prevent them working in joy.

## 2.1.5. Concluding Remarks

Overall, in Morris's utopia, after the Revolution, society has been re-organized as a 'perfect' anti-thesis of the older system (capitalism of the 19th century). However, there are some debatable themes: all outcomes of previous ages are destroyed completely alongside with capitalism and its relations. Also, the production process is not clear even though the 'nature' of labour is mentioned in great detail and many times. Finally, there is an implicit fear of change. Although, Morris never declares that this is the best and final order, he did his best to eliminate any possibility of conflict which may lead to change and further transformation. It has also become evident that Morris's utopia has certain Marxist elements such as the end of alienation, abolishment of private property, the withering away of state, and the suggested production patterns. However, Morris's utopian Revolution goes to an extreme and suggests abolishing all patterns and institutions of modernity. This sounds problematic both in reference to Marxism and modernity.

## 2.2. The 'Evolution' of *Looking Backward*

In order to examine Bellamy's utopian text, certain notions should be clarified in order to make the analysis easier to follow. In that sense, I will follow on the concepts of 'evolution', 'equality', 'freedom', 'bureaucracy', 'justice', 'equity', 'rationality', 'cooperation' and 'efficiency'.

### 2.2.1 The Major Patterns of Change

The predominant notion in Bellamy's text is 'evolution' which is defined as a process of transition from small business capitalism and private entrepreneurship into state monopoly capitalism. I will argue that this term, evolution, determines the economic and administrative structure defined in Bellamy's utopia.

In the preface of Bellamy's text, a new social order is mentioned and it is implied that it is superior to the one of the 19th century. What is implied at that point is the Evolution has been carried out through reforms which dissolved some of the elements of social formation of the 19th century, making possible a new, 'better' order (Bellamy: 1951: xxv). In his utopia, Bellamy regards the Evolution as 'a moral and material transformation', an 'improvement' and also a new way of existence (1951: xxv, 130) which is a 'progress' in his account (1951: xxvi). It is stated that this utopian order has refuted the belief in everlasting existence of the social, economic and political order of the 19th century. In addition, the negative consequences of the

previous order have been 'cured' *via* the Evolution. It is implied that the whole book will reflect a contrast between the 19th and the 21st centuries in order to make changes more visible for the reader. In addition, it is also stated that 'modern institutions and their underlying principles' will be mentioned in detail to give a full picture of the new system. Bellamy mentions that this utopian system refers to the future not to past in order to show possible future developments in the US regarding these changes as 'destiny'[13].

Before describing this process of transformation, Bellamy introduces a broad picture of the 19th century; Julian West is an aristocrat living in the 19th century's Boston-US and he is the character who experiences both the 19th century and the beginning of the 21st century (1951: 14). Everything is presented according to his perspective. While introducing the 19th century, West begins with the central problems and discontents especially those concerning relations between capital and labour. It is stated that in the 19th century society was divided into classes and this was the main defining feature of the order (1951: 1). It is also underlined that the gap between these classes was enormous in terms of both wealth and social status. The system was marked by inequalities and fragmentation. It is claimed that the members of upper classes were rich, educated, living in luxury, enjoying all the good things in life and not involved in the process of labour. They were 'enjoying an easy existence'. The material resources of this 'easy existence' were inheritance and income from the interests of investments. Also, the system was working in a way that the rich were getting richer in time, without any personal contribution

---

[13] This is Bellamy's historicism: it is a 'must' that through evolution, a future 'progress' is realized. As Beaumont (2006: 202), Hartman (1999: 29, 38-9), and Madison (1942: 450-1) argue Bellamy regards this change as a pre-determined 'historical necessity'.

to their own wealth by their own labour (1951: 2). It is stated that governments were not attempting to regulate economic affairs even within their own territories which implies the prevalence of a classical liberal economy of *laissez faire*. It can be claimed that this older social formation was organized by an 'invisible hand'. The majority of society was deprived and living under conditions of extreme poverty while the minority was enjoying a life of joy and happiness in wealth (1951: 3). As a result of these class differences, the major 'problem' was the strikes[14] supported by 'labour organisations' trying to realize their demands from big corporations and upper classes. This refers to existing inequalities within the social organisation, because wealth was accumulated by a few and the rest was suffering from poverty (1951: 38). This society was also marked with competition which was taking place among upper classes that used to aim securing their places. The rest of society was not even considered as parties to get into struggle with. Also it was possible for those who were at the top to fall down, but it was not possible for one from the lower classes to be a member of this upper level (1951: 3). The rich were struggling to keep their places because the economy was very volatile so do their places. This means that with any minor change in economic condition, they had encountered the risk of losing their places. In those terms, the recessions and business crisis were common which could change the positions in economy in a sudden way (1951: 4). It is stated that this situation was creating difficult conditions both for the upper and lower classes, but the system was preserved because of two main reasons. Firstly, it was believed that this was the only way for a society to

---

[14] The reaction of labour to these oppressed conditions of the 19th century is regarded as 'labour problem' in Bellamy's utopia. It is a problem, because labourers were demanding the impossible and creating a continuous chaos making economy even worse.

organize itself. So, competition and inequalities were seen as only ways for a social organisation (1951: 3, 5). As a result of these conditions, workers' demands were increasing in this period, but, there was not enough means to satisfy these demands under existing industrial organisation. In that sense, West was not blaming the system of inequalities between the classes, but only the way system was organised (1951: 8). It is also claimed that workers were unable to understand why their demands could not be met and they were creating a chaos for nothing (1951: 9). Secondly, the ones on the top were made to believe that they were different and better than the rest of society, deserving to be wealthy (1951: 5). The upper classes were indifferent to the suffering, poor classes, as they believed that those 'lower' classes deserve to be so (1951: 6). That feeling is regarded by West as a 'hallucination' and in a sense West seems to be opposing the idea of 'natural' inequality between men (1951: 5). As the workers' demands were not satisfied by the system and as they lived under deprived conditions, they began to use their strongest weapon; strikes, to change their situation (1951: 9). As a result, this period was also marked by massive strikes of many industries at the same time (1951: 7). It is also mentioned that labourers could use their political powers in elections for change and this was supported by spreading socialist theories, to which West seems to be an opponent (1951: 9). It is claimed that this discontent of workers was global and widespread. In West's account the 'blame' was on the socialists and their theories spreading from Europe. The 'Western civilization' has been regarded as 'dynamite in disguise'. In that sense it can be claimed that West sees the problem within the conditions of capitalism itself even though he

36

opposes to the ideas of socialists and anarchists (1951: 13). He regards anarchists as a small number of men who were using threats of violence and fear as tools to put their political order into implementation (1951: 10). He also criticizes the perception of history developed by socialism and Marxism and claims that history is cyclical and it is not possible for it to be linear because of 'natural' reasons (1951: 10). This perception of history is problematic. Bellamy regards evolution as a progress, a historical necessity directed to future in his utopia. However, interestingly he argues that history is 'cyclical'. Does not this make Bellamy's vision of future a restoration of past? Either he contradicts with his own vision of progress or his notion of progress is retrospective.

It is also claimed that differences and inequalities were evident in the way the city was organized. Some parts of the city (Boston) were more desirable than the rest because of the 'quality' of residents. The classes were located into different parts of city, in a way upper classes were isolating themselves from the rest. Urbanization had not been carried out on equal basis but on differences and inequalities (1951: 7, 256).

After this introduction of the 19th century's order, the Evolution and its outcomes are mentioned. West suffers from insomnia and takes medicine and needs mesmerizes to fall asleep and one day when he wakes up he finds himself in Boston of the year 2000. In a sense, Bellamy uses West's insomnia in order to tell about the transformation and the Evolution of the American social structure. He does this in the form of dialogue taking place between West and the Doctor in whose house West wakes up: Dr. Leete.

Dr. Leete, with respect to the motives of the Evolution, claims that discontent, inequalities, poverty of the 19th century and the hope for changing them gave way to this transition (1951: 36-7). Doctor claims that the transition was resulted from the contradictions prevailing in society[15] (1951: 37). The reasons of change are listed as; "widespread industrial and social troubles, and the underlying dissatisfaction of all classes with the inequalities of society, and the general misery of mankind" (1951: 36). It is stated that the main motive of the Evolution was hope; for peace and wealth and to create better conditions for the nation at large (1951: 37). In that sense, the reasons of change were stemming from social discontent created by the 19th century's industrial organisation under capitalism, but not capitalism itself. It is argued that labourers were becoming slaves under capitalism but this was not slavery to men. Even though exploitation was carried out by men, it is argued that it was machines making labourers slaves. Yet, it should be mentioned that technology and technological advance do not have negative connotations in Bellamy's utopia even though 'machines exploit men'. In the process of the advances of capitalism all little enterprises had been crushed down by growing industries and markets and the system produced a large body of sufferers in time (1951: 39-40). Thus, Doctor claims that the organization of labour and capital created a situation of discontent. The reason was the organization which was based on concentration of capital in private hands. In the process of transition, those

---

[15] So, for Bellamy, the seeds of change are in the existing structures, and change would remove the negative consequences of the existing order. In that sense, there is a 'historical continuity' in Bellamy's utopia (Halewood (1994: 455), Madison (1942: 450-1), Mullin (2000: 53), Sadler (1944: 533), Rhodes (1967: 27)). Even though Bellamy recognizes the contradictions created by capitalism, he does not aim a complete break. He believes that through an evolution, system could be 'rationally' re-organized without a radical change and all negative aspects will just disappear.

private entrepreneurs were absorbed by corporations and the 'era of corporate tyranny' started. This trend was followed by monopolisations or 'regime of great consolidations of capital' while putting an end to organizations of small capitalists. This was a period of concentration, centralised management and organizational unity in industry which increased efficiency at the same pace with already existing massive gap between rich and poor (1951: 38-40). This is the process of the Evolution and it did not end until it created the 'desired' conditions for the nation at large[16]. Doctor states that:

> Early in the last century the evolution was completed by the final consolidation of the entire capital of the nation. The industry and commerce of the country, ceasing to be conducted by a set of irresponsible corporations and syndicates of private persons at their caprice and for their profit, were intrusted to a single syndicate representing the people, to be conducted in the common interest for the common profit. The nation, that is to say, organized as the one great business corporation in which all other corporations were absorbed; it became the one capitalist in the place of all other capitalists, the sole employer, the final monopoly in which all previous and lesser monopolies were swallowed up, a monopoly in the profits and economies of which all citizens shared. The epoch of trusts had ended in The Great Trust. In a word, the people of the United States concluded to assume the conduct of their own business. (1951: 41)

That process of Evolution was undertaken by government in order eliminate existing inequalities and create a new system in Bellamy's utopia. Thus, nation became the only monopoly, and the era of private business ended by the intervention of government. While abolishing all private capitalists, the nation became the only capitalist. It is stated that as it is in the interest of public

---

[16] That process of evolution is problematic. Because, as Balthrope (2006: 306-7) and Halewood (1994: 455) also mention, Bellamy does not provide sufficient information on the levels of the Evolution. This 'historical necessity' appears as a magic, the steps and transition between those steps are not mentioned clearly. However, it is clear that the Evolution is realized by government led policies, rather than a mass movement from below. It can be claimed that Evolution is an imposed but inevitable process for this society. That seems to be a struggle of hegemony between private capitalists and government, more than a struggle for freedom between the oppressed classes and capitalists.

at large, not only a few private individuals, it is rational for economy to be owned by public rather than private individuals (1951: 41). In Bellamy's utopian society, just like politics, economy has been nationalized (1951: 41) and the system of 'Nationalism' with a 'Modern Social Economy'[17] is established. It is stated that this process of the Evolution had public support and society cooperated with it[18] (1951: 35). In addition, is claimed that the Evolution has been realised in a peaceful way (1951: 42). Even though in most parts of the text, changes have been referred by using the term 'evolution', in one passage it is referred as 'revolution'. As it has not been repeated again anywhere in the text, it would be better to take it as 'evolution' concerning the nature of change (1951: 44).

---

[17] Bellamy calls this system as 'nationalism', in that sense Collins (1991: 58) argues that the system is 'Nationalism' as the industry has been nationalized. On the other hand, Kumar (2006: 231) regards this system as a nation state with a 'socialist' content, Bloch (1986: 613) labels this system as 'centralist socialism', Balthrope (2006: 306) regards it as 'Christian socialist' and Peyser (2000) states that system is 'socialist in every aspect'. In addition, Auerbach (1994: 25, 27) argues that the new economy is not socialism but a revised and advanced version of capitalism. Beaumont (2006: 194, 202) regards this system as 'state communism' and a reformed version of capitalism. Also Beilharz (2004: 601) argues that system is 'state capitalism'. According to Hartman (199927), Bellamy replaces competitive market capitalism with state socialism and he calls this 'nationalism'. Madison (1942: 463) states that Bellamy destroys 'private' capitalism through nationalization, but not capitalism itself. Samuels (1984: 140) states that the state is authoritarian with features of Statism. In my mind, even though there is central planning and administration of economy this is not enough to label this system as socialist. As the transition is evolutionary, some elements of capitalism is kept and revised. So, the structure is statist, authoritarian and social. It inherits elements from both socialism and capitalism, but stands closer to authoritarianism. This is why Bellamy calls the system as 'nationalism' in general and calls the economic structure as 'Modern Social Economy'.

[18] According to Balthrope (2006: 306-7), Forbes (1997: 183), Gutek (1964: 252, 254), Hartman (1999: 29, 38-9), Madison (1942: 450-1), Towers (1957: 54), and Tumber (1999: 611); Bellamy tries to present a natural, gradual, peaceful economic transition and the new values have been internalized by individuals. Thus, evolution has been carried out by the will of an 'enlightened' public. Firstly, evolution has been carried out by government and I assume that the public has no other choice than cooperation. Because, in time, the government has become the only employer. But it is also queer that there was no opposition to transition except for communists and anarchists. As it will be examined in the next chapter, this might have been realized by education. I think that is not a genuine cooperation but a manipulation.

### 2.2.2. The Industrial Army as the Basis of Utopian Organization

One of the major outcomes of the Evolution in Bellamy's utopian society is equality in all aspects of social formation. The Evolution led to broad changes in the 'conditions of humanity' by establishing 'modern industrial system with all its social consequences'. Such change ended oppression and exploitation (1951: 8). In fact, I want to argue that what Bellamy calls as 'evolution' is rational re-organization of capitalism. He assumes that rationalization[19] is a good in itself and presents the process after rationalization rather than explaining how it was carried out. In this utopian society, one of the major changes is about 'labour' and its position within social formation. It is mentioned that in new society there is neither 'labour problem' nor strikes. It is stated with respect to the 'labour problem' that:

> It may be said to have solved itself. The solution came as the result of a process of industrial evolution which could not have terminated otherwise. All that society had to do was to recognize and cooperate with that evolution, when its tendency had become unmistakable. (1951: 35)

Thus, the Evolution brought out a new labour organisation, the 'Industrial Army' with fixed and limited term of service for realisation of equality and equity (1951: 47). This organisation has diffused its affects across

---

[19] Cotgrove (1975: 57) explains rationalization in reference to Weber as; "in the most general terms, rationalization refers to systematization, generalization and formalization by rules. Hence Weber's conception of bureaucratization as a process is inimical to personal freedom. Weber extends the use of the concept of rationalization to discussions of religion, art and music, which can all become formalized, systematized and standardized within the framework, for example, of systems and rules of notation, scale and harmony. In short, the process of rationalizing is that of systematizing and routinizing". And Hilbert (1987: 80) claims that for Weber "at the organizational level, rationalization naturally meant the proliferation of bureaucracy, or bureaucratization". And that rationalization can easily be observed in Bellamy's utopia.

the nation, so that its basic organisational principles are nation's organisational principles[20]. With respect to the distribution of labourers across the Industrial Army, it is stated that each labourer determines his own position in line with his 'natural' talents. This may refer to an assumption concerning the inequality coming from 'nature'. It is assumed in Bellamy's utopian text that by birth, not everyone is same, thus they can only be 'equalized' by external interventions (1951: 49). In line with 'natural' inequality, it is claimed that not everyone is able to be a member of the Industrial Army because of his 'natural' lacks, and for those there is a separate organisation. These people are called as 'invalid corps': "all our sick in mind and body, all our deaf and dumb, and lame and blind and crippled, and even our insane, belong to this invalid corps, and bear its insignia" (1951: 197). These people are assigned with lighter tasks so that no one in the system is wasted, but more or less every member of society contributes to the functioning of the Industrial Army. It is mentioned that this class (invalid corps) is not surviving by 'charity' but as they contribute to the system they take care of themselves (1951: 197). In that sense, it may be claimed that the system is based on 'workfare'. Also system refers to an organic conception of society, everyone has a function for the pre-determined, single goal. Deriving from these facts, it is difficult to believe that after the Evolution, oppression and exploitation ended and freedom is realized. If this is freedom, it is re-defined: to choose among the pre-determined and limited choices. In addition, there are different classes within the Industrial Army and these are classified according to merit and experience. Everyone starts equally

---

[20] Bellamy only rationalizes economy and subordinates all other parts of social formation to that process of rationalization. He aims to apply all economic notions to society at large. This sounds problematic especially considering the daily life of citizens and their freedom.

from the bottom and rises, even though their 'natural' differences hinder a pure equality (1951: 53). At the starting level all are equal as all start as 'unclassified common labourers' and remain to be so for three years (1951: 79). In such a system, everyone has the opportunity to rise to upper levels even though their 'natural' talents and abilities differ from each other, this is what system 'promises'. This is the equality for Bellamy's utopian society: equality to promote (1951: 103). Everyone also has equal opportunity to every task within the Industrial Army and these tasks are based on merit following patterns of bureaucracy (1951: 32). There is also the notion of division of labour, and the 'burden' to increase wealth of nation is shared by all which is also an indication of equality defined in terms of this new society (1951: 158). Also, equality means 'to be responsible equally' as inhabitants of Bellamy's utopic society are 'social equals' and all must serve the rest of nation (1951: 94). This means that everyone is serving to the nation and even if there is slavery, they are equally slaves, slaves of the nation[21] (1951: 126). It is also stated that in the new system there are no 'wages' but surely there are incomes in the form of credit cards and determinant of this income is 'humanity'. In other words, it is provided to everyone on equal basis[22] (1951: 72). The notion

---

[21] So, in Bellamy's utopia equality is artificial, created socially and moral. It is the system that equalizes individuals who are not equal 'by nature'. As natural differences are accepted and in a way the system is organized to favour 'the best' ones, that equality 'promise' is falsified at the upper stages of the system.

[22] In Madison's (1942: 455) account, Bellamy justifies that notion of equal income on grounds of 'common humanity' and 'industrial efficiency'. In my mind, that equality is artificial and Bellamy assumes equality in all aspects. That may refer to changed individual motives, individuals stop wanting and desiring. Their needs are simplified and equalized, they desire nothing more than the system provides and suggests them. Human nature has changed and also made to be one, everyone wants and needs the same things. 'Humanity' is taken as a single entity as if all individuals forming it are the same. So, paying them in equal amounts is justifiable for Bellamy.

of equality is not simply equality among men. In the 'social system', it is accepted that everyone doing his best works equally. So, they deserve same rewards even if their contributions are different in material amounts. This practice is called not material but moral equality (1951: 103).

In Bellamy's utopian text, nation is the sole producer. All goods are produced and owned by nation, thus they are public and also affordable by everyone. This also implies equality of wealth[23] created by national ownership of the means of production (1951: 81). There are no class differences according to differences in wealth, so, equality is realized by abolishing multiple classes and creating a new and only class (1951: 125, 137). There are differences in goods people use and consume, but it is stated that this does not reflect wealth differences, it only reflects differences in tastes (1951: 85). Also there are exactly same products across the whole country, in each and every store which also sustains equality. No region is left on its own to create inferiority of some.

This utopian society may be claimed to be closer to the 'Welfare State' and can be named as a Social Democratic Welfare State (1951: 70), because the system ensures that everyone is secured on the basis of equality and everyone is cared by the nation 'from cradle to grave'. Wealth is equally

---

[23] Auerbach (1994: 27), Balthrope (2006: 306), Becker (1954: 181-2), Hansot (1974: 6, 115), and Mummford (1962: 161) claim that Bellamy has attempted to organize an equal, 'communitarian' economic system on the basis of 'distribution' by removing scarcity. Rhodes (1967: 35-6) argues that Bellamy attempts to realize equality through distribution of wealth. In addition, Madison (1942: 463) mentions that Bellamy does not abolish private property; only ensures that it is distributed equally among the individuals. I think, that is in line with the practice of equal income. Bellamy believes that wealth should be shared equally by all for a social equality. That is not a needs or material based concern but a moral one. All citizens of the nation are equal share-holders. That may serve as another motive for production. As the capitalist motives are not left completely, *homo economicus* still exists in this system. Thus, citizens know that as long as they work efficiently, they will get their shares from the system. But, there is no mention of economic growth; is wealth constant, or is there a possibility to increase shares?

44

enjoyed by whole society rather than a small minority (1951: 30). It is stated that this is the society of equals with members who are 'absolutely equal in resources' (1951: 198). There is no need for savings, because one of the motives of savings had been to be wealthier, but now it is against the logic of system and harms equality. No citizen thinks to be richer than the rest. The principle of equality also ended crime,[24] so there remained no need of jails to inhabit criminals. Crime is regarded as genetic and as a case of 'atavism'; so it comes from nature but may also be fostered by external conditions (1951: 162). It is argued that the main reason of crime was inequality in the older system, and also "directly or indirectly, the desire for money, which then meant every good thing, was the motive of all this crime" (1951: 163). It is claimed that crime ended when the nation become the "sole trustee of the wealth of the people, and guaranteed to all abundant maintenance, on the one hand abolishing want, and on the other checking the accumulation of riches" (1951: 163).

In Bellamy's utopian text, the equality principle is also applied in the international relations; there is a mutual recognition among the nations on the basis of equality (1951: 116) without any favouritism (1951: 113). Even though there is a system of mutual dependence, there is still a notion of 'world

---

[24] Becker (1954: 185, 189), Cooperman (1963: 465), Halewood (1994: 456) and Hartman (1999: 38) argue that in Bellamy's account, human nature is good and can be changed in line with the material conditions and he regards that process constant. Thus, human nature is in progress for Bellamy. So, in Bellamy's account, human nature can be shaped by external intervention. In opposition, Hansot (1974: 134) argues that for Bellamy, human nature is static. I argue that for Bellamy, human nature is both in progress and static in different respects. It is in progress because, after transition, human motives are changed in line with new material conditions. But it is static, because individuals still need motives i.e. to work.

system' composed of unequal nations. There is a perception of 'backward races'[25] and a purpose to 'raise' them to the levels of 'developed' nations.

The second principle of this utopian society is equity which is closely related with equality. Within the Industrial Army all tasks are tried to be made equally attractive for those who would like to undertake them. In order to realise this, administration makes certain arrangements about the task under consideration like changing hours of labour according to hardship of work (1951: 150). This implies a notion of equity; the ones working in harder tasks work in less hours than the ones working in lighter tasks; "no man's work ought to be, on the whole, harder for him than any other man's for him, the workers themselves to be the judges" (1951: 51). It is also mentioned that there are no fixed, pre-determined rules to regulate functioning of administration and labour army, but only a basic principle of equity (1951: 51). As there is no free market economy to determine the wages, it is argued that there must be a mechanism to ensure that wages are determined on the basis of equity. It is stated that while arranging the incomes, justice, equality and equity are considered; as everyone does his best while working. This means that they contribute equally and paying them in return in equal amounts does not harm equity. Equity is regarded as something moral rather than material and what matters is not the amount produced by per worker (1951: 68, 73).

Another principle regulating new social relations in Bellamy's utopia is cooperation which aims to replace individualism[26] of the previous age. It is

---

[25] Balthrope (2006: 309) rightfully states that Bellamy could not envision a full-global equality as he gives the leading role to the USA and Western nations to develop the 'backward races'.

46

argued that labour question ended after nation became the sole employer as all purposes of workers are directed to a single aim (1951: 46). The organisation of labour has been realised when all industries were unified under the Industrial Army (1951: 47). Everyone's contribution is calculated individually not in comparison to others. Any labourer takes simply proportion of his achievements to his power, individual contribution to the system is measured empirically as well as rationally. This system of measuring individual contribution hinders competition within the Industrial Army, everyone is responsible for himself and there is no need to compare his personal success with others as incomes are equal independent of amount of contributions (1951: 103). It is believed that "it is the worst thing about any system which divides men, or allows them to be divided, into classes and castes, that it weakens the sense of common humanity" (1951: 125). It is stated that in the 19th century the main reason for these divisions was inequality; unequal distribution of wealth and unequal chances of people:

> The equal wealth and equal opportunities of culture which all persons now enjoy have simply made us all members of one class...Until this equality of condition had come to pass, the idea of solidarity of humanity, the brotherhood of all men, could never have become the real conviction and practical principle for action it is nowadays. (1951: 125)

---

[26] McClay (1995: 271) states that Bellamy's main concern is to create a collectivity in which individual potentials would be realized. Filler (1949: 284) claims that Bellamy creates a social organization in which individualism will be preserved within collectivity. So, Bellamy tries to overcome the distinction between collectivity and individual by redefining individualism according to principles of this collectivity. As Michaels (1989: 73, 81) argues within this militaristic system individuals are not independent but free to determine and realize themselves through difference. Individualism is abolished for the sake of individualism. That means that individuals are free to express themselves but they are not 'allowed' to follow their private interests. The collectivity is assumed to help individuals to realize themselves, to know themselves. That is a kind of a spiritual promise, like 'salvation' which can only be realized in such a community.

