

Fourier, Marx, and Social Reproduction

Blanca Missé

San Francisco State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb>



Part of the [American Studies Commons](#), [Comparative Literature Commons](#), [European Languages and Societies Commons](#), and the [Feminist, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Commons](#)

Dedicated to the dissemination of scholarly and professional information, [Purdue University Press](#) selects, develops, and distributes quality resources in several key subject areas for which its parent university is famous, including business, technology, health, veterinary medicine, and other selected disciplines in the humanities and sciences.

CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture, the peer-reviewed, full-text, and open-access learned journal in the humanities and social sciences, publishes new scholarship following tenets of the discipline of comparative literature and the field of cultural studies designated as "comparative cultural studies." Publications in the journal are indexed in the Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature (Chadwyck-Healey), the Arts and Humanities Citation Index (Thomson Reuters ISI), the Humanities Index (Wilson), Humanities International Complete (EBSCO), the International Bibliography of the Modern Language Association of America, and Scopus (Elsevier). The journal is affiliated with the Purdue University Press monograph series of Books in Comparative Cultural Studies. Contact: <clcweb@purdue.edu>

Recommended Citation

Missé, Blanca. "Fourier, Marx, and Social Reproduction." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 22.2 (2020): <<https://doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.3840>>

This text has been double-blind peer reviewed by 2+1 experts in the field.

The above text, published by Purdue University Press ©Purdue University, has been downloaded 0 times as of 08/02/20.

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

This is an Open Access journal. This means that it uses a funding model that does not charge readers or their institutions for access. Readers may freely read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of articles. This journal is covered under the [CC BY-NC-ND license](#).

CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture

ISSN 1481-4374 <<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb>>
Purdue University Press ©Purdue University

CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture, the peer-reviewed, full-text, and open-access learned journal in the humanities and social sciences, publishes new scholarship following tenets of the discipline of comparative literature and the field of cultural studies designated as "comparative cultural studies." In addition to the publication of articles, the journal publishes review articles of scholarly books and publishes research material in its *Library Series*. Publications in the journal are indexed in the Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature (Chadwyck-Healey), the Arts and Humanities Citation Index (Thomson Reuters ISI), the Humanities Index (Wilson), Humanities International Complete (EBSCO), the International Bibliography of the Modern Language Association of America, and Scopus (Elsevier). The journal is affiliated with the Purdue University Press monograph series of Books in Comparative Cultural Studies. Contact: <clcweb@purdue.edu>

Volume 22 Issue 2 (June 2020) Article 5

Blanca Missé,

"Fourier, Marx, and Social Reproduction"

<<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol22/iss2/5>>

Contents of **CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture 22.2 (2020)**

Special Issue ***The Politics of Social Reproduction***. Ed. Kelly Gawel and Cinzia Arruzza

<<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol22/iss1/>>

Abstract: This article establishes a conversation between the work of materialist socialist Charles Fourier and Marxist social reproduction theory (SRT). SRT has laid the ground to explore who produces the producer, in order to analyze and integrate the role of reproductive labor into a comprehensive Marxist view of the capitalist economy. In the context of the critical re-appraisal of the labor of social reproduction, Fourier offers a key materialist perspective which is also present in Marx: the identity between labor and desire in the socialist project. Fourier's materialism, I show, greatly influenced both Marx and Engels, for whom labor was also to be re-organized in order to fulfil human passions, according to our natural inclinations and needs, and not the other way around. Revisiting reproductive labor from a Marxist and Fourierist lenses is thus also reconnecting with our bodies and desire in a Spinozist manner, and envisioning that any social transformation will also be the result of a dialectical revolution initiated from below, at the level of the living infrastructure or affect. In Fourier, the continuity between production and consumption (and between humanity and nature) is a guiding principle for the socialist society to come. This article argues that in addition to the critique of existing power structures and forms of alienated labor that must be materially and strategically replaced, Marxism also needs to cultivate forms of labor and modes of the labor process where pleasure is affirmed, and where desire can find fertile grounds to re-imagine a different society and push back against the rule of capital.

Blanca MISSÉ

Fourier, Marx, and Social Reproduction

Social Reproduction Theory and the Actuality of Fourier

Social reproduction theory (SRT) has expanded our understanding of the kinds of labor necessary for the survival of the capitalist system. Marxism established a long time ago that the essence and engine of the capitalist system is productive labor, that is, the labor that produces commodities, and thus surplus labor and profit. In the 1980s Marxists like Lise Vogel, and later SRT theorists sought to further expand the analysis of political economy by looking at the material roots of the existing gendered division of labor within the capitalist mode of production. By asking the reflexive question of "who produces the producer?" and of "which labor processes produce her," they turned around the question of production to interrogate capitalism's own presupposed conditions: the constant availability of labor power, capitalism's "special commodity" (Vogel; Luxton; Bhattacharya; Ferguson).