In Bellamy's utopia, it is stated that, there are no more struggles between individuals based on their 'antagonistic' interests as all have the same end[27] and all work through this end in cooperation[28]. Because, 'a complex mutual dependence becomes the universal rule' as one enters into this formation and becomes a member of a larger body: "the necessity of mutual dependence should imply the duty and guarantee of mutual support" (1951: 105). In Bellamy's utopian society, there is no way for 'self-support' as it is recognized that everyone needs another to survive (1951: 104). Thus, basic motives in the utopian system are; 'brotherhood', 'solidarity' and 'fraternity' so that there is no envy, hatred and competition but cooperation of equals as all share the common title of 'human'. In line with the perception of collectivism; people are concerned with well-being of whole society, not only with themselves and their families (1951: 188). As an indication of that streets are covered-up to keep people from effects of weather rather than individuals carrying umbrellas to 'save' themselves only (1951: 122).

In Bellamy's utopia, cooperation is promoted, because it is believed that in this way production and wealth will increase easily. For instance, it is

---

[27] As Forbes (1927: 184) argues there is a 'perfect harmony' in the new order with the common purpose towards the 'common good'.

[28] Hartman (1999: 26-31) states that main motives in this social order are 'solidarity', 'harmony', 'love', 'stability', and 'cooperation' rather than conflict and competition. He adds that Bellamy regards society as an 'organic' unity or 'incorporation' and he achieves this society through the industrial army. Gutek (1964: 254-8) argues that cooperation in the new order requires a common-rationality rather than coercion for social regulation. And with obedience and solidarity, Bellamy believes that, individuals would realize themselves. Mariz (2003: 59-61) states that this new order is 'communitarian' based on 'solidarity' for emancipation of society. In my mind, that means that the Industrial Army is a means to achieve the 'perfect' order through its main principles. Bellamy tries to realize a moral community through a militaristic, strictly organized and rational unit. That may make moral transformation an imposition and manipulation rather than a voluntary act of individuals to realize themselves. In a sense, this is an authoritarian transformation even though 'coercion' is not applied explicitly.

claimed that workers should be in friendly relationships with each other so that production and efficiency will increase (1951: 197). It is believed that competition hinders production, because workers direct their efforts to compete with each other, rather than dealing with production (1951: 189). In Bellamy's utopia, one way to support cooperation is giving gifts. It is believed that gifts support mutual cooperation and friendship within social system. The abolishment of previous methods of 'shopping' are not carried out mainly by economic concerns, but with concerns of cooperation. Also, in this system of mutual dependence and cooperation, laws are regarded as unnecessary, because there is only a limited existence of private property. It is also claimed that laws are 'artificial' bonds, and the new nation does not need them anymore as it has 'natural' bonds to keep its members together[29] (1951: 170).

The practice of cooperation regulates the international arena as well which has also followed the patterns of the Evolution (1951: 111). Just like in the national order, there is no competition in the international arena; it is a system of mutual dependence (1951: 113). There is a form of Federal Union[30] among the nations based on peace and mutual cooperation, which are regulated by a higher authority; the International Council (1951: 112):

---

[29] Bellamy's perception of nation is wonderfully analysed by Auerbach (1994: 27, 31-3, 37, 39) who argues that Bellamy has a 'fetish' of cohesion and 'collective solidarity' while 'mechanising' even equality, reflecting his 'obsession' of social management and control. In this picture of cohesion, nation appears as a 'collective autonomous subject', also society has been 'rationalized' in the form of a military. Thus, nation appears to be a hybrid structure of 'family' and 'organized machinery'. In addition there are no mediating organizations or social groupings between individuals and nation which in a sense makes social relations unnecessary.

[30] Only the economic relations among the nations in the Federal Union are referred. Even though there is an international 'council' its structure is not explained.

> The peaceful relations of these nations are assured by a loose form of federal union of worldwide extent. An international council regulates the mutual intercourse and commerce of the members of the union and their joint policy toward the more backward races, which are gradually being educated up to civilized institutions. Complete autonomy within its own limits is enjoyed by every nation. (1951: 112)

It is claimed that the final aim of this international order in Bellamy's utopia is "an eventual unification of the world as one nation. That, no doubt, will be the ultimate form of society, and will realize certain economic advantages over the present federal system of autonomous nations" (1951: 114). Thus, even in the international arena, the main purpose is to increase efficiency and productivity. This is world-wide equality for Bellamy who does not even mention minorities, nationalities and races except for regarding non-Western parts of the globe as 'backward' in his utopia.

It is claimed that this utopian system is not based on competition but cooperation, however this is not the actual case. There are still some patterns of competition but this time its nature is different, it is not for material gains but for 'glory'. In addition, competition does not only exist in the Industrial Army, but desire of competition is satisfied by sports races which promote the search for glory (1951: 160). Although Bellamy assumes that human nature could be changed in line with material conditions, this change is again 'evolutionary'. In his utopian text Bellamy only changes the motives of human nature rather than the instincts. Just as he keeps some notions of capitalism, he also keeps human nature under capitalism. Because, he seems to be assuming that instincts can not be abolished but only their directions could be changed. This may also be the reason that workers are still 'paid', they need a 'material' motive to work.

Another outcome of the Evolution in Bellamy's utopia is bureaucracy which cultivates rationality, efficiency, centralisation, division of labour and governmental organisation. In that sense, Weber defines bureaucracy as "rationally regulated association within a structure of domination" (in Hilbert: 1987: 73). The basis of the Industrial Army is merit system and all different classes within the Army and their members are classified according to merit and experience. Because, to reward man according to his natural talents is not moral, they should be rewarded on the basis of merit (1951: 74). So, individuals may have equal chances. In this bureaucratic system, there is notion of hierarchy which refers to superior-subordinate relations on the basis of merit (1951: 53). In this kind of hierarchical ordering of system; "the officer commands and the private obeys", but this has to be on the grounds of 'justice' and 'civility', no one should exploit the other (1951: 168). Each worker, in their first three years in the Industrial Army, learns the Army's functioning; "the young men are taught habits of obedience, subordination, and devotion to duty" (1951: 97). Hierarchy is internalized by all during their first years in the Industrial Army.

As the utopian system is hierarchical, those at the superior positions enjoy certain privileges. One of these privileges is the advantage to choose his area of work as he wishes, he has been given priority in certain areas (1951: 99). It may be claimed that system's bureaucratic nature harms its supposition of equality (1951: 53) with respect to these privileges even at the lower levels. Also, equality principle is not applied when issue is about the higher ranks:

> The high places in the nation are open only to the highest class men, and that rank in the army constitutes the only mode of social distinction for the vast majority....various incitements of a minor, but perhaps equally effective, sort are provided in the form of special privileges and immunities in the way of discipline, which the superior class men enjoy. (1951: 100)

Only a few is eligible to be appointed to the higher ranks; to the ranks of commanding, so the structure can be defined as a pyramid in that sense (1951: 101). This hierarchy is completed by status symbols of each industry. Each industry has its own emblem, but they are not very visible in order to not to harm equality, because according to one's level in any industry the metal emblems are made vary according to the grade (1951: 99). It is recognized that in the system there are status differences and privileges, and there is not a perfect equality among the members of society; 'some are more equal than others'. Even though it is claimed that equality is not material but moral in this utopia, it remains to be material. Individuals only enjoy equal wealth and income, but when it comes to social status and 'glory' elitism is introduced. Individuals are given equal chances in the first years of the Army, but this is only a false consciousness and illusion just to keep the system functioning without any disturbance. The idea of moral equality helps the preservation of system. Individuals may have different social status, but in 'the Great Chain of Being' they are equals because of their common title of 'humanity'. In that sense, it is stated that not everyone should rise to the upper ranks to feel glorified. The system recognizes that not everyone is able to rise, there are some compensatory rewarding mechanisms for those who remain at lower levels:

> While promotion requires a general excellence of record as a worker, honourable mention and various sorts of prizes are awarded for excellence less than sufficient for promotion, and also for special feats and single performances in the various industries. (1951: 101)

As there are privileges in Bellamy's utopian society, it can be claimed that at certain points, the system can be classified as an elitist one. Only the best ones in the Industrial Army are accepted as commanders or superiors. It is stated that even though it seems to harm the principle of equality, such segregation is best for the common interest. The General Chief of the Industrial Army (who is the President of the US at the same time) passes through all stages and he rises in line with merit and equality, despite the pyramid-like structure of the system. He also appoints his subordinates but he is elected. Democracy is introduced when we come to the upper levels of the Army. With respect to elections[31], there is no equality as suffrage is not universal and workers do not have a say in this process, thus hierarchy and privileges are introduced once again (1951: 153). It is the higher officers of guilds who vote for the President and who remain to be life-long members of their guilds keeping their privileges gained by merit. The body of electors is assumed to be impartial, knowledgeable, and completely devoted to the nation rather than their self interests. At that point, elitism is evident. Only the ones on the top are regarded as trustworthy in governing both economy and politics (1951: 154). Reflecting the elitist nature of the system "the President is elected by vote of all the men of the nation who are not connected with the industrial army" (1951:

---

[31] Mummford (1992: 164) states that workers are excluded in election process on the grounds that their inclusion would harm discipline. I think, that again underlines Bellamy's obsession with 'order' and 'control'. He aims to keep society under strict control from above. If workers are granted with such a right, discipline may be harmed because the controlled ones start to control. It seems that 'citizen' for Bellamy means a 'herd' just obeying what is chosen for them. Does not this make the system authoritarian despite the claims of equality and freedom?

155). As a justification of this elitism, it is claimed that if workers vote, discipline of the system would be harmed. In that respect, it is also expressed that the main task of the President is to preserve the discipline and represent whole nation. He has the inspectorate to assist him in order to prevent and cure any deficiencies (1951: 155).

The search for efficiency works together with bureaucracy in line with its rational character both in economy and administration. It is claimed that labour is organized nationally, not privately and it is divided into industries which are regulated by officers creating a hierarchy among equals. It is coordinated in a way to work efficiently so that no labour is wasted (1951: 102). In addition, the central aim in cooperation is labour saving and efficiency (1951: 89). It is difficult to claim that in this system the main concern is human, but it is the general wealth of nation as if the nation is an actor on its own. It is stated that everyone potentially has the chance to choose his area of work, not only to be happy and self-satisfied, but more importantly, to increase his efficiency. So, it can be argued that, even though the system seems to be working for the benefit of individuals, actually it is working for economy and for the nation at large as the nation is the sole owner of the means of production. It is also argued that in order to sustain cooperation within the Industrial Army there should be a common control[32] for all industries. This is

---

[32] Auerbach (1994: 33) and Beaumont (2006: 194) underline the rationalized and naturalized process of production and distribution. Madison (1942: 455) underlines centralization of industry and control processes in order to provide maximum efficiency. Manuel (1979: 764) argues that the discourses of 'efficiency' and 'lack of waste' are main justification tools of the system working under control and discipline. "Production should be structured so as to conform the hierarchic principles of a military organization" (Rhodes: 1967: 36). Samuels (1984: 38) also stresses the control and discipline on labour. So, it is evident that Bellamy establishes control and discipline mechanisms on workers through the organization of the Industrial Army. In addition, he recognizes the potential resistance to such mechanisms. So, the

why there must be a higher control and organizing mechanism for workers to make processes efficient and productive (1951: 191).

Also, at the economic level, there is no longer 'endless number' of exchanges, but national and central distribution. All goods are distributed from 'national store houses' (1951: 67-8). Products are presented in a central building, and customers choose from their duplicates. In addition, there are exactly same products in all of the stores. These all mean that there is controlled production as only the amount needed is produced which also implies efficiency and rationality (1951: 82-3). Everything is recorded and the processes are controlled easily. These records are used for demand estimation for the next year so that exact amounts are produced and nothing is wasted. There is no possibility for excess demand or excess supply in this system, rather there is always a constant equilibrium. A governmental unit deals with that, which is called the Department of Distribution (1951: 147, 185, 193, 196). There are no disturbances because of the demand estimation and controlled production so "the material prosperity of the nation flows on uninterruptedly from generation to generation" (1951: 194-5, 187). This means that individual needs, wants and desires are either stabilized or removed. It may also mean that

---

main discourses of efficiency, productivity and equal wealth/income are adopted as safety-belts for this system. The Industrial Army is militaristic, authoritarian and in a sense a fascistic organization. But also promises equality, freedom and 'salvation' through realization of self. Does Bellamy really believe that the road to freedom and salvation should be guided under control and discipline? Individuals are 'forced to be free' but this freedom is strictly limited and controlled by the militaristic organization. The promises and hopes of socialism are redefined and tried to be fitted in an authoritarian structure of the middle ages. Bellamy combines the elements of 'guild' system of past and socialist hopes of future. The result may claimed to be a catastrophe because what combines them is fascism in the case of Bellamy. This is not a free and 'happy' order appreciated by all. If it was the case as Bellamy states (evolution through cooperation) there would be no need for a strict hierarchy, discipline, and control. This is a 'forced' order all elements of which are defined and imposed from above to the rest of society.

individuals became the rational parts of this rational economy. That also refers to control and discipline, individuals 'learn' and 'know' that they can not desire more. Also, as there is constant equilibrium it is a wonder whether or not there is any economic growth in this system.

The organisational structure of the Industrial Army is same with governmental and administrative organisation, and the General of the Army is the President of the US. The changes leading to the organisation of industry and resulting from this organisation have implications on governmental system. Government's functions[33] have been reduced. One of the reasons of such reduction is the end of wars which abolished need for military services. All the protective tasks are undertaken by the Industrial Army rather than different units of government (1951: 44). There is no more "army or navy, and no military organisation" (1951: 169). Also, there is no "departments of state or treasury, no excise or revenue services, no taxes or tax collectors" (1951: 169). There is only a small government having the functions of "judiciary and police". If one adopts Althusserian terminology, only the 'repressive state apparatuses' remain in order to keep reproduction of labour going on while providing discipline Also, administration[34] of nation has not been left to the

---

[33] Berneri (1969: 216-7) claims that as the State deals both with administration and economy, it becomes an 'all-providing God' even huge that only way for individuals to express their identities is the state. In that sense, it can be argued that Bellamy's state is a 'Leviathan' even though it is not an explicit 'public sword'. State is the Industrial Army, it is hierarchical, requires obedience and constant devotion. State is the only place for individuals to realize and express themselves, they are not atoms but a part of a bigger structure. This state is not a place of freedom and equality but obedience.

[34] Samuels (1984: 143) rightfully states that "this system may lead to three basic consequences; 'new technocratic elite' may appear, exploitation of workers may continue, and antagonisms may be created". In opposition to Bellamy's assumption that a rational organization would solve all problems, it can and in fact does create new and even worse problems.

hands of politicians who are represented as private persons searching for their self-interest. Rather, it is the task of nation now. There are neither politicians[35] nor political parties to undertake governmental affairs[36]. All industries are divided into parts in order to regulate production and distribution processes. Then it may be possible to talk about a kind of division of labour among the administrative units (1951: 148, 152). In this way, the tasks of administration have been reduced: "almost the sole function of the administration now is that of directing the industries of the country" (1951: 169). Even though there is a Congress and a constitution, there is no system of legislation because Doctor claims that "we have nothing to make laws about" (1951: 169). This is Bellamy's excessive 'rationality' established through control and discipline. He assumes that through educative manipulation, all principles of new order are internalized by public at large. This is against the logic of bureaucratic organisation, there should be rules to be applied to all equally. That may mean that decisions on disputes are left to discretion of 'elites'. It should be underlined that there can be no place for disputes in this system. Bellamy dreams a situation of perfect harmony fed by discipline. There is coercion all across the social formation, but no law.

---

[35] Auerbach (1994: 41) argues that Bellamy has 'banished' politics from the new order. Rhodes (1967: 40) states that there are no conflicts and antagonisms and the major decisions are taken technically; thus there is no place for politics. And I think that is for the sake of harmony and discipline as politics is associated with private interest. But to claim that there are no antagonisms is a blind perspective. There may be antagonisms but the rational mechanism represses them for the sake of order. There is no politics because it is removed from the system intentionally, not because there is no need for it. Politics has not 'withered away' but 'abolished'.

[36] However, there has been a National Party during the process of the Evolution. And the dissolution of this political party is never mentioned in the text. Thus, it can be speculated that there is a political party in Bellamy's utopian society even though it seems to be a passive organization.

In addition, the production process is centralized, controlled and limited. It works from the centre to periphery including the rural areas of the country (1951: 84). It has been expressed that there are no more large number of stores to shop which refers to the changed patterns of shopping and new patterns of distribution (1951: 78). There are central distributing centres for products which again imply centralisation (1951: 79). It has also been stated that the administration has been centralized, yet it has municipal governments with the functions of "looking out for the public comfort and recreation, and the improvement and embellishment of the villages and cities" (1951: 170).

Another principle within Bellamy's utopian organisation is freedom which refers to emancipation. The notion and perspective of labour is defined in a way to prevent alienation[37] and exploitation and with respect to labour, it is underlined that "it is not usually irksome, and it is often inspiring" (1951: 159). However, labour is not regarded as a means to reach emancipation; "but it is not our labour, but the higher and larger activities which the performance of our task will leave us free to enter upon, that are considered the main business of existence" (1951: 159). Thus, it is not 'working' itself, but what is produced through work is regarded as emancipatory which refers to the pleasure of achievement and contribution. The period of retirement is devoted to leisure and personal interests. There is a crucial point about this, because retirement is

---

[37] Davis (2005: 182) naively states that new regulations have abolished the problem of 'alienation' as everyone is equal under new system and serve to nation. But as Mummford (1962: 167-8) argues, there are still some patterns of 'alienation' as there is no personal contact among workers and as there is repression of and subordination to organization. In that sense, Berneri (1969: 217) also claims that in this centralized system workers turn into 'automations' handling monotonous tasks. I think Bellamy's system does not and can not end alienation. It treats workers as 'cogs in the machine' having no other choice but working in the task determined by their natural talents. But Bellamy aims to end 'anomie', it can be claimed that Bellamy's concern is more moral rather than material. He designs a system which erases individualism and provides individuals a sense of belonging, being a part of an order.

regarded as the period of freedom. Even though work is claimed to be inspiring and as enjoyed by everyone, it is mentioned that retirement is the period free from discipline and control which everyone looks forward (1951: 159). It is posited that labourers select their place in the Industrial Army themselves which means that they are volunteering these tasks. However, this does not make them 'free labourers' as they have to work anyway and labour in this system can claimed to be 'forced'. One has to work to survive. It is stated that the basis of the Industrial Army is voluntary labour, but such statement disregards the fact that, as the industry has been organised as an army and to work is compulsory, labour can never be voluntary. In addition, as the task one undertakes is determined in line with his natural talents, he has indeed no chance to choose his task freely.

Interesting enough, there is a negative perspective with respect to communism or 'red flag' in Bellamy's utopian text. It is claimed that communists hindered the process of evolution rather than fostering it (1951: 205), because communists were nothing but the hired men of capitalists in order to stop the process of evolution. With respect to political parties it is stated that there has been a 'national' party which has been the *leitmotiv* of the Evolution (1951: 206). Emancipation would be for all on the basis of equality, so the pioneer of the Evolution could not be a section of society, but it had to be carried out by nation at large. This pivotal process was carried out by the National Party and "its aim was to nationalize the functions of production and distribution" with the purpose "to realize the idea of the nation with a grandeur and completeness never before conceived, not as an association of men for

59

certain merely political functions affecting their happiness only remotely and superficially, but as a family, a vital union, a common life" (1951: 207). Thus, 'nation' is more than a political and administrative unit, it is a big family of harmony, peace, order and fraternity (1951: 207). In addition, this nation is organized through and controlled by the organization and the major defining principles of the Industrial Army. In a sense, the Industrial Army provides the internal family discipline to its workers who are at the same time citizens and members of a big family.

## 2.2.3. Concluding Remarks

To conclude, Bellamy tries to realize a combination of moral and material concerns through an evolutionary process and rationalization of capitalism. However, his system fails to be free, equal, and egalitarian unlike he assumes. The organisation of the Industrial Army is the major problem which integrates hierarchy, compulsion, order, control and discipline into the system with an organic conception of society and nation. His 'Nationalism' and the system of 'Modern Social Economy' even remind fascism if their impacts on individualism is considered. At that point, 'individualism' is used to refer to "the theory which ascribes the power to act to all and only to those who have the power to decide, and which ascribes this power to all and only to individuals; not to collectives, and not to computers, etc." (Agassi: 1973: 144). Thus in Bellamy's utopia, there is complete eradication of individualism.

## 2.3. Conclusion

In this chapter, the two utopias have been analysed in relation to the presented features of change and transformation and their outcomes on political, administrative and economic structures. As it has been emphasized, Morris establishes his utopian society through the Revolution. In that sense, Morris suggests a total destruction of capitalism as well as modernity. In Morris's utopian system there is neither market nor government. However, there are certain regulations which are carried out through the 'general will' of inhabitants. In addition, Morris defines the labouring process as an artistic creation and a source of pleasure. Morris names his utopian system as 'complete communism'. However, as it will be analysed in the following chapters, his major concepts and the underlying principles of his utopian society contradicts with his claims of socialism and communism.

Bellamy's utopian society is formed through the Evolution. In that sense, Bellamy keeps some organizational principles and relations of capitalism of the 19$^{th}$ century in his futuristic society. The basic organization in Bellamy's utopia, as it has been argued, is the Industrial Army. Bellamy keeps governmental structure (even though he makes some changes) and reformed relations of production. Bellamy names this utopian governmental structure as 'Nationalism' and economic structure as 'Social Market Economy'. In that sense, it can be claimed that, in his utopia Bellamy aims to combine some features of socialism and capitalism. However, this combination leads to a different structure far from socialism and closer to capitalism, at worst fascism.

The 'unpredicted' outcomes of this utopian organization will be discussed in the following chapters.

As it has been made evident, the two utopian texts have some features moving them away from 'socialism'. However, just deriving from these levels (administration, economic structure, the nature of work) a solid conclusion about the consequences and outcomes of change in the two utopian societies as well as about their 'socialist' natures can not be derived. So, in order to have a final conclusion about the new organizations in these utopias the basic features of social organizations should be examined. This is the task of the next chapter.

# CHAPTER III

# PASTORAL LIFE AND MECHANICAL LIFE AS THE BASIC FEATURES OF THE SOCIAL ORGANIZATIONS IN MORRIS'S AND BELLAMY'S UTOPIAS

As has been examined in the previous chapter, Bellamy and Morris design their societies in the future. They adopt different mechanisms of change for the creation of their utopias. Morris is in favour of a revolution which abolishes all the existing structures and designs his utopian society after this 'leveling down to zero'. Morris's major themes are 'artistic labour' and a society freed from all artificial burdens of previous centuries. In addition, Morris suggests revival of the guild system of the 14$^{th}$ century in his utopia. On the other hand, Bellamy introduces an evolutionary change for the creation of his utopia. In that sense, he keeps most of the basic structures and principles of the previous centuries. Bellamy's major concept is the Industrial Army and its organization as it is the foundation of his utopian society. Bellamy also suggests widespread use of technology in his utopia.

This chapter aims to analyse Bellamy's and Morris's perceptions of social organization in their utopias. Their different models of change and different political, economic and administrative regulations also have impacts on their designed models of social organizations. I want to argue that Morris's model of social organization leads to a pastoral way of life, while Bellamy's model leads to a mechanical life for the inhabitants of these utopian societies.

### 3.1. Towards a Pastoral Way of Life in Morris's *Nowhere*

In *Nowhere*, after the Revolution, a new type of life has been established and this life has pastoral elements referring to the pre-capitalist era. This pastoral way of life is not strictly regulated and pre-ordained. It can be claimed that the life in Morris's utopia is in a sense anarchistic. In order to demonstrate this, I will focus on five main dimensions of social life in *Nowhere*: art and culture, patterns of daily life, technology, nature and the gender question.

### 3.1.1. Architectural Patterns for a Pastoral Life

As has been examined in the previous chapter, society in Morris's utopia has been re-constructed to establish a society compatible with the major outcomes of the Revolution. In that respect, one of the tools in this process of re-construction and transformation has been regarded as architecture which has the function to transform man's immediate environment in line with the concurrent changes. In Morris's utopia, architecture is adopted as an element of social change in that sense. First, the relationship between architecture and new way of life should be mentioned. As has been also examined in the previous chapter, Guest (William) is highly interested in architecture, landscape and townscape of this new society comparing and contrasting them with his own (19th) century. William is astonished by the beauty of new buildings having features of an older age: of the 14th century**.** In new society, architecture stands

in opposition to the major trends of modernity and this is appreciated by William (Morris: 1995: 25-6). In the very beginning of his first day in *Nowhere*, William notices the Bridge, and houses by the River and their gardens full of flowers and trees. All through his journey William mentions about houses and gardens and their friendly appearance and existence with nature (1995: 10-1, 15, 18, 25, 29, 30, 43, 70, 76, 150-1, 184, 200). It is mentioned that unlike the case of the 19th century, nature is not destroyed for human use, but now humans have a cohabitative relation with nature in *Nowhere* (1995: 73, 199). It can be claimed that man's alienation from nature ended by this way.

In addition, William mentions the internal decorations of houses and buildings and the senses and impressions they make (1995: 15, 218). It is implied that internal designs and decorations are as important as architecture and building itself. Architecture aims to transform the external environment and internal design and decoration aim to transform its households. In addition, it is believed that through architectural changes as home structures are transformed, the nature and organization of households and families may be determined. Individuals' isolation could be ended through this way, and a communal organisation may be created (Waithe: 2004: 571-76). Reflecting on the idea of 'labour as art', construction is regarded as an artistic work in Morris's utopia. Nowhereians destroy the old buildings to construct new and beautiful ones with joy (Morris: 1995: 35). As all formations have been reconstructed after the Revolution, so does the country and its relationship with nature. Thus, it is claimed that:

England was once a country of clearings amongst the woods and wastes, with a few towns interspersed, which were fortresses for the feudal army, markets for the folk, gathering places for the craftsmen. It then became a country of huge and foul workshops and fouler gambling-dens, surrounded by an ill-kept, poverty-stricken farm, pillaged by the masters of the workshops. It is now a garden, where nothing is wasted and nothing is spoilt, with the necessary dwellings, sheds, and workshops scattered up and down the country, all trim and neat and pretty. (1995: 75)

As a consequence, architecture is regarded as a complementary part of new organisation with its beauty and simplicity and with its friendly relation with nature. It is implied that now architecture is not carried out on commercial basis, but for its function. In addition, in *Nowhere*, only the necessary buildings are constructed, the attempt is not to 'show-off' but just to get use of them. The simplicity and pastoral way of life in new society is both supported and complemented by environmental and architectural arrangements. It is believed that, in architecture the concern should be 'total design', it should be about the whole existence of building with the expression of life of its inhabitants, and it should be natural product of artistic labour[38]. Thus, artificial components have been made compatible with the natural ones, supporting the notion of pastoral way of life. These 'new' architectural patterns are not new in fact. Morris refers to 14th century's Gothic architecture. In that sense, it may be claimed that, for Morris, a harmonious life with nature can not be realized through the means and mentality of modernity. He simply sees the solution in the past, and suggests destroying not only the political and economic structures of capitalism, but its physical constructions as well. This longing for past

---

[38] Morris was highly influenced from J. Ruskin with respect to architecture. For this influence see: J. Ruskin, (1972). *The Poetry of Architecture*. Michigan.

structures gives Morris's utopia a nostalgic and archaic perspective which will be discussed in the next chapter.

These changes in architectural structures are both complemented and supported by the re-organization of cityscape and townscape. Harvey claims that "bourgeoisie both creates and destroys geographical foundations-ecological, spatial, and cultural-of its own activities, building a world in its own image. Accumulation of capital has always been a profoundly geographical affair" (2000: 23). Thus, after the Revolution in *Nowhere* with the realisation of communism, the geographical regulations have been arranged in line with the new principles. In that sense Marx and Engels (1994: 162) also argue that: "the bourgeoisie has subjected the country to the rule of towns" as a result of division of labour[39]. Such subjection also ends in Morris's utopia as there is no bourgeoisie as a class now and also all forms of division of labour have been removed from the system. In *Nowhere*, people do no longer live in big cities but they prefer country and a pastoral way of life (Morris: 1995: 76), even some of them prefer to live in forests (1995: 30). It is stated that this new way of life has been established after the Revolution and it is the result of their

---

[39] Magdoff (2006: 56) explains that for Marx and Engels, "the differentiation of town and country arises of course from the division between agricultural and industrial and commercial labor. Eventually other separations take place, as between industrial, commercial, and financial activities within the cities. But what needs to be understood is that the town-country antithesis encompasses much more than merely city vs. farm. Thus as nations evolve, regional differences emerge and become ossified. To be sure, new social formations and advances in productive forces alter particular aspects of the way people become separated by job specialization and life style. Still, there are two features common to all the variations in the social division of labor: (1) It always coincides with a particular set of hierarchical relations between individuals, social groups, and, in certain periods in history, nations—whether associated with patriarchalism, slavery, castes, estates, or modern classes. And (2) it is always taken over, shaped, and reproduced by and for a dominant social group, generally comprising those who own or control the primary means of production."

'complete communism'[40] (1995: 194). Modern administrative and settlement structures such as cities and towns are replaced by small-scale, communal, simple organisations[41]. In *Nowhere*, city is not a mechanism of control and order, it is in the form of free-association based on the idea of mutual aid. Thus, it can be claimed that there is no 'urbanization' in the modern sense of the term in Morris's utopia. Because, firstly, individuals form these units not as a result of economic and political necessities[42]. Secondly, these units are not organized and 'ordered'. Thus, within this context, the relation of inhabitants with nature should be mentioned in order to clarify their perception of 'land as a garden' and the 'pastoral way of life'.

---

[40] McDonald (2004: 288, 296-7) argues that "Morris's vision is 'eco-socialism' with a focus on 'art', beauty and its naturalist forms. In Morris's view, capitalism destroys natural world and in that way harms human life. So, only after the destruction of capitalism and modernity, a 'natural' organization can be realized". I assume, that total destruction refers to Morris's term 'complete communism'.

[41] Vaninskaya (2005: 13) claims that this is not complete de-urbanization. Pepper (1995: 178) argues that "cities are re-organised into community neighbourhoods and 'greened'". Combining both of those arguments, Beaumont (2006: 193) states that Morris's vision is a combination of pastoral landscape and cityscape. I follow that argument, because Morris establishes a structure combining both urban and rural elements as they are diffused into each other.

[42] Morris's utopian society can claimed to be a *'Gemeinschaft'* which refers to "a social relationship founded on 'solidarity between individuals based on affection, kinship or membership of a community'. It is based on organic, unalienated, and face to face relationships. In such society, general will is an expression of humanity's social, communal nature, to be fully human is to live with others and be concerned for them as one is for oneself and to be separated from this communal aspect of self is to be alienated. And this is romanticised in the visions of pre-industrial medieval and 'traditional' societies" (Pepper: 1995: 16).

### 3.1.2. The 'Re-Organization' of Nature

The first change noticed in *Nowhere* by William is the absence of pollution (1995: 8). Then, he notices the friendly relation of man with nature and even the attributed priority to nature for a happy and pleasurable life. Nowhereians do not aim to transform nature anymore for their own use, rather they adopt themselves to 'natural conditions' (1995: 74, 76, 177). They also get pleasure from nature and activities they undertake in nature (1995: 181). In a sense, there is a mutual relation[43] between them and nature; they respect nature and nature provides them joy and happiness. This perception of nature in Morris's utopia is in line with the socialist ideals. In socialism, there is a:

> Dialectical view of society-nature relationship. There is no separation between humans and nature. They are part of each other: contradictory opposites, which means that it is impossible to define one except in relation to the other. They are each other. They constantly interpenetrate and interact, in a circular, mutually affecting relationship. (Pepper: 1995: 197)

Even the weather is perfect in *Nowhere*, with 'fresh air' and 'pleasant breeze' of summer days (1995: 7). Nature is not regarded as external to individuals, rather they complete each other (1995: 135, 187, 199) in opposition to the case in the 19th century:

> Was not their mistake once more bred of the life of slavery that they had been living?-a life which was always looking upon everything, except mankind,

---

[43] Vaninskaya rightfully (2005: 12, 13) claims that this is a reincorporation of the past values into the new order. It is stated that "it presupposes an almost instinctual, some might say pagan, identification with and participation in the processes of nature." I think that is the negation of modern notion of human domination over nature. Rather than assuming a dialectical relation between man and nature, Morris simply suggests uniting them. That is quite problematic, because despite this equalization, nature becomes a part of labour in the production process. That destroys Morris's pagan myth of nature.

animate and inanimate-'nature', as people used to call it-as one thing, and mankind as another. It was natural to people thinking in this way, that they should try to make 'nature' their slave, since they thought 'nature' was something outside them. (1995: 186-7)

People of *Nowhere* do not see nature as a good to be consumed and shaped according to their needs and necessities, but a complementary part of their collective existence. In *Nowhere*, nature lost its 'commercial' feature, its reification has ended and nature re-gained its 'glory' (1995: 205). It can be claimed that human completeness is realized *via* changing all conditions surrounding inhabitants. Then, a complete emancipation from artificial, commercial bonds is realized while ending alienation. Now nature is regarded as a social creation and category. I think such project can be considered as a reaction against the mechanization of labour with an attempt to restore the practice of artistic labour described in the previous chapter.

### 3.1.3 The Beauty of Simplicity

This new way of life and these patterns of relation to nature, also have their impacts on people's physical appearances. They look healthier, stronger, younger and more beautiful (1995: 9, 16, 27, 49, 60, 65, 136). Because, new country is 'social', individuals are freed from commercial relations, and as people live with happy people and in a friendly relation with nature, they can preserve their 'good looks' (1995: 20, 41, 74-6). In addition, it is stated that a child of 'love' would be healthier and more beautiful, and as there are no economic concerns, marriages are solely based on love (1995: 59-60, 65) and

directed towards healthier and more beautiful people[44]. This pastoral life is also supported by the way people nourish; they eat healthy and natural food such as fish and fruits (1995: 9, 16-7). Hammond tells that "we of these generations are strong and healthy of body, and live easily; we pass our lives in reasonable strife with nature, exercising not one side of ourselves only, but all sides, taking the keenest pleasure in all the life of the world" (1995: 60).

However, it is also implied that even in this system, people may get sick; this is not declared openly, but when William asks about the poor people, the waterman thinks that he is talking about the ill people (1995: 27). In addition it is also implied that this is a rare occasion as waterman says that he does not know anyone sick at that time (1995: 27). This also implies that being 'natural' means welcoming the negative effects of nature alongside with the positive ones. Nature is not manipulated for the sake of humans.

Those production patterns and form of social organization suggested by Morris can also be found in Marx's writings[45]. As it argued by Beilharz (2004: 598) the *Paris Manuscripts* is based on the critique of alienation, and Beilharz claims that "the utopia implied here is one of individual autonomy and small-scale, localized production and collective management. Marx's desire is for the freedom of creation and expression of the romantics. Utopia is not here a political society, but a society of autonomous creation as and through labour".

---

[44] Parrinder (1997) rightfully defines that as the system of 'natural eugenics' realized through social justice, a better environment and sexual liberation.

[45] In that sense, Beilharz (2004: 597-8) argues that there are five different images of 'socialist utopia' in Marx's writings. And I want to argue that these images are more or less similar to the the utopian society of Morris. In that sense it can be claimed that some of the debatable features in Morris's utopia have stemmed from Marx's own works.

Beilharz (2004: 598-9) regards *The German Ideology* as another utopian text of Marxism. He claims that this work "suggests a plainly rural, and in fact horticultural utopia. It indicates a green and pleasant land, like that imagined by William Morris in *News from Nowhere*". Thus, Morris's utopian vision can easily be traced in Marx's early writings and in that sense I want to argue that Morris's anti-modernist tendencies can be seen as internal tensions in Marxism itself.

### 3.1.4. A Society Freed from Mechanization?

The new patterns of life are supported by achievements in technology and science. In the beginning of the text, William (Guest) pursues a criticism of modernity and advanced technology with respect to transportation regarding them as "means of travelling which civilisation has forced upon us like a habit" (Morris: 1995: 4). The existence of technology in *Nowhere* is questionable as each and every component of daily life is simplified, 'naturalized' and even *dys-modernized*. In this new society, there are no factories and chimneys to pollute the environment. It can be claimed that technology of the 19th century, set up against the nature, was left aside (1995: 10)[46]. It is stated that there have been changes in the use of 'mechanical force' (1995: 71). In addition, the 'labour-saving machines' of the 19th century are not used anymore as there is

---

[46] Fox (2003: 46) argues that "it was not just the devastating impact on workers and their families that concerned Morris, but the damage to the landscape, to the old ways and old places, the decline of craftsmanship, the increase in materialism and consumerism, the profiteration of shoddy goods and the profound, unrelieved ugliness of the society the machine had created". It may be claimed in line with Fox's argument that as Morris associated technology and mechanization with capitalism and modernity, he removed them from his utopia.

no purpose to increase efficiency in the production process but just to get joy (1995: 97, 99). However, it would not be correct to claim that there is no technology in this new order. 'New' and simpler technological methods are adopted in order to replace the previous methods, but new ones are not described in a clear manner (1995: 168). It can only be speculated that they are nature-friendly. Morris justifies the use of limited technology on the grounds that it will not interfere to the artistic production and only will be used for arduous labour[47]. For instance, there are 'force vehicles' and William states that they are used in place of 'steam power carrying' of the 19th century, but the 'force' or energy production is never explained (1995: 168). This society depends on fuller humanistic realization of aesthetic and creative experiences rather than the appreciation of technological advances. Even though some technology is used, it is mentioned that "this is not an age of inventions" (1995: 176). Many inventions of the previous centuries have been left now as they have been regarded as incompatible with nature and the pastoral way of life. The science of the 19th century is regarded as 'commercial' (1995: 136). In place of the previous technology, handicraft is used for production process. A transition from mechanical production to handicraft production has been

---

[47] Gerber (1973: 51) underlines that Morris does not completely destroy machinery, he keeps its social function, and argues that science is servant, but there is no attempt to explain how this servitude is realized. It is correct to claim that both machinery and science made to be servants of mankind in Morris's utopia. They are only adopted when needed and labourers decide when to use them. However, except the natural instinct of labourers to use manual labour, it is not clear why they simply do not use machines and tools to work easier. This makes Morris's assumption naive. In addition, Boos (1984:340) rightfully claims that "there is little suggestion that a more refined technology might itself create new technai [technique]. Nor does anyone in Nowhere express any wish or need to improve methods of subsistence forming". This is a problematic point in Morris's assumption, because he stabilizes technology and science. He simply abolishes the technology of the 19th century, simplifies machinery and assumes that this situation will be ever-lasting. As one may argue, that gives Morris's utopia both a static and a conservative outlook.

realized by reversing the evolution of previous centuries and in a sense the Industrial Revolution[48] (1995: 185-6, 188). It seems that Morris sees the abolition of all outcomes of modernity as the solution to negative consequences of capitalism. Can not a revision of the 19th century's science and technology be realized to fit them into the new order rather than a complete destruction? Morris sees an irreconcilable antagonism between handicraft production and modern industrial technology and he believes that one of them should be completely destroyed for the sake of other. I think there is another option for Morris because they can be complementary methods if their natures are re-defined. However, as Morris admires the past methods of production, he disregards this possibility. So, this is the age of (mostly) non-mechanical production leading to joyful labour and works of art (1995: 187). Thus, inhabitants of this society have realized a balanced relation between production and nature, and they produce while protecting beauty (1995: 204) and nature itself as it is. In that sense, modernity and civilisation are criticised in a radical manner (1995: 65). Within this context, Morris's anti-capitalism turns into anti-modernity and this conflicts with Marx's original vision. As it has been argued by Löwy (1987: 895-6), Marx:

> Rejects as 'reactionary' any dreams of returning to the handicraft or any other precapitalist mode of production. He extolls the historically progressive role of industrial capitalism, not only in developing gigantic and unprecedented productive forces, but also in creating universality, the unity of the world economy-an essential pre-condition for the future socialist mankind. He also hails capitalism for tearing apart the veils that hide exploitation in pre-capitalist societies, but this kind of applause has an ironic thrust: by introducing more brutal, open, and cynical forms of exploitation, the capitalist mode of production favors the development of the class consciousness and class struggle of the oppressed. Marx's anti-capitalism is

---

[48] That negation of the Industrial Revolution gives Morris's utopia an anti-modern quality.

not the abstract negation of the modern industrial (bourgeois) civilization but its *Aufhebung,* [sublation] i.e. at the same time its abolition and the conservation of its greatest achievements, in a movement toward a higher mode of production (socialism).

Even though science and technology are criticised, this criticism is actually directed to their negative impacts on both humans and nature in the capitalist and commercial system of the 19th century[49]. Now, as capitalist relations are removed, a fixed and limited level of scientific activity and technology can be employed (only when it is necessary). Because, as scientific activity and technology are shaped through 'social production', they do not have negative consequences in Morris's utopia.

At that point, Morris's vision of labour and its 'organisation' should be reminded to present the possible reasons of his hostility to mechanization. In *Nowhere*, as in the pre-capitalist societies, there is no strict division between work and leisure[50]. As it has been argued by Marx (1964: 79) "worker needs above all leisure time in which to produce and to enjoy culture. The progress of organization of work creates this leisure". Thus, in the utopia of Morris labour

---

[49] Evans (1980: 264) and Harvey&Press (1996: 19-20) argue that Morris's criticism is not directed to technology *per se* but to its consequences especially its negative impact on nature and relation of humans with nature. Even though Morris's problem is the negative consequences of technology, his solution is problematic. As Ulam (1966: 121) argues the pre-industrial order is brought back in order to cure the negative consequences created by commercialism and industrialism. As one may observe, Morris tries to destroy mechanization rather than modifying it in line with new society. I agree with such interpretations, because there is an inherent nostalgia and romanticism in Morris's approach to nature and labour.

[50] Davis (1996: 721) argues that for Morris, "when artificial obstacles to pleasurable labour are removed, work will be re-united with art". And Schorske (1967: 219) claims that "in opposition to enslaving new technology, Morris suggested an ancient way: the medieval ideal of a unified simple house". This means that for Morris, with a pre-capitalist, natural order, work and leisure dichotomy ends. Work is in the realm of 'freedom' together with leisure. Morris sees the full destruction of modern values and restoration of past ones as the solution. It can be argued that Morris's obsession with art and beauty makes his perspective of change quite conservative, because in such a system there will be no progress guided by advance and novelties.

and joy should be unified and only through this, freedom can be attained. In Morris's view, such labour should be for the most part un-mechanized. In that sense, Morris advocates the 'Victorian Gospel of Work' which is "the ideal that work is a good in itself; that fosters a sense of stable identity or community; or that through it one increases essential development and satisfaction" (Breton: 2002: 43). It can be claimed that Morris assumes a natural work instinct, as Nowherians desire to work all the time without any external imposition and intervention: they simply choose to work. Because, in their perspective, not all work is non-pleasurable. Artistic work is pleasurable and offers high degree of 'libidinal satisfaction'. As Marx (1994:53) claims, after the revolution "my labour would be free manifestation of life and an enjoyment of life. Working is not living under presupposition of private property. In my labour the particularity of my individuality would be affirmed because my individual life is affirmed". In other words, Marx was always cautious about the difference between egoistic, liberal individualism and genuine individuality. This difference seems to have been underlined by Morris. Thus, it can be claimed that for Morris the production process is freed also from necessities and alienation, and labour is not in the 'realm of necessities' anymore. And just like Marx and Engels, Morris regards work as a central element of human existence.

### 3.1.5. How Women are 'Emancipated'?

In line with those changes, most of the patterns of daily life are transformed. One of those patterns is dressing. It has a non-commercial character and depends on one's taste rather than class position unlike the 19th century (Morris: 1995: 9, 23, 27). It is claimed that inhabitants of *Nowhere* are well-dressed and the way they dress reflects the patterns of the 14th century (1995: 9, 14, 16, 25-6, 144, 181). For instance, it is mentioned that in this new society, unlike the 19th century, women dress "like women, not upholstered like arm-chairs" (1995: 16). Even the way people dress up has been simplified and adopted to the new principles and refer to past values.

There are also a number of changes in relation to women and their status within new organization. The relations between the sexes are realized on the basis of equality (1995: 59) without any relations of hegemony and domination reciprocally (1995: 62, 83). Inhabitants have their foods in the public houses which are served by women (1995: 16). This is strange because even though women work in public sphere rather than private, they are still assigned to 'domestic' or feminine tasks. In order to justify that, Morris claims that the status of 'housekeeping' and domestic tasks have been raised in *Nowhere* (1995: 62). In addition, women are not only undertaking feminine labour, so it would not be correct to claim that they are only assigned to traditional tasks[51]. The 'emancipation' and 'liberation' movements for women of the 19th century are criticized in the text (1995: 63) by the claim that they

---

[51] However, women's labour in *Nowhere* is not explained in detail. That may be because, Morris does not define labour in general. He only tells that it is artistic, joyful, mostly manual and free, but the essence and the content of labouring activity remain an enigma.

'insulted' domestic labour, and the attempt was merely to free women from this type of labour so that they would deal with 'intellectual tasks'. In new society, domestic labour is regarded as an important part of daily life, not as a 'dirty job' to be avoided. In *Nowhere*, women are emancipated, but they are emancipated together with society at large. As the society has reached to a certain level after the Revolution, so does the status of women.

Maternity is still honoured by this new society. In addition, the burdens of children are shared between the parents, mother is not the only bearer and rearer. So, women are emancipated from the 'artificial' bonds of motherhood imposed on them in the previous centuries. With respect to family and also parenthood, it is claimed that children do not have to live with their parents, and also spouses do not have to live in the same house (1995: 58, 67-68). This refers to the changed patterns and the concept of 'family', since there are no legal or artificial bonds to keep families together (1995: 84). Thus, all the patterns of social relations and all the units of social organisation have been subjected to changes, they have been simplified.

### 3.1.6. 'Anti-Intellectual' Life

In relation to intellectual life, education in *Nowhere* should be mentioned. Children are free to enjoy themselves in nature rather than being locked up in school buildings, they learn in nature by themselves (1995: 30). There is no 'formal system of education' even not a 'system of education'. It

can be argued that the terms 'education'[52] and 'teaching' might have lost their meanings in the new society (1995: 31). Rather than the conventional education of the 19th century, children now learn to swim, cook in nature and have the liberty to choose what to learn (1995: 31). In the sense of 'mental education', it is stated that 'book-learning' and also writing are not encouraged in the early ages for children. Interestingly enough, in *Nowhere*, children usually learn foreign languages before learning how to write and read (1995: 32-3). It is justified on the grounds that people differ in their tastes and interests and it is not plausible to introduce and enforce certain standardized subjects to children, they are free to choose (1995: 33). It is stated that in the past, education was 'refined' and open only to wealthy ones, it was commercial, and in general, society was not educated (1995: 66, 72, 166). In the new system, bodily and mental growths have priority over conventional patterns of learning (1995: 67). This makes sense because daily life of Nowhereians is the realization of artistic labour and conventional methods would do no use to them. 'Education' is not limited with age and does not start in early ages as there are no economic concerns and individuals have as much time as they need to learn anything they desire (1995: 67). 'Education' is left to individual choice and this is the mental freedom in Morris's account. At the first glance, Morris seems to have a neutral perspective with respect to 'intellectual education' as he states that Nowhereians are free to choose what to 'learn' and read. However, the main patterns of daily life have a discouraging

---

[52] Frye (1966: 45) and Stansky (1983: 36) argue that in this society there is an anti-intellectual quality. In my mind, it may be regarded as 'anti-intellectual' in modern terms. However, when it is considered in the context of new society, the removal of conventional methods of education is both necessary and useful. Nowhereians do not need 'intellectuals' but knowledge, and they gain as much as they desire.

effect with respect to 'intellectual education'. Because, the foundation of society is based on the notion of 'artistic labour' which is for the most part manual. In such a system, intellectual activity becomes unnecessary and this gives an anti-intellectual quality to Morris's utopia.

Even though conventional methods of education have been left, literature still has a place in Morris's utopia (1995: 23). In addition, there are new novels and poems. However, not everyone can be an author or a poet, these artistic and cultural tasks should be undertaken by the 'gifted' ones (1995: 23, 32). It can be claimed that new people are not very interested in books. They think that real life is more important than fiction, in a sense, they regard reading as a 'waste of time' (1995: 156-7). Rather than dealing with imagination, Nowhereians deal with the facts of real life. It may be argued that this neutral and even negative stance against literary works gives an anti-intellectual aspect to Morris's utopia. It may be stated that, for Morris, Nowhereians no longer need the 'magic' of imagination in their happy and fulfilled lives. They do not need day-dreams of 'Not-Yet-Conscious' because they enjoy what they desire already. So, Morris thinks that imagination is limited and this society is the best one that could be imagined. Or is he just afraid of more imagination because it may mean change?

In line with the changes in the perception of 'intellectual' notions, also 'history' becomes unnecessary in Morris's utopia. Firstly, it is not compulsory to know about history, because it is the individual to decide what to read and learn in line with his taste (1995: 32). History is regarded as 'unnecessary' because it is associated with conflictual situations and as there is peace now,

Nowhereians do not need history (1995: 33, 57, 156). This again may reflect Morris's fear of change and disturbance. He simply associates history with conflict, conflict with change and regards change as 'unnecessary'. In this atmosphere of freedom, he does not attempt to banish history, but makes it useless.

As a part of daily life, newspapers in Morris's utopia should also be mentioned. It is stated that they were the tools of the dominant classes in the 19th century, then, they were not objective but biased (1995: 116, 118, 121). In addition, those papers conflicting with the interests of the dominant classes and state in the 19th century, were subjected to censorship (1995: 122). It is also stated that they had the task of manipulating public consciousness through articles in the 19th century (1995: 126). However, there is no mention of newspapers in this new society, there is no journalism in *Nowhere*. As it would be against the basic principles of the Revolution and new society, it can not be claimed that news-making is banned or removed by force. It might have become unnecessary in time. This is because all organizations have been simplified and made to be small in scales. If one adopts Althusser's phrase, there is no need for 'ideological state apparatuses' to hegemonise and dominate the public.

### 3.1.7. 'Popular Art'


Another point about daily life in *Nowhere* which is subjected to change is art alongside with labour[53]. In that respect museums should be mentioned. For instance, as money is not used in new system, coins are kept in museums as works of art (1995: 12). Also the National Gallery and the British Museum of the 19th century have been preserved (1995: 47, 52-3). It is stated that Nowhereians have kept museums and artifacts in them as they believed that "it is not a bad thing to have some record of what our forefathers thought a handsome building. For there is plenty of labour and material in it" (1995: 54). On the other hand, they think that because of the deprived conditions created by capitalism, the 19th century's art was wishing for better days if not depressive (1995: 105-6). Morris regards this art of the 19th century as 'soulless' and far from being 'artistic' as they are the products of a commercial age. In addition, as it has been pointed out, in *Nowhere*, Morris sees no need and place for imagination. Thus, Morris has a negative perspective to the 19th century's art.

I want to argue that Morris's major problem with capitalism and modernism stems from his vision of art. This vision is the basis of his utopia and the reason of his attempt to restore the old order. He wishes to abolish the distinction between labour and art with his suggestion of restoring artistic labour. This would lead to the democratization of art. As each and every daily

---

[53] Morris (1997) claims that he uses the term 'art' in wider sense and attempts to make a distinction between 'art' in socialism and capitalism. He also argues that art should be common to all; as an integral part of life as it is a necessary element for human life. In addition, it is stated that in the production process, handicraft should have priority over mechanization. It can be claimed that Morris's perception of art in general establishes the foundation of his utopia.

activity is art, then everyone is an artist and has access to the works of art[54]. In his account, this artistic labour can only be realized through handicraft production because machines can not produce works of art. Actually, in my mind, machines may produce artistic works. Thus, while arguing that machines can not produce works of art, Morris seems to be talking about the 'uniqueness' and 'originality'. The realization of such a society organised by art is freed from all forms of alienation created by capitalism and machine production. In that sense, Morris attempts to aestheticise whole life through freedom, beauty and joy[55].

### 3.1.8. Religion in *Nowhere*

Even though there is no explicit reference, there are religious practices in this new society. First, the religious practices of the 14th and the 19th centuries, Christianity, are referred. It is implied that this religion could not 'salvate' individuals from the 'evils' of commercialism (1995: 45). It is stated that now Nowhereians have a 'new' religion; which is the 'religion of humanity':

---

[54] As Brantlinger (1975: 37-8) argues "only great art is 'popular art', shared by all the people". However, "under the most favourable conditions 'art' might cease to exist altogether. 'Popular art' would be indistinguishable from common labour...Art is unnecessary as a separate activity because all life has become art". Morris's attempt to restore the real nature of art while unifying it with labour abolishes art on its own. In this system; art, labour and life are all unified and such unity leads to a pleasurable existence for society at large in Morris's account.

[55] As Schorske (1967: 227) argues, that is the vision of a "mediaeval commune, where social, economic and aesthetic life were one." That is another attempt for Morris to restore the 14th century's organisation and guild system. It can also be claimed that this is an anti-modern attempt as modernity requires separation of economic, political and social spheres.

> With its assured belief in heaven and hell as two countries in which to live, has gone, and now we do, both in word and indeed, believe in the continuous life of the world of men, and as it were, add everyday of that common life to the little stock of days which our own mere individual experience wins for us: and consequently we are happy. (1995: 136)

It can be claimed that in line with new patterns of life and friendly relationship with nature, the religious practices have been transformed and the new religion is close to 'paganism'. As most of the patterns of new order refer to previous centuries, these people may claimed to be Wiccans with reference to their relation with nature and their pastoral way of life.

### 3.1.9. Concluding Remarks

As it has been discussed, the patterns of daily life in Morris's utopia have been subjected to transformation after the Revolution. In that sense, the striking point in Morris's utopia is his longing for a past order. Even though he designs this life for future, he suggests restoring the elements of the 14th century for his idealized pastoral England. This longing for past values gives his utopia an anti-modern perspective which is incompatible with socialism as well as Marx's vision in relation to modernity and capitalism. The simple and pastoral life designed in *Nowhere*, can not claimed to be a socialist model even though the horticultural patterns are in line with Marx's writings. The basic problem is that Morris rejects modernity and its outcomes alongside with capitalism. He suggests leaving modernity to cure the negative outcomes and impacts of capitalism. This betrays his so-called vision of socialism in *Nowhere*.

**3.2. Socialized Technology and Mechanical Life in Bellamy's** *Looking Backward*


In contrast to Morris's 'disordered' and 'disorganized' life in *Nowhere*, Bellamy's utopian society is organized along with pre-determined rules and principles. I want to argue that Bellamy's utopian society is marked by a 'mechanical way of life'. The main patterns of such 'mechanical' life in Bellamy's utopia can be classified under four main subtitles: art and education, daily life, technology and gender. All of these elements serve to the establishment and protection of a mechanical way of life which is not carried out only through machines and advanced technology, but through social organization and individuals and their interaction in a process of rationalization.


**3.2.1. Hegemony of Technology**


In Bellamy's utopia, the idea of rationalization is embodied and institutionalized in the Industrial Army and supported by the practices of discipline and control. Thus, rationalization refers to a political and economic hegemony diffused to each and every aspect of daily life through the organisation of the Army. This rationalization is also related with technology and its widespread uses in the utopia. Individuals are controlled through the same process, then it can be argued that technology is a means of hegemony in Bellamy's utopia. Such comment can be derived from Marcuse's (1998)

analysis of Freud. Marcuse argues that such technological hegemony is realized through blurification of distinction between society and individual. The interests and needs of society at large and single individual are made to appear as one and same. This 'rationalized' culture restrains humans while transforming 'pleasure principle' into 'reality principle' with a continuous process of submission. This leads to the rationalization of domination, for a long time interests of domination and society coincide as production meets the needs of individuals. In that sense Bellamy assumes that this will be a never-ending situation. He fails to see that after a point, especially with the increasing specialization, this process would cause alienation as men do not live their own lives but perform pre-established functions in a routine manner. Because, as Marcuse claims, men exist only part-time, during the working hours, as an instrument of alienated performance. And in the rest of time he is free to be himself. This means that man has to work to be free. Bellamy keeps the duality between necessity and freedom, or work and play at the centre of his utopian project. Bellamy assumes that rationalization and mechanization of labour has a tendency to free energy for realization of objectives set by free play of individual faculties. As technology minimizes the time necessary for production of necessities of life, it saves time for the development of needs beyond the realm of necessities. This hegemony makes Bellamy's utopian society mechanistic and in a sense enslaving despite having so-called emancipatory potentials.

Thus, Bellamy's utopian society is technological and mechanical, because the improved machinery is adopted and used in every stage of social

86

formation[56]. It is appreciated as a positive value and regarded as a source of pleasure, because it removes or reduces the burden of production. It is at the same time a step to freedom. This idea can be found in Marx's writings too. It has been mentioned with respect to Morris's utopia that Marx's two utopian visions of socialism can be detected in *Nowhere*. However, Marx also have the other two visions for a socialist society as it has been argued by Beilharz (2004: 597-8) which are not compatible with Morris's vision, but of Bellamy's. In that sense Beilharz (2004: 599) argues that:

> In the *Grundrisse* Marx plays with the creative image of musical composition as labour, but later toys with the fascinating possibilities made available by the prospect of automation. Plainly Marx was speculating, anticipating a process well beyond Ford and Fordism; yet the implications are not only futuristic. Here the very labour ontology upon which his early work is based is placed under question. Labour's magic is transferred conceptually into technology itself; technology, rather than labour, becomes the transcendent force implicit within capital. The prospect of freedom, or at least of free time, shifts beyond the sphere of labour or production to the realm beyond it. Production, here, rather seems to be the prerequisite of free time and capacity elsewhere, though never for Marx in leisure. The ontology of creation persists across his work, but here it escapes from the realm of production. This drift seems to be confirmed in one passage in *Capital* Volume Three, where the famous discussion of freedom and necessity shifts freedom more clearly beyond labour. Here imagination seems to be separated from work; the craft utopia implicit in the *Paris Manuscripts* is nowhere in sight. Freedom is defined as the work of the associated producers, who rationally regulate their interchange with nature, bringing it under their common control rather than being ruled by it. The realm of work is now conceived as the realm of necessity. Beyond that, there begins the development of human energy which is an end in itself. This is the true realm of freedom. Its very possibility depends on the shortening of the working day.

---

[56] Balthrope (2006: 307) states that appreciation of technology is one of the basic characteristics of new society of Bellamy and it is assumed to support communal life even though at certain points it has 'decentralizing tendencies'. It can be claimed that Bellamy uses technology to organize the social formation. This is the hegemony of technology over individuals. In that sense, Auerbach (1994: 38) argues that technology is the link between individual and community. Rather than relying on 'civil society', Bellamy employs technology to bind individuals to each other and that is realized under the organization of the Industrial Army. So, Berneri (1969: 252) underlines that the faith in technical progress complements the basic notions of government and administration; thus the hierarchical structure of the Industrial Army is justified. I agree with those arguments because, Bellamy adopts technology as ideology to manipulate and control the inhabitants of his utopian society.

The first indication of technology is based on the observations of West (the 19<sup>th</sup> century's aristocrat who wakes up to the Boston 2000) about the non-existence of 'chimneys and smokes' (Bellamy: 1951: 30). This may imply a change in the energies used. Also, in relation to education, it is claimed that people have to learn the functioning of mechanisms theoretically (1951: 50). This may mean that mechanisms are sophisticated and a certain degree of 'knowledge' is necessary to use them. When West stresses the 'artificial light' used in lightening indoors (1951: 31) we get the idea that there are certain significant technological advances, at least in the energy used in that society. Bellamy describes technology in detail and provides a picture of factories, yet these factories are never seen in action. Bellamy defines merely the organisation of the Industrial Army, production, distribution and exchange. However, he never actually mentions the production process. This can be regarded as a rupture from Marxism as Bellamy here seems to be neglecting the economic base and its transformation. I want to argue that such neglection reflects Bellamy's obsession with structuring and order rather than the processes taking place in these organisations. This may mean that Bellamy sees individuals as 'cogs in the machine' to be organized and regulated in line with the basic principles of the social organization. Bellamy's mechanistic notion prevents him to describe whole structure in detail. He provides us the bigger picture and while neglecting the minor details he may want the reader to assume that these details reflect the main patterns of the organisation. In addition, West comes across with a broadcasting mechanism operating from a central source inside each and every room of houses (1951: 88, 110, 222). It

should be noted that *via* that technology, music can easily reach to the masses all day long. Music is not a joy for upper classes anymore (1951: 90-1). So, it can be argued that technology, in a way, serves to the realization of equality in terms of access to good life. This broadcasting mechanism is explained in following words: "there are a number of music rooms in the city, perfectly adapted acoustically to the different sorts of music. These halls are connected by telephone with all the houses of the city whose people care to pay the small fee" (1951: 89). The role of women reflects another example of 'emancipatory' and equalizing features of technology. Women are emancipated from domestic labour by the use of machines, or at least their burden has been 'lightened' (1951: 94). As another example, there are 'waterproof coverings' on the streets in order to protect each and every inhabitant from the negative effects of weather (1951: 121). These examples reflect Bellamy's obsession with technology in his utopian society.

It can be maintained that in Bellamy's utopia, social and 'biophysical' worlds are regarded as entities to be transformed rationally according to man's desires and needs (Meyer: 2004). Humans also attempt to perfect nature and the negative effects of climate are controlled. In this system, nature itself is not modified but only its effects are changed and controlled. This is a 'social construction' in a sense, as nature is not transformed but the way it is 'used' has been altered in a radical manner (Meyer: 2004). The antagonism between human beings and environment is abolished or at least that what it seems to have been accomplished. Thus, Bellamy may be classified as a

'technocentric'[57]. The process of rationalisation makes even the nature an artificial being which can be rationally reformed and organised. It can be argued that the relation between nature and individuals in Bellamy's utopia is problematic if one looks from the perspective of socialism. Bellamy does not establish a dialectical relation between man and nature, but simply transforms nature into an object and establishes human domination over nature. Bellamy justifies this with the argument of rationalisation for an ordered society guided by technological means. It can be claimed that this obsession of Bellamy with technology conflicts with socialism.

The patterns of scientific activity in Bellamy's utopia should also be pointed out. For instance, it is stated that there is a laboratory in the Doctor's house, and this may imply the use and significance of empirical sciences as Doctor has built it for 'chemical experiments' (1951: 24). In addition, there is also a focus on 'positive-natural' science in Bellamy's utopia (1951: 140). In line with these remarks, it is stated that this is an "era of mechanical invention and scientific discovery" (1951: 130). Consequently, scientific progress goes together with technical developments as an integral part of the Industrial Army. Thus, science and scientific activities are adopted as mechanisms of order and control for this future society together with technology.

As Bellamy underlines the emancipatory aspects of technology, machinery is regarded not as the enemy but as the servant of humanity. Bellamy adopts technology as a means to emancipation and control for his ideal society. This reflects a belief that technology can be utilized in a positive

---

[57] "Technocentrism recognizes environmental problems but believes that society will solve them or through careful organizational arrangements they can be regulated" (Pepper: 1995: 53).

way in order to overcome its negative consequences realized under capitalism. In this manner, technology can satisfy mankind's needs and desires rather than creating endless problems. This cooperation of machinery and humanity makes Bellamy's utopian society artificial as well as mechanical[58].

### 3.2.2. Privacy within Publicity

In relation to technology and its impacts on social life, the design of public and private[59] spheres in Bellamy's utopian text should be mentioned. In Bellamy's utopia, the inhabitants prefer to have their dinners in 'public dining houses'. However, each family or individual has a private room reserved and rented as a part of their houses. Isolation is kept, they experience privacy within public sphere (1951: 122-3). The separation between public and private spheres is protected, as it is stated that "at home we have comfort, but the splendour of our life is, on its social side, that which we share with our fellows" (1951: 198)[60]. Individuals in Bellamy's utopia prefer to be in public as they are parts of a big nation and 'have to' interact with their fellows.

---

[58] As Segal (2001: 563) argues, Bellamy's utopia is regarded as technological because of the fact that society is dependent upon machines and constructed on the parameters of modern technological mentality.

[59] Auerbach (1994: 27) argues that in Bellamy's utopia there is confusion between public and private spheres even though they exist as two different spheres. There is indeterminacy concerning the status of public and private because, as Collins (1991: 60) claims, individuals live as if they are in isolation. I agree with these arguments because it can be claimed that public sphere is highly 'privatized' in Bellamy's utopia. Bellamy defines public and private as two distinct and different spheres but a full publicity is not realized. Individuals remain to be private beings even when they are in public sphere. That fact makes impossible to define the status of public and private spheres.

[60] As Towers (1975: 59-60) argues, one of the control mechanisms, family kept its place at the centre of society without major changes. For instance, house is still an isolated structure.

However, individuals desire to keep their privacy and isolation. So, privacy is enclosed within public. It can be stated that 'individuality' is attained through a synthesis of private and public spheres. The process through which one learns to be a part of public is regarded as an educative process achieved by the development of self to fit in a rational order. In this way, the attempt is to end the duality between community and individual. This individualism is compatible with common interest, this notion of individualism is closer to individual identity[61]. This mechanical and standardized society model is a kind of a *'Gesellschaft'* which is a social organisation based on "division of labour and contracts between isolated individuals conducting their own self-interest" (Pepper: 1995: 16). Through rationalization, individuals internalize their places within the system. They can be recognized only in relation to the system and this is the core of Bellamy's individualism. Community defines individual and it realizes that through the Industrial Army. It can be argued that both the individualization process and community created by these individuals are really mechanical and standardized. In addition, this makes Bellamy's utopian society a static collectivity. Because, community appears to be a finished, pre-

---

[61] In that sense, Hall (1997) argues that human beings are motivated by their self-interests but they are capable of altruism which is compatible with self-interest. And Michaels (1989: 73-81) claims that Bellamy sets out a notion of individuality as difference within the 'system'. Individuals are not independent, but individualized by their place within the system and this is a kind of mechanization. Individuality becomes a part of standardization and this process of individualization continues and is promoted within the Industrial Army. This is an individualism defined by difference rather than independence. The system consists of differences and by making differences possible, it makes identity possible. Thus, as Mullin (2000: 61) states Bellamy makes social duty as a condition of individual freedom. I agree with these arguments because Bellamy establishes a system which both limits and promotes individuality. Bellamy does not desire individuals to be uniform, but to be different from each other so that each and every individual can undertake separate functions in such a system as organic entities. However, Bellamy limits this individuality with the principles of the Industrial Army. This means that individuals would develop their identities within certain boundaries which blocks the way of independence. Individuals have to undertake their assigned tasks within the system to realize themselves. Thus, the Industrial Army appears to be only option for individuals to realize themselves.

determined structure, a scheme for individuals and through 'assimilating' individuals in line with its principles it ends up in defending a static and closed structure for the individuals.

### 3.2.3. 'Mechanized' Education

In Bellamy's utopian text, education is carried out in line with the needs of technological advances[62] and the Industrial Army (Bellamy: 1951: 49). Education is the basis of the Industrial Army, and it may be argued that the whole system depends on education and its main patterns (1951: 50). As to compare with Morris's anarchism in terms of education, one may argue at that point that Bellamy's vision of a clearly defined system of education reflects his obsession with order, social fixity and predictability. It may be claimed that Bellamy does not want anything unpredictable in his utopia which may disturb the order. In that sense, Bellamy aims to reduce individual choice to a minimum. In addition, the model of education in Bellamy's utopia is not radical, but a revised version of the system of education of the 19$^{th}$ century (1951: 177). Education is the first level composing the Industrial Army, as through it, the natural talents of children are determined so as their future places within the Army (1951: 50, 178). The nature of education is one of

---

[62]About the relation between education and the Army in Bellamy's utopia, Hansot (1974: 119, 122) underlines that education is 'merged' with the economic system and it is "almost identical to the desire for economic equality, the social ideal". Cooperman (1963: 464) claims that education or 'training' serves to the realization of pre-determined ends; to the principles of Nationalism. It may be argued that as education appears to be a complementary part of the Industrial Army, it also has a static nature. Education does not aim to further advances and progress but realization of pre-determined ends. I want to argue that this conservative nature of education blocks the way for any further progress and change. Because, it aims to keep individuals in 'their places'. That will be discussed in the next chapter.

intellectual rather than manual even though the students get familiarized with mechanics to a certain degree (1951: 50). Unlike Morris's system of education based on practical knowledge rather than intellectual, in Bellamy's utopia education is much more a 'brain work' rather than manual. There are different schools for different professions and all are equally open to every citizen on the basis of natural talents in line with individual preferences up to the age of 30 (1951: 55). Those 'talents' are determined and revealed through certain examinations in a rational way in line with the basic principles of the Industrial Army and Nationalism: "our schools are national institutions, and to have passed their tests is a proof of special abilities not to be questioned" (1951: 55). There is also another set of tests before one gets into the Industrial Army and starts his profession (1951: 96). In Bellamy's utopia, citizens attend schools to get a profession, not to avoid work and labour in opposition to the case of the 19th century. It is assumed that without equality in education, a real equality in society could not be realized (1951: 176)[63]. Thus, in a sense, education aims to 'equalize the unequals' and create a 'refined social life' (1951: 180): "we should not consider life worth living if we had to be surrounded by a population of ignorant, boorish, coarse, wholly uncultivated men and women" and "no single thing is so important to every man as to have for neighbours intelligent, companionable persons" (1951: 179). The basic principles of education have been listed as three: everyone has a right to education, everyone

---

[63] With respect to the relation between education and equality in Bellamy's utopian text, Auerbach (1994: 34-5) argues that 'mass and universal education' is both a democratizing element and a way to establish and preserve the 'national culture', and in that way both 'uniformity and individuation' are realized. I agree with this argument because in Bellamy's utopia education serves to mechanization of individuals and acts as a control and manipulation mechanism under the veil of self-development and equality discourses.

has a right to have educated people around himself and every unborn has the right to have educated parents (1951: 180-1). This implies that education does not only serve to the individual fulfillment and satisfaction, but it is for the social formation at large and for the well-being of the Industrial Army. It can be argued that the main purpose of education is to create 'perfect citizens' to fit into the principles of the Industrial Army rather than cultivating creative minds. Thus, one may argue that in Bellamy's utopia, education acts as an instrument of control and as a 'normalization' mechanism. This means that order and discipline are not realized by coercion, but by the ideology which is technological rationality[64]. As it has been manifested, Bellamy and Morris have distinct ideas on education. In Morris's *Nowhere*, individuals are free to choose what to learn, but Bellamy designs a compulsory system of education which necessitates everyone to have at least a minimum and standard education. It may be claimed that these are two separate ways to keep society harmonious. That is to say, Morris leaves individuals on their own so there is no coercion on individual which would prevent any risk of disturbance through disobedience. On the other hand, Bellamy aims to use rationalisation as a means to keep society at peace through the internalization of basic principles of the utopian society through education.

---

[64] About the technological rationality Gutek (1964: 252-9) states that system of education in Bellamy's utopian society has a dual nature. It is carried out on both formal and informal levels. On the informal level, Bellamy assumes an enlightened public which would educate individuals and realize a conversion. This informal education would serve to preserve order and society and act as a regulative authority with the social structure. And it would preserve equilibrium. On the other hand, formal education does not have the role to reconstruct society continually. It aims to preserve society as it is. In addition, Bellamy does not describe formal education and its quality. He takes it for granted that education is good in itself. Bellamy also unifies the formal system of education with the Industrial Army. In my mind, this means that in Bellamy's utopia, education has a conservative connotation as it aims to shape individuals in line with the basic principles of the Industrial Army and then to keep them in their places.

### 3.2.4. Women as 'Imperium in Imperio'

In addition, women and their status within the social formation have undergone a somehow radical transformation in Bellamy's utopia. Following the premise of 'social equality' women are now freed from the burdens of domestic labour (1951: 93). Domestic tasks are undertaken by the Industrial Army at the public centres, it is even stated that there is no housework to carry out now (1951: 94, 116, 122-3, 127). Women are emancipated, and their burdens are transferred to the 'broad shoulders of the nation' in opposition to the situation of the $19^{th}$ century (1951: 95, 185). Women are freed from housework, because it was consuming so much energy and the housework did not have any use to the industrial production when compared to the national methods of production (1951: 208-9). At that point, Bellamy seems to be ignoring the reproduction of labour power outside working places, and such ignorance could only be possible for the sake of 'concrete' efficiency realized within the Industrial Army. In Bellamy's utopia, women are recruited to the Industrial Army to increase efficiency and productivity. Thus, such 'emancipation' ends women's slavery in private sphere, and starts a new slavery within the Industrial Army. It is open to debate whether this is a real emancipation or not[65]. Women leave the Army only when their maternal duties

---

[65] As Balthrope (2006: 308), Connor (2000: 46) and Manuel&Manuel (1979: 763) argue, there is no real progress in relation to position of women within Bellamy's utopian society; 'paternalism' and 'patrimonialism' continue and women are still regarded to be 'secondary-citizens'. I agree with those arguments because Bellamy's concern is not equality in that sense but to increase efficiency and productivity. Thus, his main concern is not to 'equalize' the

necessitate, but not because they get married (1951: 209). However, women are regarded as 'inferior in strength to men', women have different occupations even though they participate to the Army on equal grounds (1951: 209, 213). Women are assigned with lighter tasks, and have shorter working hours (1951: 210). Also, in Bellamy's utopia the labour organisation of women is different than the general organisation of the Industrial Army[66] and they "constitute rather an allied force rather than an integral part of the army of men. They have a woman general-in-chief and under exclusively feminine regimé" (1951: 210). Women are *'imperium in imperio'* (1951: 211). It is stated that sexes have different features and this fact has not been recognized in the previous centuries. Now, these differences are realized and organisations are adopted in line with these differences realizing both equality and equity (1951: 211). Hammond (the old man of the 21st century who is providing information about this new society to West) says that "we have given them a world of their own, with its emulations, ambitions, and careers, and I assure you they are very happy in it" (1951: 211). In my mind, this means that women are subjected to both positive and negative discrimination. One may argue that this is negative discrimination, because women are completely separated from the general functioning of the Industrial Army, the state and government. This is also positive discrimination as the uniqueness of women is recognized and they are

sexes but to increase productivity through recruiting all potential labour force into the Industrial Army.

[66] As Davis (2005: 183, 188) argues, because women do not participate in the general Industrial Army, they are denied from the membership into the 'universal brotherhood'. Communality remains to be 'gender-specific'. Following this argument, I want to state that Bellamy's equality discourse remains to be gender-blind in a sense, he still keeps the antagonism between the sexes within the Industrial Army.

assigned to different tasks than men but still, they are paid in equal amounts in return to their services.

### 3.2.5. Family and Eugenics

It is claimed that in this future society family and parenthood are based on equality between the sexes. It is stated that "a husband is not a baby that should be cared for" (1951: 209). In addition, there are no 'artificial' bonds to keep women at domestic sphere even after the marriage unlike the 19th century. Also, maternity does not prevent women from being a part of public life, because they are free to take their necessary time, and then they return to the Army (1951: 212-3). In addition, it is claimed that women who are wives, mothers and labourers at the same time are regarded to be more respectable in the Industrial Army. However, this 'being respectable' is not proved by any objective criteria. In the previous chapter it has been argued that citizen-labourers in Bellamy's utopia are not guided by material motives, but moral concerns like soldiers. Thus, as it has been demonstrated, honour and glory are regarded to be more important than material benefits to the people of Bellamy's utopia. In that sense, being respectable does not necessitate any objective or material proof. These women are honoured by society because, they are believed to represent their sexes 'fully' (1951: 213). This means that Bellamy still keeps traditional feminine roles for women; to be 'full women' they have to be mothers and wives alongside with being labourers for the nation. In Bellamy's utopia women do not only participate in the material

production process but they undertake reproduction of the 'race' as one of their major 'tasks'. In addition, in Bellamy's utopia, no one individual depends on the other. In a family, both man and woman are economically independent from each other and even their children are not their dependents (1951: 214-5). The children are regarded as future sources of labour by nation, and they belong to nation. Parents are only the guardians to direct them to the patterns and principles of the Industrial Army (1951: 214). It is argued that in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, there was a dependency structure within the family because of the way the society was organized. Now, as the nation takes care of all, independence and freedom for all have been realized (1951: 215). It is stated that "entire change in the position of women cannot have taken place without affecting in marked ways the social relations of sexes" (1951: 216). Because the economic concerns are abolished and the principle of equality among sexes is realized, now marriages are based on love and inclination (1951: 216-7, 226).

Interestingly enough, in such set of relationships, there is the implication of eugenics, race betterment and purification. This is realized through sexual selection as everyone is free to choose his/her spouses (1951: 218). It is stated that this is not only a physical but also mental and moral betterment (1951: 219). It is claimed that people are better off both physically and psychologically as they have overcome idleness and have nation to keep them healthy both in body and mind (1951: 182). Even though the institution of marriage and sexual selection occupy a relatively large part in Bellamy's utopia, there is no mention of contraceptives and abortion. This may imply that the process of race purification is realized 'naturally' without any intervention.

However, to regard this process of eugenics purely 'natural' may be naive because what leads to this betterment is the way the system is organized.

### 3.2.6. Religion in Bellamy's Utopia

In the first chapters of Bellamy's utopia, it is implied that inhabitants believe in a 'creator' or 'God'. In the beginning it is not certain whether people are still Christians or not (1951: 74, 107). When it is Sunday, West becomes sure that they are still Christians as they have Sunday Sermons and churches (1951: 221). However, he realizes that there are certain changes in relation to the religious practices. For instance, clergy as a class does not exist anymore (1951: 222, 235) as there is only one class which is the nation. West hears a sermon which criticises the society of the $19^{th}$ century and religion in that age stressing the beauty and superiority of this new age (1951: 226-7, 229-31, 233-4, 238). This new age is regarded as 'heaven' (1951: 239). It is stated that as full-mundane equality is realized, eternal equality before the God can be realized too. This reflects Bellamy's moral concerns together with his concerns for material and technological advances. In a sense, he establishes a *terrestial* Kingdom of God in his utopia.

### 3.2.7. Art and Culture in Boston the Year 2000

This *'terrestial* Kingdom' does not only include technology but also art. In that sense, music should be introduced which seems to be an integral part of

inhabitants' lives, as it reaches to the masses easily (1951: 87-90). Just like music, all forms of art are easily accessible by public and even public decides which work of art is worthy; people vote for them (1951: 132). In that sense, it can be claimed that art has been fully democratized in Bellamy's utopia. In addition, the common practice with respect to the arts and literature should also be examined. The classics of the 19th century are still being appreciated (1951: 117), and new literary artifacts are produced (1951: 129). It is stated that this is an era of "art, musical and literary productiveness" (1951: 130). However, the processes have been changed with respect to the art and now the artist pays for his/her publications (1951: 130-1). This may imply that anyone is capable of producing works of art. This may claimed to be mechanistic too, as art is regarded as an ordinary and in a sense, a rational activity rather than a matter of talent and muse. It is stated that in the 19th century the literature in general was not realistic as if it was independent from the objective facts. They were romances (1951: 137) and also were pessimistic reflecting the general aura of the age. However, as Bellamy does not mention the nature and features of new literary and artistic products, a comparison with the 19th century is not possible. It may only be claimed that Bellamy does not appreciate the works of the 19th century.

As has been pointed out, music reaches the masses easily and this is realized through a kind of broadcasting media. In that sense, through broadcasting media, there is a sort of mass communication in Bellamy's utopia. At that point the role and position of the printed press, and the newspapers should also be mentioned. With respect to the newspapers, it is stated that they

are not regarded as the sole source of criticism. Unlike the 19th century they are not biased tools of the government and/or the dominant ones (1951: 134). As the whole process in news-making is nationalized and made to be financially autonomous, and since there is no censorship (1951: 130) the newspapers are claimed to be free to express any opinion people desire (1951: 134). There are a number of newspapers almost for each and every purpose and idea (1951: 135). At that point it should be reminded that as this process is national, all ideas and purposes would be in line with the basic ideas and principles of the Industrial Army. Thus, newspapers would not be mechanisms to create any sort of public opinion to lead change. They are just manipulation mechanisms of the Industrial Army, another way to exert its hegemony over the public.

### 3.2.8. The Mechanization of Urbanization

It has been argued that in practice there is not a clear-cut distinction between public and private spheres, but individuals 'have to' be in public sphere. This public sphere in Bellamy's utopia is city[67] the organisation of which has also been transformed in time. In relation to the townscape and architecture, it is stated that city has been re-structured with the introduction of certain natural patterns (1951: 27). The distinction between urban and rural parts is also preserved and the city retained its central role in the social

---

[67] It can be claimed that city is the secondary public sphere in Bellamy's utopia. Because, as has been indicated the major public sphere for individuals is the Industrial Army.

organisation[68]. Even though Bellamy does not describe the city and its organisation in detail, deriving from the general patterns and principles of the new order, it can be claimed that city is a complementary part of the general organisation and the sphere of realisation of mechanical human interaction.

### 3.2.9. Concluding Remarks

Bellamy founds his utopia on the idea of rationality which in turn is based on the dominance and hegemony of modern technology and mechanization. Even though Bellamy seems to be following Marx's idea on the emancipatory function of technology, he is at the same time trapped in the negative outcomes of 'technology as ideology' as it has been analysed by Marcuse. The result is a mechanistic way of life which is standard, routine and static. The idea of such rationality blocks any possibility of further change and acts as the tool of discipline for the inhabitants. Bellamy's 'dream' turns to be a 'nightmare' for the inhabitants of this future society. Because, he leaves no place of escape, freedom and joy in his utopia. Bellamy's obsession with order and technology makes his designed Boston of the year 2000 a gray, depressive and in a sense to use Foucault's terminology a 'Panopticon'-like structure.

---

[68] Mullin (2000: 52-4) argues that there is the theme of a 'great city'. "Bellamy sees city as the central force within society and he slightly mentions countryside. Bellamy's utopian city is planned, organized, regularized and public intervention is evident in scenery. In addition, the new city has been built on the old one. Bellamy regarded city worth keeping; the city does not have to be destroyed for a radical transformation. Bellamy does not eliminate rural life but he rationalizes rural life through reforms. Thus, this is a progressive urban community, urban based and built on an historic continuum and new city is architectonic, ordered, straight and proper. And it is marked by standardization, repetition, regularization and a sense of strong centralized control". I agree with such an argument because as whole system is rationalized and ordered, the city, as the only public sphere other than the Industrial Army should also be ordered and rationalized.

### 3.3. Conclusion

This chapter has identified the social organisation perception in Morris's and Bellamy's utopias. This identification revealed the differences in these utopias as well as these utopias' non-socialist and anti-modernist features. As it has been examined, Morris designs a pastoral way of life for the inhabitants of his utopia. This pastoral life is marked by the values and features of the 14<sup>th</sup> century. Thus, it can be claimed that Morris's utopia is nostalgic in that sense. It has also been manifested that Morris rejects modernity and its outcomes alongside with capitalism. In his utopia, Morris is in favour of the Gothic architecture of the 14<sup>th</sup> century, 14<sup>th</sup> century's clothing, he rejects technological advances and suggests handicraft production, 'emancipates' women but assigns them to traditional feminine roles, 'abolishes' education, suggests unification of cities and towns and makes literature and history unnecessary in a sense. Thus, it may not be wrong to argue that Morris's utopia is archaic, anti-modern and anti-intellectual. The problem arises at that point because Morris's rejection of modernity and his anti-modernist tendencies contradict with the theory of socialism. Deriving from this conflict, I would like to question whether Morris's utopia can be regarded as socialist. This will be the task of the next chapter.

It has been argued that Bellamy's utopia is mechanistic and determined by technological advances. Deriving from this fact, it may be argued that Bellamy's utopia is modern to a certain extent. Bellamy designs a society organized along the rational lines, he aims to adopt technological advances in

every aspect of daily life, attributes high importance to education, equalizes the sexes and establishes an ordered structure. On the other hand, Bellamy keeps traditional moral values in this society which distances him from the socialist theory. Even though Bellamy's utopian society is a rational one, it is designed as an organic structure. Also the traditional values such as importance of family and the 'secondary' position of women are still kept. In addition, all social formation is designed in a way to prevent any further change and progress. This conservative outlook shadows this utopia's claim of socialism. Thus, in the next chapter I will try to find out whether Bellamy's utopia may be regarded as socialist.

As to conclude this chapter, even though both Bellamy's and Morris's utopias are 'labeled' as socialist, Morris's nostalgic perspective and Bellamy's obsession with technology and traditional values at the same time make this label questionable. Thus, in the next chapter the analysis will be directed to question the 'socialist' nature of the two utopias in terms of the notion of modernity.

# CHAPTER IV

## MODERNITY AND SOCIALISM IN *NEWS FROM NOWHERE* AND *LOOKING BACKWARD*

In the previous chapters, it has been demonstrated that both Bellamy and Morris suggest and try to justify the need for a change to create new and better societies with the Marxist principles of historical materialism. They regard these changes as historical necessities and claim that indeed their roots have existed in previous orders.

Briefly, Burawoy claims that Marx's theory of historical materialism firstly holds that "for there to be history, men and women must transform nature into means of their survival, that is they must produce the means of their existence" (Burawoy: 1990: 780). Secondly, it is claimed that "the 'economic base' or mode of production defines the limits of variation of the superstructure" (Burawoy: 1990: 780). In addition, a certain mode of production "develops through the interaction between the forces of production (how we produce the means of existence) and the relations of production (how the product of labor is appropriated and distributed)" (Burawoy: 1990: 780). This development of a mode of production refers to a transition from one mode to another and in this process the motto is class struggle. In order to realize a 'successful' transition, material conditions should be present. Thus, "history is progressive insofar as it follows the expansion of the forces of production" (Burawoy: 1990: 780). In that sense "communism spells the end of social antagonisms and the beginning of the emancipation of individuals. We no

longer make history behind our backs but consciously and collectively" (Burawoy: 1990: 780). Thus, the theory of historical materialism basically argues that "growth in productive power is the force underlying social change" (Cohen: 1988: 137). Social change in historical materialism is not romantic, that is to say, it does not seek to re-establish pre-modern and pre-capitalist values. It aims to abolish capitalist relations of production as well as social and political relations determined by them. Such transformation aims to make use of modernity and the positive aspects of its outcomes. In addition, it is assumed that change is organized and carried out through class struggles in any capitalist society.

In line with these arguments, in this chapter, the association and disassociation of historical materialism and socialism of Marx and Engels with the utopias of Bellamy and Morris will be examined under the notions of modernity, change and discipline. The intention on the one hand is to reveal the anti-modernist tendencies in these utopias, and on the other hand, while referring to Marxism to point out that these anti-modernist features may be regarded as a price paid in their attempts to be socialist. In addition, I want to argue that to a great extent, the anti-modernist features of the two utopias result from Marxism itself and to be modern and socialist at the same creates certain points of tension in these utopias. That is to say, while trying to be socialist, these utopias move away from socialism, as they escape from the main premises of modernity.

## 4.1. Modernity

Wallerstein (1995: 471) terms two definitions of modernity. He claims that the first one is 'positive and forward-looking and refers to advanced technology'. And it has a material form. He argues that the second definition is:

> More oppositional rather than affirmative. One could characterize this other connotation less as forward-looking than as militant (and also self-satisfied), less material than ideological. To be modern signifies to be anti-medieval, in an antinomy in which the concept 'medieval' incarnated narrow-mindedness, dogmatism, and above all the constraints of authority. (Wallerstein: 1995: 472)

Overall, one may enumerate certain aspects of modernity as: equality, freedom, individuality, instrumental reason and progress.

As has been examined in the previous chapters, Morris designs a social formation established through a revolution which abolishes all structures set out by capitalism under modernity. This 'new' society is indeed based on the main features of a pre-modern order, the Middle Ages. For Morris, since capitalism has negative connotations such a return is plausible. However, I want to argue that his anti-modernist tendencies make his so-called communism archaic. Such anti-modernism is evident in the labouring process, because Morris unifies life and production and underlines handicraft production. His utopia carries anticipation for rebuilding the guild system and craftsmanship. In addition, the modern idea of nation has left its place to fellowship which is regarded as a 'natural' bond among people. Also, even the built and natural environments have been re-organized in line with the patterns

of the 14th century, for instance Gothic architecture is the predominant style in new society. Another point refers to human's relation with nature. Morris simply tries to unify human and nature as one. He is also hostile to modern technology and mechanization and keeps them very limited in his utopian system. More interesting is that even the dressing of inhabitants has the patterns of the 14th century in this ideal system.[69]

Thus, Morris tries to envision a communist future but he founds this future on the features of pre-modern times. This model is regarded as 'Romantic Anti-Capitalism'[70] and 'Romantic Communism'[71]. Even though Morris tries to locate his theory of revolution on the Marxist theory of historical materialism, as he aims to 'wheel back the course of history' his

---

[69] In reference to restoration of the patterns of the 14th century, Bloch (1986: 614) argues that "Morris's utopia dreams up a new construction in the 21st century, it follows in the direction of medieval tendencies, but de-feudalized and secularized". For Bloch, "this backward-looking utopia is reminiscent of the longings at the time of the Restoration, of the Romantic infatuation with the Middle Ages and the wish to see it approaching again from the future". So, Morris desires to revive the past in the future in an arcadian way. In line with this idea, Schorske (1967: 216-232) claims that "Morris quested for future in the relics of past, Germanic myth, and medieval guild ideal. Only with disenchantment with modern civilization he sought for a vision by which ills of his age might be cured. Morris regarded these ills as special product of modern history, result of commercial civilization. So, he fills out socialist future with romanticized picture of Middle Ages". It can be claimed that Morris tries to apply a modern theory (socialism) to his pre-modern constructions. Also Daly (2006: xviii) states that Morris often seems to be trying to revive the practices of the feudal past. So, his communism refers both to a pre-capitalist and a pre-modern era. It is evident that this idea is not in line with Marxist perception of history which assumes the transition as one from capitalism to socialism/communism. Morris seems to be suggesting a conservative theory of history which is cyclical. Morris's perception of history in his utopia can claimed to be cyclical, because he carries the past elements into the future. This means that, in Morris's utopia, the progress towards future is the restoration of the past. This revival of the past makes Morris's utopian perception of history cyclical.

[70] Löwy (1987: 891) claims that "the essential characteristic of Romantic anti-capitalism is a thorough critique of modern industrial (bourgeois) civilization (including the process of production and work) in the name of certain pre-capitalist social and cultural values".

[71] According to Davis (1996: 719-20) 'Romantic Communism' "assumes that communism must represent a total break with modernity in favour of a reassertation of pre-modern social and cultural values". In addition, criticism of capitalism should be grounded in pre-modern social and cultural values.

theory becomes both anti-modern and conservative. Morris's anti-modernism is also accompanied with a suspicion towards civilization and this is evident in this dialogue between Guest and Hammnond:

> Said I: 'I could hardly have believed that there could be so many good-looking people in any civilized country.'
> He crowed a little, like the old bird he was. 'What! Are we still civilized?' said he. (Morris: 1995: 65)

Thus, in this chapter, one of my attempts will be to find out possible reasons for such anti-modernism that can be derived from Morris's utopia despite his Marxist rhetoric.

On the other hand, Bellamy's utopia seems to be a modern one because of its cultivation of an anticipation of technology and modern bureaucracy. However, a deeper analysis reveals his critical, if not anti-modern attitude towards modernity and in that sense his utopia is similar to Morris's *Nowhere*. Bellamy's critical attitude towards certain notions of modernity may be regarded as 'Reactionary modernism' which rejects liberal democracy and the legacy of the Enlightenment, however embraces the modern technology (Antliff: 2002: 149). First of all, Bellamy seems to be following the idea of historical materialism as he argues that the Evolution was a historical necessity and it had its roots in the old order. He regards the economic contradictions of capitalism as the motto for the Evolution. In that sense he seems to be employing the Marxist idea that "economic structure of society constitutes its 'real basis, on which a legal and political superstructure arises'" (Cohen: 1988: 30). Also the principle that "growth in productive power is the force underlying social change" (Cohen: 1988: 137). However, he also argues that history is not

linear but cyclical. This gives to his work a conservative and anti-modernist perspective. Because, if history is cyclical, the progress must refer to an old order. As Bellamy prefers evolution over revolution he does not suggest a complete break from both capitalism and modernity. He rather suggests a re-organization and selective introduction of elements of modernity and capitalism. Bellamy designs an organic conception of society and assigns a function for everyone which is directed to a pre-determined single goal: the wealth of the nation. In a sense, this provides his theory an almost fascistic element together with his idea and organization of 'labour army'. Bellamy designs a system of hierarchy and 'expertise' in the Industrial Army referring to the guild system (Bellamy: 1951: 98). Morris also appreciates guild system, but he eliminates its negative parts, and interestingly, the parts eliminated by Morris are the ones appreciated by Bellamy. This also shows Bellamy's desire to revive the past in the future. Let me now focus on each utopia in separate sections from the angle of the reasons for anti-modernism.

### 4.1.1. Morris's Anti-Modernity in *Nowhere*

In order to analyse Morris's perspective, I will focus on three basic concepts: individualism, instrumental reason and sense of a community[72]. My intention is to derive possible reasons for such hostility for modernity while examining the uses and meanings of these terms in Morris's utopia. In that

---

[72] Those terms-individualism, instrumental reason and a sense of a community-will also be used for the case of Bellamy. I chose those terms and concepts deriving from C. Taylor, (1991), *The Malaise of Modernity*. Ontario: Anansi Press. More or less I plan to follow his analysis on modernity.

sense, individual autonomy will be used so as to refer to the Kantian legacy of Enlightenment. In that sense:

> Enlightenment is man's emergence from his self-imposed immaturity. Immaturity is the inability to use one's understanding without guidance from another. This immaturity is self-imposed when its cause lies not in lack of understanding, but in lack of resolve and courage to use it without guidance from another. *Sapere Aude*! [dare to know] 'Have courage to use your own understanding!'--that is the motto of enlightenment. (Kant: 1784)

Thus, individualism is not used in this chapter to refer to self-interested, egoistic beings but as human beings who have the potential to realize themselves only through referring to their own reason rather than any external source than themselves. So, this individualism also refers to freedom besides autonomy. In addition, for Kant, this individualism can be realized through public use of reason. This means that the use of individualism also refers to publicity rather than concerning for private interests and benefits. In addition, the term 'instrumental reason' will be used to refer to a "kind of rationality we draw on when we calculate the most economical application of means to a given end. Maximum efficiency is its measure of success" (Taylor: 1991: 5).

In *Nowhere*, individualism is left for free development. As it has been mentioned, there is no education in the common sense of the term. Children are free to 'educate' themselves whenever and wherever they like to. In addition they chose what to learn. This means that knowledge is left to individual choice (Morris: 1995: 30-1). So, individual differences are recognized and embraced with respect to education (1995: 67). Because the capitalist economic relations of exchange have been left, each and every individual can have any material good he desires. This is left to the individual choice, taste and preferences (1995: 39). Even the family ties have been weakened, one is not obliged to live

112

in a definite place, and is free to move any time he wants (1995: 68). These amount to something more than private interest understood under modernity. Individuals are free to express their personal and private desires but this can not be against the ends of collectivity under the system of equality and freedom. In that sense, Taylor (1991: 44) identifies two types of individualism and Morris's model is 'individualism as a moral principle or ideal'. Following Taylor's argument, I want to claim that even though individuals are free to express themselves, they should live with others in harmony in Morris's utopia. In this system, there is no place for social atomism[73], radical anthropocentrism[74] and nihilism. Because, even though individual differences are recognized and individuals are left to develop their capacities freely, this is not an unconstrained 'liberty'. The friendly and peaceful relations among the inhabitants may be explained by Morris's perception of human nature. He seems to be regarding human nature as essentially good under proper conditions. As all material concerns have been abolished, these private interests only serve to the realization of self. Thus, it is directed to self-fulfillment. The possible tension between individual and community is tried to be removed 'formally'. The distinction between individual and public is kept. In that sense Morris recognizes that a full submission of individual to a community is not possible and this would mean infringement on personal liberties. So, on private

---

[73] Taylor (1991:58) defines social atomism as "centering fulfilment on individual making his affiliations fully instrumental and impersonal".

[74] For Taylor (1991:58) radical anthropocentrism is the tendency to "see fulfilment as just of self, neglecting or delegitimating demands coming from beyond our own desires".

matters individuals are free to choose but on public matters the will of the majority works. In that sense Hammond states that:

> You see in matters which are merely personal which do not affect the welfare of the community-how a man shall dress, what he shall eat and drink, what he shall write and read, and so forth-there can be no difference of opinion, and everybody does as he pleases. But when the matter is of common interest to the whole community, and the doing or not doing something affects everybody, the majority must have their way; unless the minority were to take up arms and show by force that they were the effective or real majority; which, however, in a society of men who are free and equal is little likely to happen; because in such a community the apparent majority is the real majority. (Morris: 1995: 90)

In *Nowhere*, individuals both realize and express themselves through their labour under conditions of freedom and equality. This refers to the notion of 'artistic labour': "that remedy was the production of what used to be called art, but which has no name amongst us now, because it has become a necessary part of the labour of every man who produces" (1995: 137). In that respect, Morris's notion of artistic labour is closely related to the term 'authenticity' used by Taylor. Taylor (1991: 37) argues that modern understanding of authenticity refers to notion of difference, originality, acceptance of diversity and it is related with art. In addition, this is 'expressivism' which refers to self-discovery and artistic creation relation which is creative and original (1991: 61-2). Just like in the artistic labour, self-discovery requires *poiesis*, making (1991: 62). As has been examined in the previous chapters in detail, Morris's term artistic labour refers to all production and labouring processes. In addition, inhabitants of this utopian society can only realize and express themselves through their labour which is also the ultimate source of joy. Released from any constrains and determinations of capitalist relations of

production and distribution, the labouring process in *Nowhere* is both creative and authentic. As each and every product is regarded as a work of art, individuals express themselves through their labour and products. Labouring is the daily activity of individuals, in that sense individuality[75] is produced and reproduced all the time.

It can be claimed that instrumental reason has vanished in this system. There is no system of private property and currency now (Morris: 1995: 86), so any motive and need for calculative action. The *homo economicus* has died in new society of *Nowhere*. Morris suggests that in this system individuals are motivated by 'joy' and 'creation of life'. This has moral connotations too, because individuals act in line with their inner principles and motivations rather than external concerns.

The senses of being a community and belonging have increased. The main indication of these is lack of administrative units such as cities to bring people together. Cities and towns dissolved into each other and left their places to small-scale voluntary organisations of individuals (1995: 72-5). As a consequence of equality, everyone regards each other as friend and there is a sense of fellowship. In addition, the political capacity of people has not decreased and political sphere as a place of 'collective action' has not disappeared. There is neither state nor government but there are local decision making units functioning through the patterns of direct democracy (1995: 77,

---

[75] "Individuality differs from individualism in three respects. It does not imply any isolation of the self, just the contrary. Nor does it suggest any sort of acquisitive drive. Finally, individuality is a dynamic notion. Although the lines of development are never sharply defined in advance, 'individuality' does summon people to regard their whole lives as open to drastic revaluation. De facto desires are never taken as nondebatable because they may not represent what an individual truly is and wants. In sum, individuality may in certain respects have been an outgrowth of the older individualism, but it embodies a very different idea of what constitutes a satisfactory life" (Hinchman: 1990: 765-6).

88-92). It can be claimed that the bond keeping these people together is moral, as Morris supposes friendship as natural bond in his society. The dissolution of cities into towns and communal units can also be regarded as an indication of Morris's anti-modernity. Cities are modern units organized by material and administrative concerns. In that sense, Morris's complete negation of urbanization can be associated with his negation of the Industrial Revolution and modernity.

Deriving from these suggestions, it can be argued that Morris rejects modernity on the basis of moral concerns and for the sake of individualism. He suggests artistic labour for the development of individual capacities and realization of individuals. This is the reason why he abolishes instrumental reason and creates, in a sense, a moral community based on the idea of friendship. It can be claimed that Morris sees modernity hostile to the individual development. Morris's utopian system is based on the idea of individual realization and satisfaction and he believes that these can only be possible through the negation of modernity and suggestion of revival of the pre-modern order and structures.

## 4.1.2. 'Reactionary Modernity' and Bellamy

In Bellamy's utopia, individualism is both promoted and limited by the Industrial Army. On the one hand, Bellamy tries to promote the development of individual capacities, on the other hand he tries to limit these capacities by the principles of the Industrial Army. In that sense, Taylor (1991: 2-3) argues

that individualism is related with the notion of freedom, as individuals have broke from previous moral horizons and hierarchical order of universe. It is claimed that this brings 'disenchantment' of the world. Thus, it can be argued that what Bellamy tries to do is to reconnect individuals to these moral horizons. One may argue that he tries to organize individuals as parts of a 'Great Chain of Being' which is represented by the Industrial Army in his utopia. The Industrial Army is based on differences and the recognition of these differences by system[76]. The main indicator of this is the determination of occupations based on individual choices according to their talents (Bellamy: 1951: 49). In addition, there is a stress on voluntary choice of individuals but this only functions within the limits of the Army[77] (1951: 52). Besides the differences, individual talents and tastes are also recognized and promoted by the system (1951: 85). In such a system, it is not possible for individuals to seek for the realization of their private concerns. In this new society, there is 'true self-interest of a rational unselfishness' (1951: 225) rather than 'anti-social qualities of men'. They 'work together for the maintenance of community' (1951: 188). It can be claimed that differences serve to the betterment of the society at large like different parts of a plant. It is stated that:

---

[76] Taylor (1991: 33) claims that human life has a dialogical character based on exchange and recognition for identity definiton. This is what Bellamy allows in his system, namely a kind of the identity formation and recognition which is realized by the Industrial Army.

[77] Michaels (1989: 73, 81) argues that in Bellamy, defense of individuality against the 'group' took the form of imagining persons as machines. The group poses a threat to individuality. Alternative is the army, consisting not of independent individuals but of individuals individualized by their place within the system. Individuality now appears as an effect of standardization. This is an assertion of individuality that only certain 'system' can make available. So, Bellamy's individuals are not independent atoms but parts of a system having distinct places and roles as an organic body. As has been manifested in the previous chapters, Bellamy's utopian society is mechanistic. In that sense, individuals are regarded as parts of a machine or a larger body. In addition, as parts of a larger body, individuals work towards a pre-determined goal. Those elements make Bellamy's utopia an amount of fascistic.

Individualism, which in your day was the animating idea of society, not only was fatal to any vital sentiment of brotherhood and common interest among living men, but equally to any realization of the responsibility of the living for the generation to follow. To-day this sense of responsibility, practically unrecognized in all previous ages, has become one of the great ethical ideas of the race, reinforcing, with an intense conviction of duty. (1951: 219)

This organic conception of society in Bellamy's utopia can be associated with his perception of human nature. As has been examined in the previous chapters, Bellamy believes that human nature is essentially good and can flourish as long as appropriate conditions are ensured. In Bellamy's utopia, one of these conditions is an all-powerful state to keep the citizens of the utopian society at peace[78].

Bellamy stresses the importance of morality over material concerns. In that respect, Taylor argues that:

Any technocratic, bureaucratic, industrial society is based on instrumental reason. On the one hand it fortifies atomism as it induces us to see our communities in an instrumental perspective. On the other hand, it breeds

---

[78] In referance to Bellamy's organic society conceptualization, a comparison and contrast with Hobbes can be introduced in order to reveal Bellamy's anti-modernist tendencies together with the modern ones in his utopia. Unlike Bellamy, Hobbes argues that human nature is evil, so human beings need a power above them to live together in peace. Even though Bellamy too, believes in the vitality of a power structure to regulate society, he tries to keep the internal bonds among the inhabitants in his utopian society free from these power networks with the discourse of solidarity. Contrary to Bellamy's view, Hobbes (1991: 119) claims that human beings need a power to live 'sociably' with one another. Hobbes develops this argument against Aristotle and argues that "certain living creatures, as Bees and Ants, live sociably one with another (which are therefore Aristotle numbred amongst Politicall creatures;) and yet have no other direction, than their particular judgements and appetites; nor speech, whereby one of them can signifie to another, what he thinks expedient for the common benefit:....Man-kind cannot do the same". In that sense Hobbes (1991: 119-20) provides six main reasons for his argument: men compete for honour and dignity that leads to hatred and war; amongst men common good differs from the private interest; men see themselves better than the rest and this leads to war; through the use of language men can lie; man causes most troubles when he is at ease because he has passions; and unlike ants and bees the agreement among men is not natural but artificial so a common power is needed "to keep them in awe, and to direct their actions to the common benefit". In that sense, it can be claimed that Bellamy's modern idea of state conflicts his anti-modern idea of society. He accepts in his utopia that there is a need for a strong state to guide the citizens towards a common good through various mechanisms of order and discipline. However, he disregards the 'risk' that solidarity may not be enough for a peaceful and stable society. It can be claimed that, as has been argued with respect to education in his utopia, Bellamy relies on his identification of individuality in the organization of society.

anthropocentrism in making us to take an instrumental stance to all facets of our life and surroundings. (1991: 59-60)

In that sense, it can be argued that by declaring the superiority of moral concerns over material ones, Bellamy tries to overcome that 'risk' of instrumentalism. Because, his society is bureaucratic and technocratic, thus modern. Hence, by the introduction of selective modernity, he tries to restore old idea of morality rather than modern instrumentality. Yet, as it has been argued, indeed he changes the level of instrumentality from individual to the collective. At first glance this seems to be the end of instrumental reason. However, all system is organized to maximize efficiency by the use of technology. It may be claimed that even though the main individual motive is not material, the collective motive is purely material and guided by instrumental reason. In a sense, Bellamy uses morality as a means to achieve the material goal. As has been pointed out, Bellamy designs his utopian society organized towards a pre-determined goal which is the national wealth. In such a system, the Industrial Army serves to the realization of this goal. It has been emphasized in the previous chapters that Industrial Army is organized along with the rational lines and this rationality is what determines that structure and organization of Bellamy's utopian society.

Bellamy names his utopian system as 'social' (Bellamy: 1951: 67), this may mean that he does not want to leave any space for atomism and self-interest, the community comes first. It is stated that there is a "sense of community of interest which supports our social system" (1951: 69). Indeed, there is excessive stress on solidarity and fellowship. This is the society of

119

'solidarity of the race and the brotherhood of man' (1951: 106). In other words, he aims to prevent any risk of atomism in his society. However, despite this lack of fragmentation there is no chance for collective action. All policies are made by 'elites', the people are not involved in these decision making processes. This is Bellamy's selective modernism. He embraces 'positive' use of industry and technology, but he shies away from modern notion of politics and gets closer to fascism. Bellamy's utopia has fascistic tendencies because as has been revealed, there is determination. The utopian society is directed to a pre-determined goal and organization is arranged to the realization of this goal.

Thus, it can be claimed that Bellamy's selective adoption of modernity is related with his obsession with harmony which leads to order and stability. The supposed outcome would be maximum efficiency and rationality. Especially application of instrumental reason is his remarkable solution to any possible disturbance and conflict in his utopian society.

## 4.2. Change in *News form Nowhere* and *Looking Backward*

As has been argued, both Morris and Bellamy have problems and a negative stance against modernity. Also they have established their utopias more or less far away from the notions of conditions of modernity. There is another point to be revealed, as they seem to be following the parameters of historical materialism, there is a possibility that their utopias may progress towards modernity in the course of history. It has been examined in the second chapter that Morris, through a revolution and Bellamy through an evolution

designs 'new' social formations. Actually, the striking point comes after formation of these societies. Their perception to future developments, progress and change should also be analysed in order to determine these societies' basic features[79]. So, I will try to determine whether the two utopias are open to change or whether they have static natures. The outcome of such an analysis will reveal Bellamy's and Morris's perception of historical materialism in their utopias.

### 4.2.1. Eternal 'Complete Communism' of Morris

In *Nowhere,* Morris argues that the main reasons for a revolution to create a new order have been the conflicts prevailing in the old order. It can be claimed that he regards conflicts, contradictions and antagonisms as the sources of change, transition and progress. In addition, the motives of a desire for change are guided by dreams of a better world and order (Morris: 1995: 109). So, under the 'perfect' conditions, man would not dream for change any more. Despite this idea, he attempts to eliminate all possible sources of conflict from his utopian system. For Morris, these conflicts were mainly the consequences of private property and wealth inequalities. He argues that without inequalities in wealth and material motives, individuals would not compete with each other. So, conflicts in the production process are also prevented. In addition, the existence of any authority such as government is

---

[79] Samuels (1984: 132) argues that "utopias neglect the mechanisms of change within their own respective ideal systems. These novels manifest a very human desire to establish the right and perfect system and then let it work and have individuals operate within it, with the confidence that it will produce harmony, correct behaviour, and the right goals". In this chapter I will try to find out whether this argument is valid or not for the two utopias under consideration.

regarded as a source of conflict, so state has been abolished. The laws have also been dissolved with the same intention. Morris believes that as soon as equality is established as the regulating and organizing principle of the society, there will be no place for conflicts. As has been indicated, even though there is no government, there are regulations for social affairs and they are carried out on the basis of the will of the majority. However, it is claimed that this system would never lead to conflicts because of the principles of freedom and equality. So, it can be claimed that such vision is applied in order to prevent any possible conflict resulting from differences in opinions. As another precaution against conflicts, politics has been removed from the system. In that sense, Hammond states that:

> Differences in opinion about real solid things need not, and with us do not, crystallize people into parties permanently hostile to one another, with different theories as to the build of the universe and the progress of time. Isn't that what politics used to mean? (1995: 89)

The removal of politics from *Nowhere* also has a tendency to uniformity and standardization with respect to the inhabitants. Even though in Morris's utopia individuals are left to free-development and it is stated that they are free to choose, the removal of politics may lead to standardization. It seems that in Morris's utopia there is only one ideology and the other possible ideologies have been removed from the system for the sake of stability. In such a situation the removal of politics serve to prevention of clash among individuals based on their different world-views.

Literature and history are also associated with conflict in *Nowhere*. Even though they have not been banished from the system, they are simply

made to be unnecessary. It is claimed that literature is for people who desire more than they have and people of *Nowhere* already have what they can desire. With respect to history[80] it is claimed that it is about conflicts and discontent, and as there is none now, there is no need for history anymore. Within this context, Hammond claims that "the last harvest, the last baby, the last knot carving in the market-place, is history enough for them. It was different, I think, when I was a lad, when we were not so assured of peace and continuous plenty as we are now" (1995: 57).

History may also show progress to the utopian citizens, the knowledge of history can reveal that there has been progress up to their times. This may be another reason why Morris regarded history as unnecessary in his utopian society. Together with change, Morris may also want to prevent progress in *Nowhere.* Morris's utopian system of perfect freedom, equality and happiness comes closer to dystopias[81] in reference to his attempt to create an ahistorical society. This means that present is glorified and made to be eternal without any change. The dystopian literature has regarded this never-changing perception of time as nightmare, however the socialist utopia written by Morris attributes a positive notion to this situation. These different perspectives to the same phenomenon seem strange. Stability and negation of change and progress are

---

[80] As Gerber (1973: 124) argues "there is one important slogan on which most utopias are based: stability. In the face of this maxim, knowledge about the past becomes a problem, even a danger; for the past contains only all those forces and processes which led to utopia, but also all those disruptive tendencies and disintegrating attitudes which prevented utopia from being realized for such a long time". In line with this idea, Morris has a negative stance against history if not hostile. So, even 'socialist' utopias can not escape from the utopian verdict of stability.

[81] For the manipulation of history in dystopias see Ersoy, D. "Manipulation of History and Language in Three Dystopias." Unpublished MS. Thesis, METU, September, 2006.

regarded as 'hell' for the dystopian literature, but Morris's socialist utopia embraces these concepts. Indeed, it should be mentioned that in Morris's utopia history is neither 'manipulated' nor modified but regarded to be unnecessary. This means that actually any individual in *Nowhere* has access to the knowledge of history, there is no strict control on history and access to its knowledge. This may be the reason why Morris's perception of history does not lead to a nightmare unlike the case of the dystopias. Also, this may be a point to break Morris's utopian stability. However, the quality and features of the historical record in *Nowhere* is not apparent. On the other hand, as Hammond provides answers to Guest's questions in comparison to the 19th century, it can be claimed that memory is not manipulated and historical knowledge is open to all. Yet, Hammond, time over time, underlines the superiority of this system than the previous one. Still, one may argue that there may be a point left for progress and change in *Nowhere.*

Also, the non-existence of newspapers can also be regarded as a safety-belt for new society[82]. As newspapers may be tools for educating the public and rising consciousness they may foster change. So, perhaps Morris may have regarded them as threats to his perfect order. Also, the new idea of education may prevent progress. Because, children choose themselves what to learn and it is only for practical purposes rather than scientific and technical advances. In a sense, it serves to keep the *status quo* as it is without any further transformation.

---

[82] In the previous chapter, I have stated that Morris does not provide an explanation in reference to non-existence of newspapers. Thus, my arguments on newspapers in *Nowhere* only depend on my comments and speculations regarding the general context of Morris's utopia.

In addition to the removal of conflicts, Morris imposes certain limits on technology, technical progress and science in his utopia. The basic reason of those limits is Morris's archaic perspective, but also it can be speculated that technological progress may lead to modernity and change and this means discontent for Morris. Morris also replaces machine production with handicraft production arguing that this kind of a production process transfers labour into an artistic action. In that sense, Morris does not make 'pleasure principle' subservient to the 'reality principle' but unifies them under his concept of artistic labour. This may be another way to prevent change. Morris allows Nowhereians to actualize their fantasies in all areas of their lives. Thus, the potential 'destructive' tendencies of pleasure principle have been removed in that way.

It has been evident up to that point that, Morris's system has a static nature and seems to be a well-functioning and finished structure. He basically sees the reason for change as conflicts and discord. In other words, he naively believes that by removing them from his system, his utopian structure will function 'eternally' in harmony and concord with high 'libidinal' satisfaction. This is problematic with respect to 'historical materialism' as well as socialism which suggest historical continuity, change and progress. However, this also appears to be a tension in Marxism itself. Just like Morris, Marx and Engels also argue that history will progress from a mode of production to another and communism will be realized through a revolution. When it comes to the dynamics of change and progress in a communist society, I want to argue that Marx and Engels, too establish a static structure. First of all, Marx (1995: 66)

claims that if there is no antagonism, there will be no progress, thus he also

regards conflicts and antagonisms as the mottos of change. On the other hand,

it is claimed that:

> In communist society it would not occur to anyone to have a standing army.
> It will not occur to anyone to disturb internal peace. Fear of revolutions is the
> consequence only of the opposition of interests; where the interests of all
> coincide, such fears are out of the question. (Engels: 1975: 249)

Thus, Marxism too, seems to be suggesting a closed and static structure

just like Morris's *Nowhere* and as it will be analysed Bellamy's utopian text. In

that sense, closeness to change appears to me as a paradox of Marxism rather

than the 'socialist utopias' under consideration.

*Nowhere* turns to be a closed and finished structure with an explicit

assumption of perfection. When this is combined with Morris's archaism, his

utopia ceases to be a romantic structure located in a certain historical period

carrying out the basic features of a past order eternally.


### 4.2.2. Bellamy's Never-Changing Industrial Army


Bellamy regards evolution as a historical necessity and a product of

existing conflicts within the society. Thus, the new society should be an

organization freed from these conflicts as it is supposed to be relying on the

cure for these conflicts[83]. In that sense, Bellamy does not only remove sources

---

[83] Hartman (1999: 26, 37) argues that for Bellamy, "progress is movement toward a state of harmony and solidarity. Progress does not introduce anything really new to the world, since genuine novelty is unsettling. Since evolution serves primarily as a stabilizing force for Bellamy, his doctrine of 'evolution not revolution' betrays a fear of change and desire for stability". After change is realized, Bellamy stabilizes his order with the idea that there is no further need for social engineering. I want to argue that these are the static and conservative

126

of conflicts but also establishes strict mechanisms to prevent any possible future change.[84] Bellamy believes that the main reasons for any conflict and discontent stem from material inequalities which lead to moral decay. Thus, he builds his society on the idea of material equality. In addition, he regards ideologies suggesting change as 'dynamites' and banishes any ideology from his utopia. This is evident as he calls his utopian system as 'Nationalism' and 'Modern Social Economy'. It may be argued that he sees ideologies as well, as the sources of conflict and mottos for change, so he keeps any 'pure' ideology away from his utopia. Also, there is no politics, but the Industrial Army takes care of all affairs regarding the governing of social formation. In this new society, all power and authority have been consolidated in the hands of the Industrial Army-the state and market. This means that all society have been organized by a gigantic power network. This organization is designed to prevent any conflict and contradiction in society through certain mechanisms of discipline and control. This is also fed by the idea that human nature is good, and under proper conditions it remains to be so. It means that with the internal and external mechanisms, individuals are kept away from any conflict. It can also be claimed that this organization has a self-control mechanism. It is not

aspects of Bellamy's utopia. Bellamy envisions a finished structure in his utopia and he tries to prevent and abolish any means that can lead to change. In that sense, Bellamy does not only try to prevent any rapid change but also evolutionary ones in order to protect his utopian perfect *status quo.*

[84] As Gutek (1964: 261) argues "the society of the Year 2000 was in perfect equilibrium and required no further social engineering. No conflicts marred the utopian tranquility. Once a perfect society had been established, there was no need to change it". In addition, Samuels (1984: 144) claims that "individual freedom is lost in the face of social control and that of continuity *vis-a-vis* change, specifically the absence of any mechanism for systemic change". I want to argue that Bellamy's attempts to keep the utopian society as it is lead to fascistic tendencies with respect to individual freedom. Because, Bellamy establishes strict order and discipline instruments in order to prevent any possible threat to the *status quo.*

certain, in the economic sphere especially, whether there will be any growth or not. It is stated that there is always a constant equilibrium between supply and demand, and also the major concern is to increase efficiency and productivity. However, the system seems to be relying on constant equilibrium at the same point. In addition, Bellamy replaces competition with cooperation so that there would be no struggle between the individuals. Also, under the guidance of the Industrial Army individuals are directed to the same end. As has been denoted, through the process of rationalization, individuals internalize their places within the system and this is Bellamy's individualism[85]. This attributes to Bellamy's utopia a static nature[86]. Because, community appears to be a full-finished, pre-determined structure, a scheme for individuals and through 'assimilating' individuals in line of its principles, it ends up as a static and closed structure. Also, education system is designed in a way to prevent further change. The formal education system is directed to the aims of the Industrial Army (Bellamy: 1951: 49). Also the informal education provided by social formation aims to teach children their places within the Army. Thus, education serves to a conservative purpose and attempts to preserve the established order.

In addition, Bellamy's utopia is a Christian society organized in line with Christian moral principles. He regards this new order as 'heaven on earth'.

---

[85] In the case of Bellamy's individualism, Auerbach (1994: 27) argues that in Bellamy, "there is avoidance of an understanding of power itself, the means to affect social change. Rejection of individualism is a rejection only of the power that attends any social relation". I agree with Auerbach because Bellamy only accepts the state power coming from above and he disregards internal dynamics of his utopian society.

[86] In opposition to my argument that Bellamy's utopia has a static nature, Becker (1954: 189) claims that "Bellamy's utopia is not static as often charged, though its machinery may be static, for it assumes an indefinite expansion and development of human personality". I want to argue that even though Bellamy assumes development of human nature, such development is still limited and determined by the Industrial Army.

It can be claimed that religion is employed as another mechanism to prevent change and keep the order as it is.

As has been argued, in Bellamy's utopia, there is excessive use of technology and he introduces technical changes and progresses into the system (1951: 130) and such changes take place under the control and guidance of the Industrial Army. The society described in Bellamy's text is static and close to change and the main obstacle to further change is the Industrial Army which is the basic organization of the social formation.

## III-Order and Discipline

In the above analyses, it has become evident that the hostility of Morris and Bellamy to modernity led them to design static structures which will not evolve into modernity. The task now should be to find out the mechanisms to keep their societies static and without any major change. In that sense, the central notions are 'discipline', 'control' and 'order' in these utopias. In both texts, there is no 'history' but only the idea of 'now'. There is no past, no future; and hence these utopias are ahistorical and this feature is maintained by the mechanism of discipline.

### 4.3.1 Morris and Dis-Orderness with Invisible Discipline

Morris tries to remove any kind of power and authority from his utopian society. He even tries to stay away from any form of government. In

that sense it is plausible to claim that there are no visible mechanisms in Morris's utopia to discipline its inhabitants. However, certain devices for providing order and discipline could be detected with a careful and deeper textual examination, keeping in mind that discipline is not necessarily associated with certain specific institutions.

It can be claimed that the main outcomes of the Revolution regulating the social formation are also means of discipline. I do not claim that all these principles (equality, freedom, equity etc.) are only employed for the sake of discipline. However, they serve to the protection of order while abolishing the need for further change. Thus, it may be claimed that these principles have a disciplinary effect upon social structure. I want to argue that both freedom and equality may be seen as the methods of discipline, because they abolish desire and wish for transformation while leading to stability.

In *Nowhere,* under the system of equality and freedom, everyone has a desire to work. Those principles create new individuals who perfectly fit into the system, without any external regulation. There is even no education for children to internalize the values of new system. Nowhereians just work, this is their reason of existence and working is what gives meaning to their lives. How can this be possible? How can a society function in such a harmony without any regulation and intervention? Actually, there are some ways to make people 'choose' to work. The rejection of work is regarded as a 'disease' (Morris: 1995: 41) and medical methods are adopted to 'cure' it (1995: 42). In that sense, Hammond states that "however, I am happy to say that all that is gone by now; the disease is either extinct, or exists in such a mild form that a short

course of aperient medicine carries it off. It is sometimes called the Blue-devils now, or the Mulleygrubs" (1995: 41). This means that those refuse to work are regarded as deviant and means are adopted to 'normalize' them. So, Morris suggests an invisible discipline mechanism to normalize Nowhereians and to keep them acting in line with norms. Even though he tries to remove all power relations from his system, this process of normalization is an exercise of power. Thus, even though Morris claims that there are no power relations in his utopian social order, this normalization process falsifies this claim. As Foucault argues:

> Power relations are rooted deep in the social nexus, not reconstituted 'above' society as a supplementary structure whose radical effacement one could perhaps dream of. In any case, to live in society is to live in such a way that action upon other actions is possible-and in fact ongoing. A society without power relations can only be an abstraction. (1982: 222-3)

In that sense power is defined by Foucault (1982: 219-20) as "not simply a relationship between partners, individuals or collective; it is a way in which certain actions modify others". In this relationship, power is an action which acts upon actions of others. If Foucault's power definition is adopted, there is no way for Morris to remove power and power relations from his utopian society, because this specific definition of power does not consolidate power within specific institutions. In addition, there is body-politics in *Nowhere,* as in this utopic society, 'normal' means to have a natural desire to work and to get joy from it. In that sense, as Foucault (2006: 63) argues, body is surrounded by power relations and subjected to those relations because of its capacity to labour.

Morris also proposes a process of evolutionary eugenics. As has been demonstrated, people in *Nowhere* are beautiful and healthy. Even though Morris claims that there is no external manipulation in relation to individual bodies, this is a form of discipline provided by labour under conditions of freedom and equality (1995: 60). Hence, there is the practice of body politics in a sense which is again a form of discipline and power. This is not a direct intervention to human body, but an indirect one exerted through the internal dynamics of the utopian society.

In Morris's utopic society, there is neither law, nor crime, nor punishment, nor prisons. There is no higher authority to regulate the behaviours of individuals. There is no society or 'code of public opinion' to create a sense of sanction to the individuals at the first instance. However, traditions are kept in order to regulate 'abnormal' behaviours. As Foucault (2006: 272) argues, disciplinary powers aim to transfer individuals and to normalize them. In Morris's utopia, discipline is diffused into the society and punishment aims to normalize the deviant ones. It can be claimed that society is kept under discipline through anarchy in society. In that sense Hammond states that:

> I do not say that people don't judge their neighbours' conduct, sometimes, doubtless, unfairly. But I do say that there is no unvarying conventional set of rules by which people are judged; no bed of Procrustes[87] to stretch or cramp their minds and lives; no hypocritical ex-communication which people are forced to pronounce, either by unconsidered habit, or by the unexpressed threat of the lesser interdict if they are lax in their hypocrisy. (Morris: 1995: 61)

---

[87] A 'procrustean bed' is an arbitrary standard to which exact conformity is forced.

In this system, prisons are regarded as temporary solutions and insufficient to remove the risk of crime completely. Even though it is argued that in such a society there is no possibility for any crime, it is mentioned that there are rare occasions. Together with crime, any enforcement by laws has disappeared. It is stated that:

> When any violence is committed, we expect the transgressor to make any atonement possible to him, and he himself expects it. But again, think if the destruction or serious injury of a man momentarily overcome by wrath or folly can be any atonement to the common-wealth? Surely it can only be an additional injury to it...In a society where there is no punishment to evade, no law to triumph over, remorse will certainly follow transgression. (1995: 85)

It should be clarified that by the term 'crime' Morris refers to 'abnormal' behaviours of individuals guided by their passions. Thus, he recognizes that it is not possible to create perfect individuals even under a perfect system. His utopic vision does not aim to punish those individuals, but 'normalize' them through traditional patterns and this is handled by inhabitants rather than a higher authority. In that sense, as there is no civil society in this system, individuals appear to be the authority to normalize in such a case. So, Morris recognizes that even in such a perfect system there can be crimes resulting from violence and tragedies. In this context Hammond claims that:

> If the ill-doer is not sick or mad (in which case he must be restrained till his sickness or madness is cured) it is clear that grief and humiliation must follow the ill-deed; and society in general will make that pretty clear to the ill-doer if he should chance to be dull to it; and again, some kind of atonement will follow, - at least, an open acknowledgment of the grief and humiliation. (1995: 85)

Thus, in this society it can be argued, crime is considered as a 'disease' (1995: 85) and the mechanism to 'cure' is not a body of laws but a

'Panopticon' carried out by social formation at large. In Foucault's terms Panopticon is a structure that controls not only bodies of its 'prisoners' but also their minds. This method of punishment has also an effect of discipline and normalization. It also serves to individualization and collectivization at the same time. Panopticon, in Foucault's terms does not refer to prisons as institutions but society, each and every structure and institution in society as well as all relations among the members of any society. In other words, it is diffused within the society It refers to a method of constant observation over inhabitants (visible or invisible) in order to control and discipline them. In Morris's utopia, this structure is mostly invisible, at certain times it can not hide itself, but in general, it can be claimed that Morris relies on invisible control and discipline powers.

Even though Morris tries to remove any kind of power relation from his utopia, he fails to do so. Because his desired harmony and order can not be realized without any power and disciplinary mechanism even under the conditions of freedom and equality. This dimension of power is the last element to complement his anti-modern and static order. Because, such a disciplinary power exercised over the social network keeps the order unchanged, thus away from troubles of modernity.

## 4.3.2. Bellamy's Industrial Army as a Source of Order and Discipline

Unlike Morris, Bellamy establishes an institutionalized structure of control and discipline in his utopia. This institution is the Industrial Army

which has diffused its organizational structure all across the society and become the society itself in a sense. So, it can be claimed that even though discipline and control stem from the Army, with the diffused structure of the Army they take the form of more complex power mechanism.

It should firstly be mentioned that the Evolution in Bellamy's utopia has been carried out by government and its policies. On the one hand, Bellamy argues that society has cooperated with this process, however, on the other hand he establishes strict mechanisms to protect this new order. This means that society did not provide a genuine cooperation but has been manipulated for reaching this new order. It can even be claimed that this new society does not rely on what individuals desire but it relies on the goals of government. So, there are explicit mechanisms for discipline and order in this system to keep the public at peace[88]. As has been stated, Bellamy's main concern is to create 'moral individuals'[89].

---

[88] Gutek (1964: 255, 258) claims that "although Bellamy's utopia took the form of military organization, he did not believe that a coercive discipline is necessary to regulate society. Once men were convinced of the rationality of their economic system, they gladly accepted the required discipline. The new society represented a highly advanced form of mutual and associative life which resulted as a consequence of the ongoing process of industrial consolidation. Every man would regard himself as a member of a great industrial partnership". However, I think that is a misleading perspective. First of all the acceptance of rationality is realized through an ongoing education process and this is discipline itself. In addition, there are 'repressive state apparatuses' to make it sure that discipline and order is kept. Thus, the system is clearly based on discipline and regulatory mechanisms.

[89] Bellamy's attempt to create moral inidividuals refers to concept of 'anomie' of Durkheim in a sense. Horton (1964: 285) states that "anomie refers to the problems of social control in a social system. The concept always focuses on the relationship between individuals and the constraining forces of social control". So, it can be argued that Bellamy searches for a moral discipline in his society. As Samuels (1984: 138, 140) rightfully underlines, "Bellamy's system is still a system of the control and discipline of the human labor force. Freedom and social control are multifaceted and caleidoscopic". Also, Sibley (1973: 267) claims that in Bellamy's utopia, "the Industrial Army, which operates the machines, is a highly disciplined, centrally co-ordinated body".

Bellamy claims that after the establishment of the equality of conditions, crime and punishment have become almost extinct. However, he recognizes the possibility of crime coming from human nature. Even though there are no laws to punish criminals, in his utopia there is the practice of punishment:

> As for actual neglect of work, positively bad work, or other overt remissness on the part of men incapable of generous motives, the discipline of the industrial army is far too strict to allow anything whatever of the sort. A man able to duty, and persistently refusing, is sentenced to solitary imprisonment on bread and water till he consents. (Bellamy: 1951: 101)

Crime is regarded as genetic and a case of 'atavism'. There are no prisons to punish crimes but hospitals to cure those people (1951: 162).[90] It is stated that these crimes are violent ones against persons, are not related with material gains and they are rare cases (1951: 164). Crime is regarded as atavism "because nearly all forms of crime known to you are motiveless now, and when they appear can only be explained as the outcropping of ancestral traits" (1951: 164). Despite the existence of crime, there are no lawyers in this utopian society, because it is claimed that criminals do not need defense. Criminals accept their guilt (1951: 164-5), however there are trials and penalties. There are also judges and a Supreme Court for trials. Doctor tells that:

> He is not accused on light grounds, and if he denies his guilt, must still be tried. But trials are few, for in most cases the guilty man pleads guilty. When

---

[90] The practice of curing the criminals rather than punishing them is in line with the analysis of Foucault (2006: 59-60) concerning disciplinary power that those mechanisms are not necessarily 'coercive' and 'repressive' but they are located into positive series. In that sense punishment undertakes a complex social function. It becomes a way of exercising power and a part of political strategy. It is related to the transformation of 'human soul' as a part of body politics.

he makes a false plea and is clearly proved guilty, his penalty is doubled. Falsehood is, however, so despised among us that few offenders would lie to save themselves. (1951: 165)

Bellamy, with the institution of the Industrial Army, establishes a 'militaristic nation' organized in line with military principles. It is stated that "the people were already accustomed to the idea that the obligation of every citizen, not physically disabled, to contribute his military services to the defense of the nation was equal and absolute" (1951: 46). This idea is directly applied to the production process within the Army. In addition, this is the only way of survival for individuals. It is stated that:

> Our entire social order is so wholly based upon and deduced from it that if it were conceivable that a man could escape it, he would be left with no possible way to provide for his existence. He would have excluded himself from the world, cut himself off from his kind, in a word, committed suicide. (1951: 47)

Everyone has to work in this system, even the 'invalid' ones have their own regulations to work. The Industrial Army is organized along the lines of military and participation is a 'matter of course' for survival in this system. There is no other option for individuals but to be the compulsory members of such an army[91]. In addition, there is no chance for individuals to realize themselves outside the Army[92]. They work towards a pre-determined end under

---

[91] Bellamy also believes that 'workfare' would increase efficiency: "does it not seem to you that men who found themselves obliged, whether they wished or not, to work, would under such a system be strongly impelled to do their best?" (1951: 102)

[92] Bellamy's 'individualism' also refers to 'homo duplex' which is defined as "an individual who is part egoistic, anarchistic and self-seeking, part moral in so far as he is regulated and constrained by society, which is the source of all logic and morality" (Horton: 1964: 290). This idea is also in line with the Foucault's (1982: 208-13) analysis demonstrating that "human beings are in a constant process of subjectification and this is realized through three modes of objectification. These are 'modes of inquiry' which try to attribute themselves the status of

the rational rules and principles of the Army[93]. All individuals are subjected to this bureaucratic rationality and hierarchy[94]. The system makes it sure that hierarchy is internalized by individuals during their first years in the Industrial Army: "this grade is a sort of school, and a very strict one, in which the young men are taught habits of obedience, subordination, and devotion to duty" (1951: 97). It is also stated that while those showing excellence are awarded, negligence receives penalties (1951: 98)[95].

At the same time, the utopian society of Bellamy is elitist because, those who are not 'better', that is to say workers, are excluded from the Presidential elections. This is justified on the grounds that their participation

---

science such as economics, two dividing activities (from others and inside himself), and self-process of human beings. This human subject is surrounded by a complex set of power relations". Foucault claims that there is a specific form of power which transforms human beings into subjects. In such a relation, the modern forms of power have both individualizing and totalizing effects.

[93] Foucault (2006: 59-60, 63) argues that power relations have a direct intervention on body through its political enclosement directed to its economical use. Body can only be a useful source of power when it produces and is subordinated at the same time. Knowledge and hegemony make body's political technology which is not organised and rarely formulated. Thus, it is not possible to determine its place within social formation. Even though the principles of Bellamy's Industrial Army are the organizing principles of this utopian society, it is diffused to each and every aspect of social formation. Power in that sense is not applied directly to the individuals.

[94] The rationality in Bellamy's utopian society refers to Foucault's (2006: 215-221) argument that discipline undertakes the task to spatial diffusion of any action and has adopted four main techniques for that. The first one is enclosement such as the factories, the second one is surrounding which means that everyone has a place in an organization, the third one is functional locations such as division of labour and the final one is rank which refers to hierarchy. In Bellamy's utopia all of those techniques are adopted at the same time. In Foucault's perspective this is the application of strict discipline on individuals. In other words, what Foucault afraids, exists in Bellamy's utopia as his ideal.

[95] With respect to punishment, Foucault (2006: 131, 165-6, 198, 201) argues that that is a form of politics directed to collective body and plurality of powers and it functions sharper and direct, aims to adopt power mechanisms on individuals. That deals with individuals' daily actions, identities, functions and their constant observation. It is not only carried out through certain power institutions. The bodies are made to be subordinate through the control of ideas as ideological power. In such a system the aim of punishment is 'reformatory' that is to say to transform the criminal and make him a subject.

would harm discipline and order. This is Bellamy's attempt to keep the society under strict control from above. In line with this obsession of discipline and control, only the 'repressive' governmental functions remain in Bellamy's utopia. In addition, the system is based on the idea to increase efficiency while keeping order and individuals under strict discipline and control from above by the Industrial Army. This is explicitly declared in this dialogue between the Doctor and West:

> 'The general of the guild appoints to the ranks under him, but he [the president] himself is not appointed, but chosen by suffrage'.
> 'By suffrage!' I exclaimed. 'Is not that ruinous to the discipline of the guild, by tempting the candidates to intrigue for the support of the workers under them?'
> 'So it would be, no doubt', replied Dr. Leete, 'if the workers had any suffrage to exercise, or anything to say about the choice. But they have nothing'. (1951: 153)

Under such elitism, even the motives for individuals to work have been modified. These motives are now in line with the requirements of discipline and devotion to the higher-good. It is stated that:

> Now that industry of whatever sort is no longer self-service of the nation, patriotism, passion for humanity, impel the worker as in your day they did the soldier. The army of industry is an army, not alone by virtue of its perfect organization, but by reason also of the ardor of self-devotion which animates its members. (1951: 76)

As has been examined, Bellamy cultivates a strong confidence in advanced technology and technical organization of society. It can be claimed that this is another mechanism to provide discipline and control in his utopia. Individuals are regarded as machines, or worse, parts of machines and their lives are both standardized and mechanized. This technological dominance

reflects the ideas of Habermas and Marcuse who argue that technology can be deployed as an ideology. It has been argued that Bellamy removes any sort of ideology from his system. But there must be a 'belief system' or set of ideas to regulate and discipline the society. In Bellamy's utopia, this task is handled by technology and 'technical reason'. Habermas (1993: 34) claims that technic itself is power (over nature and human spheres) which is methodical, scientific, calculated and calculating. So, technological rationality serves as a belief system or ideology in Bellamy's utopia. This specific type of ideology exerts its hegemony over individuals and keep them under strict discipline and control. One may argue that, through this use of technology, a different and 'better' type of hegemony is established over the individuals. It is supposed to be better, because it is very rational so that individuals do not even realize that they are under strict discipline[96]. Rationality and efficiency are the justification items for discipline in Bellamy's utopic society.

As a complementary part of this ideological adoption of technology, another mechanism of discipline is education in Bellamy's utopia. As has been emphasized, education is both carried out in formal and informal levels and serves to the internalization of the basic principles of the Army. Individuals learn their places within this utopian society *via* education and this process is constant through the informal level. Thus, the discipline from above is also supported by discipline from below. Individuals are kept under constant control in Bellamy's utopian society. As a part of this utopian education system, there

---

[96] In order to explain that invisibility of discipline, deriving from Marcuse, Mattick (1967: 375) argues that "integrated man lives in a society without opposition. Technological development tends to create a totalitarian productive apparatus which determines not only socially needed occupations, skills, and attitudes, but also individual needs and aspirations".

are also exams to determine an individual's place within the system and this is another dimension of power[97]. Just like education, exams also serve to stabilize individuals' places within the society once they are individualized through the patterns of the Industrial Army.

In this system of body politics, Bellamy also implies 'race betterment' which is also realized evolutionary. Even though there is no external manipulation to 'corps', there must be a mechanism because all weaker ones have disappeared in Bellamy's utopia. Foucault (2006: 208-211) claims that body is both the subject and target of power and in a sense directed to the creation of a 'machine-human' who is obedient, subservient and usable. Thus, bodies are assumed to be transformed into automats as small models of power. This is realized through constant control, manipulation and domination over body. Discipline increases and decreases the powers of body at the same time. These mechanisms may also have physical outcomes and repercussions. I have argued that Bellamy's main concern in his utopia is to maximize efficiency while preserving the moral tenets. In that sense, in Bellamy's utopia everyone is a worker trying his best to yield maximum efficiency for the nation. Thus, it is clear that Bellamy needs strong and healthy inhabitants in his utopia. It is stated in the utopian text that not everyone is healthy (invalid corps) but they work for the nation too. However, while reading the text one may easily feel that these 'invalid' individuals are not honourable members of this utopian society. Bellamy's utopian individuals are integrated into the system,

---

[97] As Foucault (2006: 256, 280-284) argues, exams are unification of discipline mechanisms which are organized through hierarchical order, and sanctions directed to normalization. Also, exams document individuality within collectivity and helps the production of individual.

mechanized, rationalized and get stronger in body and mind. These all reflect Bellamy's adoptation of Foucault's 'body-politics' in his utopia.

In Bellamy's 'reactionary modern' system, technological rationality as ideology is accompanied by a traditional ideology; religion. It has been stated that Bellamy's utopian society is a Christian one. In that sense, Christianity is used to keep public under discipline and control through its basic moral principles. This may be Bellamy's recognition that a society organized only through rational lines can not be kept in peace, but it should be complemented by moral tenets in order to create a sense of solidarity among the inhabitants.

As a consequence, Bellamy's Industrial Army establishes a structure of order and discipline which extends and diffuses its 'Panopticon' effect all across the utopian society. This helps Bellamy to keep his model of reactionary modern society without further change and advocates social engineering for a supposedly socialist future.

## 4.4. Conclusion

In this chapter, Morris's and Bellamy's utopias are examined under to notions of modernity, change and discipline with reference to socialism. The main intention has been to arrive a conclusion about the supposedly socialist features of these utopias. The analysis under the term modernity showed that Morris's utopia has pre-modern, archaic tendencies and it can at best be named as 'Romantic Communist' or 'Romantic Anti-Capitalist'. In that sense, his utopia can not claim to be a socialist one. The reference to modernity, in the

case of Bellamy, revealed that his utopia has fascistic and conservative tendencies. In that sense, Bellamy's utopia should be named as 'Reactionary Modern' rather than socialist as it combines modern and pre-modern elements. The second examination has been carried out under the notion of change in the two utopias and it has become evident that the two utopias are close to change. That is to say, both Morris and Bellamy design strong safety-belts to keep their utopian *status quo*s. This stands in opposition to modernity and moves them away from socialism. The final terms I used to analyse the utopian texts are discipline and order which are employed as means to prevent change and progress in these utopias. I want to argue that the introduction of these mechanisms conflict with the socialist principles as well as modernity. In order to conclude, neither Morris's *Nowhere,* nor can Bellamy's *Looking Backward* claimed to be socialist on the grounds of my analysis. While Morris takes us back to the pre-modern times and leaves us there eternally, Bellamy imprisons us into a mechanical world without any point of escape under strict hierarchy, order and control in a fascistic manner.

# CHAPTER V

# CONCLUSION

In the beginning of my study, my intention has been to examine the utopian texts of *News from Nowhere* (William Morris) and *Looking Backward* (Edward Bellamy) with reference to their association or disassociation with socialism. These utopias were written in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century as a reaction against the capitalism of the time, and are classified as 'socialist utopias'. In that sense, I intended to analyse the relation of these utopias with socialism regarding them as political texts rather than the works of literature. I should also declare that in the beginning of my study, even though I did not take it as granted, I classified these utopias as socialist. This was problematic for me, because if these utopias can claimed to be socialist, my thesis would only be a repetition of the previous studies. In the second chapter of my thesis I have focused on the idea of change and transformation in Morris's and Bellamy's utopias. While writing that chapter, there were some clues to shape my thesis but the real analysis appeared while I was writing the third chapter on the social organization in these utopias. It became evident that these utopian texts have many notions that move them away from socialism. Thus, in my thesis, the two utopian texts of *News from Nowhere* and *Looking Backward* are analysed with respect to the patterns of change which determine the administrative and economic structures and institutions in these utopias, the social organizations and regulations in these utopian societies are examined in

detail in order to identify the consistency between socialism and these utopian societies in order to question the validity of 'socialist' label for these utopias.

Thus, I have elaborated the texts in detail; *News from Nowhere* of Morris and *Looking Backward* of Bellamy. As has been argued by many scholars, these two texts represent the 'socialist utopia' tradition of the second half of the 19th century. In that sense, the main purpose of this thesis has been to find out whether it is possible to talk about a genre of 'socialist utopias' with reference to these two utopian texts. It revealed itself, in opposition to many scholars who identify these utopian texts as 'socialist', these utopias can not be claimed to be socialist. In order to clarify that, let me restate the findings leading to that conclusion.

In the second chapter of the thesis, I have argued that the nature of change and transformation adopted by Morris and Bellamy determine the administrative and economic organizations in their utopias. Morris clearly declares that his utopian society is a 'communist' society created through a revolution. Morris's Revolution refers to a complete destruction of all the outcomes of the previous centuries. I have found this suggestion concerning radical rupture debatable because, Morris's hostility towards capitalism also turns out to be hostility towards modernity. This negation of modernity in Morris's utopia is the basic point that prevents his utopian society to be socialist or communist as he intends it to be. It should be accepted that Morris tries to envision a communist society by using the terms and concepts of socialism identified by Marx and Engels. He suggests revolution, abolishment

of private property, destruction of free market economy, new patterns of production leading joy and happiness, and the 'withering away' of state and politics. However, Morris explicitly denies modernity together with capitalism. Instead of capitalism and its modern relations and organizations, he defends his 'complete communism' with reference to relations and organizations of the 14th century societies based on guild system. He simply tries to restore the pre-modern order in the future with all its consequences. I think this archaism and romanticism makes the socialist nature of this utopia seriously questionable.

In opposition to Morris's suggestion of revolutionary change, Bellamy prefers evolution. This means that in his utopian society, the previous order of capitalism and modernity have not been destroyed completely. Bellamy's utopian society is founded on the organization of the Industrial Army which is the economic organization and the government as well as civil society. The Industrial Army is the monopolistic organization in all aspects in Bellamy's utopian society. It should be mentioned that unlike Morris, Bellamy neither regards his utopian system as 'communist' nor 'socialist'. In opposition, Bellamy calls the administrative system as 'Nationalism' and economic system as 'Modern Social Economy'. In that sense, intentionally, Bellamy tries to keep his utopia away from the label of socialism. As has been indicated, Bellamy's utopian society is the rational re-organization of capitalism in order to cure and overcome its negative consequences, rather than a socialist society. In addition, the system is based on 'workfare', each and every citizen in this society is a worker and has to work for a pre-determined span of time for the 'Greater-

Good'. Bellamy does not destroy capitalism and modernity but he installs and fills them with traditional concepts such as the organic notion of society. Even though it is not as explicit as in the case of Morris, Bellamy also has a longing for past values too. In addition, Bellamy's utopian society is also marked by a certain version of elitism and this elitist perspective is not in line with the ideal of equality which is embedded in socialism. As has been examined, for Bellamy, moral betterment and moral equality are more important than material achievements. This gives a conservative perspective to his utopia and moves him away from socialism. The organisation of the Industrial Army integrates hierarchy, compulsion, order, control and discipline into the system with an organic conception of society and nation. I want to argue that, Bellamy's 'Nationalism' and the system of 'Modern Social Economy' are reminiscent of fascism rather than socialism.

Thus, the second chapter provides the first indications that these utopias are not socialist in opposition to widespread suggestions of many scholars. Morris's communist society is a revival of a pre-modern order even though he adopts some socialist principles and expectations. Bellamy's utopian society does not cultivate any socialist element. The nationalization of economy does not refer to socialism but a version of monopoly capitalism. In addition, the strict organization of the Industrial Army prevents this utopian society from becoming free and equal. Thus, Bellamy's utopian society is re-introduction of the old moral principles into modern material ones and this system reminds fascism.

In the third chapter, I have examined the daily lives and social organizations in these utopias. I have pointed out that the daily life in Morris's *Nowhere* is a pastoral, unregulated, simple life referring to 14th century's conditions of pre-modernity. In this pre-modern society, each and every detail of daily life has been re-organized for a simplified life. Even the architectural patterns refer to the Gothic period of the 14th century. In addition, cities and towns have been dissolved into each other leading to a common life in nature rather than a regulated and ordered life in cities. The relationship of humans with nature is re-organized in Morris's *Nowhere,* nature is not regarded as external to individuals but a part of them and their lives. While this utopian society of Morris is embracing nature with all its negative and positive aspects, this society negates artificial constructions. As a part of these artificial constructions, technology and mechanization are kept minimum in *Nowhere.* It has been argued that Morris has a negative attitude towards modernity, and as he regards technology as a part of modernity and hostile to its proposed patterns of production, indeed, I think he tries to remove modern technology away from his utopian society. Thus, Morris tries to restore the order before the Industrial Revolution and so modernity. This denial of modernity and capitalism damages Morris's 'socialist' utopia, because it gives the image that socialism is not symbiotic with modernity. Even though he claims that the roots of the Revolution to create this utopian society existed in the 'wombs' of the 19th century's order, his negation of this century and its all outcomes lead to a disguised negation of socialism. In relation to 'intellectual' life in *Nowhere,*

education and the perception of history have been analysed. In that sense, it has been argued that Morris's utopia carries a typical anti-intellectual message with respect to the patterns of the so-called education and non-importance of history. This analysis made it clear that Morris's utopia is an archaic and romantic text rather than a socialist one. Such archaism is evident since Morris clearly suggests the re-introduction of the patterns and structures of the 14th century. I think, his utopia is not to be labeled as socialist, but as 'Romantic Communist'.

In the case of Bellamy's idealization of social life in his utopia, it has been argued that Bellamy's utopian society is mechanistic organized through the principles of the Industrial Army. I have argued that in Bellamy's utopia, rationalized technology serves as an ideology and as a control and discipline mechanism. In addition his utopia is marked by the extensive use of technology. In that sense, unlike Morris, Bellamy does not deny the Industrial Revolution and its outcomes. Bellamy welcomes the technological-progressive outcomes of modernity and capitalism. In addition, unlike Morris's inhabitants' friendly relations with nature, Bellamy's inhabitants of the utopian society aim to transform and change nature according to their needs and necessities. I think that such relation with nature in Bellamy's utopia contradicts with the perception of nature of socialism. Bellamy does not establish a dialectical relation between man and nature, but simply suggests transforming nature into an object and establishes human domination over nature. Bellamy's perception of nature is not 'socialist', it is definitely modern and indeed capitalist. As

another modern prejudice, Bellamy also keeps the distinction between public and private spheres, but he attributes more importance to publicity rather than privacy. This implies his desire to create a communal and organic society which makes his utopia rather conservative. In this organic society, individuals gain their privacy and individuality within the collectivity which is the Industrial Army. In a sense, there is no other option for Bellamy's utopian individuals to obey the rationality of the system. This makes Bellamy's utopia very static and conservative. Unlike Morris's anti-intellectual statements in *Nowhere,* Bellamy's utopian society is based on a two-fold system (formal and informal) of education which is compulsory for all on a minimum basis. In Bellamy's utopia, the patterns of education are also a revised version of the one of the 19th century. Thus, those have modern intentions but have conservative consequences rather than progressive. In the utopian society of Bellamy, women are 'emancipated' that is to say they are recruited to the Industrial Army, but their traditional role of maternity is kept even though the equality between the sexes has been realized. Also, Bellamy keeps Christianity in the core of his utopian system of perfect moral order. In a sense, religion co-operates with technological ideology to keep the system as it is. I want to argue that, this is not socialism, but fascism or 'Reactionary Modernism' with the central obsessions for order and stability.

The fourth chapter has provided me with the basic points of departure from socialism in the case of utopias of Morris and Bellamy. Morris's pre-modernity with a suggestion concerning a total break from modernity makes

his utopia archaic as well as romantic, and it contradicts with his advocation of communism and socialism. Bellamy does not deny modernity, but he sees negative consequences in its functioning. In that sense Bellamy keeps the material aspects of modernity and tries to fill the 'gaps' caused by modernity with the moral principles of the previous centuries such as religion and tradition. This makes Bellamy's utopia conservative and 'Reactionary Modern' rather than socialist.

The second and third chapters also provided a general plot and organization of these utopias. In the fourth chapter, deriving from the conclusions of my analysis in the previous chapters, I have interpreted the texts with reference to socialism and modernity. While writing the fourth chapter, I was almost sure that these utopias could not be classified as socialist. In that sense, in the fourth chapter, I have tried to make it clear why these utopias can not claimed to be socialist. So, I have carried out my study under the concepts of modernity, change and discipline in these utopias. With reference to modernity, I have tried to find out the compabilities and conflicts between Morris's and Bellamy's utopias and modernity. It made itself clear that, even though these utopias have certain modern ideas, they can not be claimed as defending modernity. If I compare these two texts, I can claim that Bellamy's utopia is more modern relative to Morris's one. Morris's utopia is completely pre-modern as well as anti-modern because he does not believe that his desired society can be established by the means of modernity even though he suggests revolution for this society. The Revolution in *Nowhere* destroys all the

structures and institutions of the previous centuries and they are built anew following the patterns of the 14th century. Thus, as I have denoted many times, Morris's utopia ceases to be an archaic one and should be named as 'Romantic Communist' rather than socialist. In contrast to Morris, Bellamy suggests an evolutionary change and he never suggests a total break from capitalism and modernity. The most visible indication of Bellamy's modernity is the extensive use of technology and science. Also, the Industrial Army follows the principles of bureaucracy even though rules and laws of regulation do not exist. I have argued that Bellamy's main concerns in his utopia are not material but moral. That is to say, he does not desire to sacrifice moral tenets for the sake of material good. So, he fills his modern terms and concepts in his utopia with traditional moral codes. In other words, he underlines certain aspects of modernity and negates the others, or replaces them with the traditional ones. I think, this is not socialism, but Bellamy's 'Reactionary Modernity'.

After this detection that these utopias can not be claimed to be modern, I have moved on to the notion of change. In that sense, I have tried to find out whether these utopian societies can move towards modernity in time, as it is planned by their authors. Also, in reference to change, my analysis has been about historical materialism as well. I have found out that in the two utopias there are mechanisms (visible or invisible) to prevent change and progress. These utopian societies appear to be full-finished structures and all patterns that may lead to change have been removed from these utopian societies. This is strange because both Bellamy and Morris establish their utopian societies

originally with reference to the basic premises of historical materialism. However, in both of these utopias the course of history ends and an eternal present is established.

As has become visible that these utopias are not modern and they deny change, I have tried to detect the ways to keep the *status quo* in these utopias. In that sense, I have referred to Foucault and his conceptualizations of discipline and power. I have mentioned throughout the thesis that Morris's utopian society seems to be un-regulated and in a sense anarchistic organization. However, a deeper analysis revealed that there are invisible marks of discipline as well as intense exercise of power in *Nowhere*. Morris tries to keep his 'Complete Communism' without any change and he establishes safety-belts for this society to keep it away from change which may lead to the indeterminacies brought by modernity. However, as Morris sets these disciplinary powers invisibly it does not appear as a negative situation to the reader. Because, Morris does his best to convince the reader that this is the best possible society with its freedom, equality and happiness. He does not abolish the points of escape in his utopia. Individuals are left to choose, but he is somehow naively sure that they would never prefer another society. On the other hand Bellamy designs strict mechanisms of order and discipline *via* the Industrial Army leaving no way of escape for the utopian citizens. He sets out visible and invisible structures to protect the *status quo*. It can even be argued that what Foucault regards as nightmare can easily be detected in Bellamy's utopian society because his utopia depicts a fully successful disciplinary

society. Bellamy creates his utopia, locates individuals in it, destroys any possibility of change, and in a sense, sentences the individuals to live in this utopia. So, the fourth chapter has revealed that these utopias are not modern at all, stay away from change and progress and there are means to prevent any possible change towards modernity. Thus, under these circumstances it is not possible to classify these utopian texts as socialist. This is because they cultivate a strange tension between being socialist and being modern.

I have examined these utopias as political texts because they reflect a radical criticism of the age and they suggest the ways out of the system. In that sense, I want to argue that these utopias can not be disregarded by the claim that they do not fit into the classification suggested by many scholars. Bellamy writes his *Looking Backward* in order to criticize the 19th century's USA and the 'Gilded Age'. He detects the main negative consequences of this system and suggests an alternative to cure them. In that sense, his utopia provides us a view of this historical period and its possible negative connotations. However, the way suggested to cure this situation turns out to be a fascistic organization. This may be because of the fact that Bellamy tries to remove any possible means for his utopia to evolve in time and turn into the situation of the 19th century again. His fear of the ills of the 19th century makes him obsessed with order and discipline.

Morris also writes *News from Nowhere* in the second half of the 19th century as well as to be a response to Bellamy's utopia. Morris's utopia reflects the situation in the 19th century's Victorian England and its negative impacts

on society. So, even though Morris's utopian text is archaic and anti-modern, it provides a criticism to his own time. His pre-modern tendency is to cure the negative impacts of modernity on society as well as art. Morris's desire to cure capitalism and modernity brings him back to the 14th century and makes him to negate various positive achievements of modernity. As a result, his major concern remains aesthetical. However, as has been underlined, the anti-modernist tendencies in the two utopian texts may result from Marxism's ambiguity about a vision of communist and/or socialist society after the revolution and certain weaknesses within the Marxist theory itself concerning the validity of the basic premises of historical materialism in post-revolutionary society.

Overall, even though Morris's and Bellamy's utopias can not be claimed to be socialist as it is assumed and suggested, they provide the reader with a criticism of the 19th century and possible ways to cure the negative consequences of this period even though one may not like those cures but regards them as other types of ills to be cured.

# REFERENCES

Abbott, P. (2004). "Utopians at Play." *Utopian Studies* 15.1 (Winter): 44-63.

Agassi, J. (1975). "Institutional Individualism." *The British Journal of Sociology* 26.2 (June): 144-155.

Antliff, M. (2002). "Fascism, Modernism, and Modernity." *The Art Bulletin* 84.1 (March): 148-169.

Arata, S. (2004). "On Not Paying Attention." *Victorian Studies* 46.2 (Winter): 193-205.

Auerbach, J. (1994). " 'The Nation Organized': Utopian Impotence in Edward Bellamy's Looking Backward." *American Literary History* 6.1 (Spring): 24-47.

Balthrope, R. (2006). "Bellamy's Looking Backward, 2000-1887, Globalism and Race." *Contemporary Justice Review* 9.3: 303-315.

Beaumont, M. (2004). "News from Nowhere and the Here and Now: Reification and Representation of the Present in Utopian Fiction." *Victorian Studies* 47.1 (Autumn): 33-54.

Beaumont, M. (2006). "Shopping in Utopia: Looking Backward, the Department Store, and the Dreamscape of Consumption." *Nineteenth Century Contexts* 28.3 (September): 191-209.

Becker, G. J. (1954). "Edward Bellamy: Utopia, American Plan." *Antioch Review* 14.2 (June): 181-194.

Beilharz, P. (2004). "Looking Backward: Marx and Bellamy." *The European Legacy* 9.5: 597-604.

Bellamy, E. (1951). *Looking Backward-2000-1887.* ed. R. L. Shurter. NY: Modern Library.

Berneri, M. L. (1969). "Introduction", "Utopias of the Nineteenth Century" in *Journey Through Utopia.* NY: Books for Libraries Press.

Bleich, D. (1964). "Eros and Bellamy." *American Quarterly* 16.3 (Fall): 445-459.

Bloch, E. (1986). *The Principle of Hope Vol.I&II.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Boos, F. (1984). "Morris's German Romances as Socialist History." *Victorian Studies* 27.3 (Spring): 321-343.

Bowman, S. E. (1958). "Bellamy's Missing Chapter." *The New England Quarterly* 31.1 (March): 47-65.

Brantlinger, P. (1975). "'News from Nowhere': Morris's Socialist Anti-Novel." *Victorian Studies* 19.1 (September): 35-50.

Breton, R. (2002). "Work Perfect: William Morris and the Gospel of Work." *Utopian Studies* 13.1: 43-57.

Brinton, C. (1966). "Utopia and Democracy." in *Utopias and Utopian Thought.* ed. F. E. Manuel. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Burawoy, M. (1990). "Marxism as Science: Historical Challenges and Theoretical Growth." *American Sociological Review* 55.6 (December): 775-793.

Burrel G. and K. Dale (2002). "Utopiary: Utopias, Gardens and Organization." *Utopia and Organization* eds. M. Parker. USA: Blackwell Publishing.

Buzard, J. (1997). "Ethnography as Interruption: 'News from Nowhere', Narrative and the Modern Romance of Authority." *Victorian Studies* 40.3 (Spring): 445-474.

Cohen, G. A. (1988). *History, Labour, and Freedom: Themes from Marx.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Collins, G. (1991). "Tomorrow Never Knows." *Nation* 1/21/1991 252: 2: 55-61.

Connolly, W. E. (1983). "Discipline, Politics, and Ambiguity." *Political Theory* 11.3 (August): 325-341.

Connor, G. E. (2000). "The Awakening of Edward Bellamy: Looking Backward at Religious Influence." *Utopian Studies* 11.1: 38-51.

Cooperman, S. (1963). "Utopian Realism: The Futurist Novels of Bellamy and Howells" *College English* 24.6 (March): 464-467.

Cotgrove, S. (1975). "Technology, Rationality and Domination." *Social Studies of Science* (February): 55-78.

Daly, M. (2006). "A Short History of Marxist Aesthetics." in *Karl Marx and Frederick Engels on Literature and Art.* ed. M. Daly. Nottingham: Critical, Cultural and Communications Press.

Davis, L. (1996). "Morris, Wilde and Marx on the Social Preconditions of Individual Development." *Political Studies* 44.3 (September): 719-732.

Davis, M. R. (2005). "Remaking the Nation Through Brotherhood in the Utopian Fiction of William Dean Howells and Edward Bellamy." *Contemporary Justice Review* 8.2 (June): 177-193.

DeJouvenel, B. (1966). "Utopia for the Practical Purposes." in *Utopias and Utopian Thought.* ed. F. E. Manuel. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Engels, F. (1975). "Speeches in Elberfeld." in *Karl Marx, Frederich Engels Collected Works, V.4.* New York: International Publishers.

Ersoy, D. (2006). "Manipulation of History and Language in Three Dystopias." Unpublished MS. Thesis. METU.

Evans, T. H. (1980). "Folklore as Utopia: English Medievalists and the Ideology of Revivalism." *Western Folklore* 47.7 (October): 245-268.

Ferrara, M. (2007). "A Religion of Solidarity: Looking Backward as a Rational Utopia." *Renascence* 59.2 (Winter): 83-92.

Filler, L. (1949). "Edward Bellamy and the Spiritual Unrest." *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 8.3 (April): 239-249.

Forbes, A. B. (1927). "The Literary Quest for Utopia, 1880-1900." *Social Forces* 6.2:179-89.

Foucault, M. (1982). "Afterword, The Subject and Power." in *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics.* ed. H. L. Dreyfus. New York: Harvester Press.

Foucault, M. (2006). *Hapishanenin Doğuşu: Gözetim Altında Tutmak ve Cezalandırmak.* Translated by M. A. Kılıçbay. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.

Fox, N. (2002-2003). "Rage Against the Machine." *Ecologist* 32.10 (Dec/Jan.): 44-48.

Frye, N. (1966). "Varieties of Literary Utopias." in *Utopias and Utopian Thought.* ed. F. E. Manuel. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Gardner, M. (2000). "Looking Backward at Edward Bellamy's Utopia." *New Criterion* 19.1 (September): 19-26.

Gerber, R. (1973). *Utopian Fantasy: A Study of English Utopian Fiction Since the End of the Nineteenth Century.* London: McGraw-Hill.

Glancey, J. (1996). "A Peculiarly English Socialist." *New Statesman&Society* 05/10/96 9.402: 18-21.

Gutek, G. (1964). "An Analysis of Formal Education in Edward Bellamy's Looking Backward." *History of Education Quarterly* 4.4 (December): 251-263.

Habermas, J. (1993). *'İdeoloji' Olarak Teknik ve Bilim.* Translated by M. Tüzel. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Halewood, W. H. (1994). "Catching up With Edward Bellamy." *University of Toronto Quarterly* 63.3: 451-461.

Hall, R. S. (1997). "The Religious Ethics of Edward Bellamy and Jonathan Edwards." *Utopian Studies* 8.2 (Spring): 13-31.

Hansot, E. (1974). "Introduction.", "Edward Bellamy's Looking Backward and Equality.", "Conclusion." in *Perfection and Progress: Two Modes of Utopian Thought.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Hartman, M. (1999). "Utopian Evolution: The Sentimental Critique of Social Darwinism in Bellamy and Peirce." *Utopian Studies* 10.1: 26-42.

Harvey, C. & J. Press. (1996). "William Morris-Art and Idealism." *History Today* 46.5 (May): 15-22.

Harvey, D. (2000). *Spaces of Hope.* California: University of California Press.

Hilbert, R. A. (1987). "Bureaucracy as Belief, Rationalization as Repair: Max Weber in a Post-Functionalist Age." *Sociological Theory* 5.1 (Spring): 70-86.

Hinchman, L. P. (1990). "The Idea of Individuality: Origins, Meaning, and Political Significance." *The Journal of Politics* 52.3 (August): 759-781.

Hobbes, T. (1991). "Chapter 17." in *Leviathan.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holzman, B. (1984). "Anarchism and Utopia: William Morris's News From Nowhere." *ELH* 51.3 (Autumn): 589-603.

Horowitz, I. L. (1989). "Socialist Utopias and Scientific Socialists: Primary Fanaticisms and Secondary Contradictions." *Sociological Forum* 4.1 (March): 107-113.

Horton, J. (1964). "The Dehumanization of Anomie and Alienation: A Problem in the Ideology of Sociology." *The British Journal of Sociology* 15.4 (December): 283-300.

Kant, I. (1784). "What is Enlightenment?"

<http://www.english.upenn.edu/~mgamer/Etexts/kant.html> (28 July 2008).

Kaplan, A. (1990). "The Embodiment of American Masculinity in the Popular Historical Novel of the 1890s." *American Literary History* 2.4: 659-90.

Kateb, G. (1963). "Maintaining Utopia." in *Utopia and Its Enemies.* NY: Free Press of Glencoe.

Kateb, G. (1966). "Utopia and the Good Life." in *Utopias and Utopian Thought.* ed. F. E. Manuel. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Kinna R. (2000). "William Morris: Art, Work and Leisure." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 61.3 (July): 493-512.

Kumar, K. (1995). "Introduction." to W. Morris's *News from Nowhere.* ed. by K. Kumar. Cambridge University Press.

Kumar, K. (2005). *Ütopyacılık.* Translated by Ali Somel. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.

Kumar, K. (2006). *Modern Zamanlarda Ütopya ve Karşıütopya.* Translated by Ali Galip. İstanbul: Kalkedon Yayınları.

Levi, A. B. (1945). "Edward Bellamy: Utopian." *Ethics* 55.2 (January): 131-144.

Liberman, M. (1986). "Major Textual Changes in William Morris's News from Nowhere." *Nineteenth Century Literature* 41.3 (December): 349-356.

Llyod, T. (1977). "The Politics of William Morris's 'News from Nowhere'." *Ablion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned With British Studies* 9.3 (Autumn): 273-287.

Löwy, M. (1987). "The Romantic and the Marxist Critique of Modern Civilization." *Theory and Society* 16.6 (November): 891-904

Madison, C. A. (1942). "Edward Bellamy, Social Dreamer." *The New England Quarterly* 15.3 (September): 444-466.

Magdoff, H. (2006). "The Meaning of Work: A Marxist Perspective." *Monthly Review: An Independent Socialist Magazine* 58.5 (October): 52-64.

Mann, N. D. (1979). "Eros and Community in the Fiction of William Morris." *Nineteenth Century Fiction* 34.4 (December): 302-325.

Manuel, F. E. and F. P. Manuel. (1979). "Equality or Death." and "Utopia Victoriana." in *Utopian Thought in The Western World.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Marcuse, H. (1997). *Tek Boyutlu İnsan: İleri İşleyim Toplumunun İdeolojisi Üzerine İncelemeler.* Translated by A. Yıldırımlı. İstanbul: İdea.

Marcuse, H. (1998). *Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud.* Routledge: London.

Marin, L. (1993). "Frontiers of Utopia: Past and Present." *Critical Inquiry* 19.3 (Spring): 397-420.

Mariz, G. (2003). "Towards a Socio Historical Understanding of the Clerical Utopian Novel" *Utopian Studies* 14.1 (Winter): 51-73.

Marx, K. (1964). "Economic and Political Manuscripts." in *Karl Marx-Early Writings.* ed. T. B. Bottomore. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Marx, K. (1994). "The Communist Manifesto." and "Excerpt-Notes of 1844 (Selections)." in *Karl Marx: Selected Writings.* ed. L. H. Simon. Indianapolis, Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company Inc.

Marx, K. (1995). *The Poverty of Philosophy.* New York: Promethous Books.

Marx, K. (1998). "Introduction to the Critique of Political Economy." in *The German Ideology Including Theses on Feuerbach and Introduction to the Critique of Political Economy.* K. Marx and F. Engels. New York: Promethous Books.

Marx, K. and F. Engels. (1998). "The German Ideology." in *The German Ideology Including Theses on Feuerbach and Introduction to the Critique of Political Economy.* K. Marx and F. Engels. New York: Promethous Books.

Mattick, P. (1967). "The Limits of Integration." in *The Critical Spirit: Essays in Honor of Herbert Marcuse.* eds. K. H. Wolff and B. Moore Jr. Boston: Beacon Press.

McClay, W. M. (1995). "Edward Bellamy and Politics of Meaning." *American Scholar* 64.2 (Spring): 264-271.

McCulloch, C. (1984). "The Problem of Fellowship in Communitarian Theory: William Morris and Peter Kropotkin." *Political Studies* 32.2 (September): 437-450.

McDonald, B. J. (2004). "William Morris and the Vision of Ecosocialism." *Contemporary Justice Review* 7.3 (September): 287-304.

Meyer, W. B. (2004). "Edward Bellamy and the Weather of Utopia." *Geographical Review* 94.1: 43-54.

Michaels, W. B. (1989). "An American Tragedy: or The Promise of American Life." *Representations* 25 (Winter): 71-98.

Miele, C. (1995). "A Small Knot of Cultivated People." *Art Journal* 54.2 (Summer): 73-80.

Morgan, Jr., G. (1942). "Individualism versus Individuality." *Ethics* 52.4 (July): 434-446.

Morris, W. (1995). *News from Nowhere or An Epoch of Rest: Being Some Chapters from a Utopian Romance.* ed. K. Kumar. Cambridge University Press.

Morris, W. (1997). "The Socialist Ideal." *Monthly Review: An Independent Socialist Magazine* 48.8 (January): 16-25.

Mullin, J. R. (2000). "Edward Bellamy's Ambivalence: Can Utopia be Urban?" *Utopian Studies* 11.1: 51-66.

Mumford, L. (1962). "Chapter 8." and "Chapter 9." in *The Story of Utopias.* NY: Viking Press.

Mumford, L. (1966). "Utopia, City and The Machine." in *Utopias and Utopian Thought.* ed. F. E. Manuel. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Nordstorm, J. (2007). "Looking Backward's Utopian Sequels: 'Fictional Dialogues' in Gilded-Age America." *Utopian Studies* 18.2: 193-221.

O'Neill, J. (1986). "The Disciplinary Society: From Weber to Foucault." *The British Journal of Sociology* 37.1 (March): 42-60.

Osgood, H. L. (1889). "Scientific Anarchism." *Political Science Quarterly* 4.1 (March): 1-36.

Parrinder, P. (1997). "Eugenics and Utopia: Sexual Selection from Galton to Morris." *Utopian Studies* 8.2 (Spring): 1-13.

Pepper, D. (1995). *Eco-Socialism: From Deep Ecology to Social Justice.* London, New York: Routledge.

Peyser, T. (2000). "Looking Back at Looking Backward." *Reason* 32.4 (Aug/Sep.): 30-36.

Prettyman, G. (2001). "Gilded Age Utopias of Incorporation." *Utopian Studies* 12.1 (Winter): 1.

Reedy, P. (2002). "Keeping the Black Flag Flying: Anarchy, Utopia and the Politics of Nostalgia." *Utopia and Organization* eds. M. Parker. USA: Blackwell Publishing.

Reichert, W. O. (1969). "Anarchism, Freedom, and Power." *Ethics* 79.2 (January): 139-149.

Rhodes, H. V. (1967). "The Nature of American Utopias.", "Bellamy: The Socialist Utopian.", "Conclusions." in *Utopia in American Political Thought.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Riede, D. G. (1984). "Morris, Modernism and Romance." *ELH* 51.1 (Spring): 85-106.

Roche, J. F. (1995). "The Culture of Pre-Modernism: Whitman, Morris and the American Arts and Crafts Movement." *ATQ* 9.2 (June): 103-119.

Ruskin, J. (1972). *The Poetry of Architecture or The Architecture of the Nations of Europe Considered in its Association With Natural Scenery and National Character.* Michigan.

Sadler, E. (1944). "One Book's Influence: Edward Bellamy's 'Looking Backward'." *New England Quarterly:* 17: 1/ 4 (December): 530-555.

Samuels, W. J. (1984). "A Centenary Reconsideration of Bellamy's Looking Backward." *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 43.2: 129-148.

Sargent, L. T. (1975). "A Note on the Other Side of Human Nature in the Utopian Novel." *Political Theory* 3.1 (February): 88-97.

Schiffman, J. (1953). "Edward Bellamy's Religious Thought." *PMLA* 68.4 (September): 716-732.

Schiffman, J. (1954). "Edward Bellamy's Altruistic Man." *American Quarterly* 6.3 (Autumn): 195-209.

Schorske, C. E. (1967). "The Quest for the Grail: Wagner and Morris." in *The Critical Spirit: Essays in Honor of Herbert Marcuse.* Eds. K. H. Wolff and B. Moore Jr. Boston: Beacon Press.

Scott, A. (1997). "Modernity's Machine Metaphor." *The British Journal of Sociology* 48.4 (December): 561-575.

Segal, H. P. (2001). "Back to the Future from 1888." *Nature* 2/1/2001 409.6820: 563.

Shurter, R. L. (1933). "The Literary Work of Edward Bellamy." *American Literature* 5.3 (November): 229-234.

Shurter, R. L. (1951). "Introduction." to E. Bellamy's *Looking Backward-2000-1887*. ed. R. L. Shurter. NY: Modern Library.

Sibley, M. Q. (1973). "Utopian Thought and Technology." *American Journal of Political Science* 17.2 (May): 255-281.

Stansky, P. (1983). "Utopia and Anti-Utopia." *History Today* 33.2 (February): 33-39.

Stirling, J. (2002). "William Morris and Work as it is and as it Might be." *Capital and Class* 76 (Spring): 127-144.

Taylor, C. (1991). *The Malaise of Modernity*. Ontario: Anansi Press.

Thomas, K. (1964). "Work and Leisure." *Past and Present* 29 (December): 50-66.

Towers, T. H. (1975). "The Insomnia of Julian West." *American Literature* 47.1 (March): 52-63.

Trilling, J. (1997). "Freedom and Convention: Old Arts for a New Century." *International Journal of Politics* 10.4 (Summer): 563-590.

Tumber, C. (1999). "The Erosion of Public Life, and Gnostic Revival." *American Literary History* 11.4 (Winter): 610-641.

Ulam, A. (1966) "Socialism and Utopia." in *Utopias and Utopian Thought*. ed. F. E. Manuel. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Vaninskaya, A. (2003). "Janus-Faced Fictions: Socialism as Utopia and Dystopia in William Morris and George Orwell." *Utopian Studies* 14.2: 83-98.

Vaninskaya, A. (2005). "The Bugle of Justice: The Romantic Socialism of William Morris and George Orwell." *Contemporary Justice Review* 8.1 (March): 7-23.

Waithe, M. (2002). "News from Nowhere, Utopia and Bakhtin's Idyllic Chronotope." *Textual Practice* 16.3 (Winter): 459-472.

Waithe, M. (2004). "The Stranger at the Gate: Privacy, Property, and the Structures of Welcome at William Morris's Red House." *Victorian Studies* 46.4 (Summer): 568-95.

Wallerstein, I. (1995). "The End of What Modernity?" *Theory and Society* 24.4 (August): 471-488.

Weber, M. (1978). "Basic Sociological Terms." in *Economy and Society V.1.* eds. G. Roth and C. Wittich. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Weinberg, R. L. (2001). "Looking Backward, Going Forward." *Nation* 2/1/2001 5.272: 32-34.

Wiener, M. J. (1976). "The Myth of William Morris." *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned With British Studies* 8.1 (Spring): 67-82.

Wilde, O. (1891). "The Soul of Man Under Socialism." <http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/wilde-oscar/soul-man/index.htm> (20 November 07).

Williams, N. M. (1999). "The Limits of Spatialized Form: Visibility and Obscurity in Edward Bellamy's Looking Backward." *Utopian Studies* 10.2: 25-40.

Yalçınkaya, A. (2004). "Giriş.", "Tarih İçinde Ütopya." in *Eğerden Meğere: Ütopya Karşısında Türk Romanı.* Ankara: Phoenix Yayınevi.

Zilbersheid, U. (2002). "The Idea of Abolition of Labor in Socialist Utopian Thought." *Utopian Studies* 13.1 (Winter): 21-44.

Zilbersheid, U. (2007). "The Utopia of Herbert Marcuse." Paper presented as a part of the Marxist Critical Theory and Utopia at the 32nd Annual Meeting of the Society for Utopian Studies, Toronto, ON, 4-7 October.