In this new theoretical horizon both reproductive labor and the whole sphere of social reproduction (the labor of care, education, cooking, cleaning etc.) have been brought to the forefront. As Tithi Bhattacharya argues "human labor is at the heart of the creating and reproducing society as a whole," and both the production of commodities and the production of people need to be connected in the "systematic totality of capitalism"(2). SRT is set to lay out a unitary conception of the circuits of production and reproduction.

In fact SRT is more than a complement to Marx's *Capital*, or a regional extension of the Marxist critical method to the unexplored undergrounds of capitalism. In articulating growing and pressing ecological and feminist demands and concerns, SRT has enabled a double shift inside Marxist theory itself, and a revamping of its theoretical tools. First, it has accomplished a broadening of the concept of labor by specifying the different components of "necessary labor" under capitalism, by showing how a portion of that necessary labor is realized by non-capitalist means. Second, it has re-centered human experience in the labor process itself, so that the relation between work and desire, and that of humanity and nature can be revisited with new light.

Regarding the first shift, the broadening of the Marxist concept of labor beyond its focus on productive labor, SRT has, as Susan Ferguson argued, included "the processes outside of direct production-relations that are necessary to capitalism's survival" (49). SRT, she further stated, "is not simply expanding the concept of labor in order to draw attention and valorize a sphere of activity and set of relations that have hitherto been naturalized and largely neglected," it has more importantly advanced and is still developing "an argument about the internal relations between reproductive and productive labor" (49). Bhattacharya has showed the importance of Michael Lebowitz's work who, in *Beyond Capital* (1992), theorized "the moment of the production of labor power" as "'a second moment' of production as a whole," unearthing this "second circuit" of production necessary in the capitalist system, that of "wage-labor" (Bhattacharya 76). In fact, these theoretical shifts result from the application of the same method of analysis and critique Marx applied to the concept of value to the concept of labor itself, by showing what is presupposed and what is concealed. SRT not only expands *Capital*, it reflects critically on its concepts.

I argue that this reconceptualization of labor has allowed a second shift, that of considering analytically not only different forms of labor, but the labor process itself and its productivity from a non-capitalist perspective. SRT has enabled an anti-capitalist re-appraisal of the work of social reproduction as the labor producing and reproducing life. By doing so, it has opened the door to a critique of abstract labor and its multiple separations and alienations, and also to the revalorization of the sensuous and joyful dimension of labor, and the formulation of labor alternatives to capitalism's.

SRT's methodology, like that of Marx in *Capital*, refuses to believe and take at face value the "discourse" of capital about itself, that is to say, the epistemological categories and value systems capital generates, which are centered on commodity production and profit-making. As Bhattacharya stated "SRT displays an analytical irreverence to 'visible facts' and privileges 'process' instead. It is an approach that is not content to accept what seems like a visible, finished entity" (2). SRT's theoretical emphasis on *process* has the potential to go beyond its already ambitious project of continuing Marx's unfinished project of *critique* in *Capital*, and expand Marxist political economy beyond the critique of the forms of labor we must reject into the forms of labor we may desire.

In fact, the revalorization of the sphere of social reproduction or the "second circuit of production" is maybe bound to bring forward an added internal revolution of the goals of Marxist political-economic theory itself. Lebowitz argued that the two circuits of production, the visible one (commodity production), and the invisible one (social reproduction of labor power) are not only integrated in a

subordinated way, where social reproduction is geared towards the satisfaction of the needs of the production system; but that these "two moments" of production are also "two different goals, two different perspectives on the value of labor power: while for capital, the value of labor power is a means of satisfying its goal of surplus value... for the wage-laborer, it is the means of satisfying the goal of self-development" (Lebowitz 127). The sphere of social reproduction is surely as Bhattacharya argues a growing and significant "site of class conflict," where different projects oppose each other (work for profit or work for life and self-development), and if Lebowitz is right, it is also a fertile ground for formulating a new political economy of emancipated labor. If the two circuits of labor offer two competing critical standpoints on the "value of labor," that is, on what makes labor valuable, then Marxist political economy must go beyond critique of the categories of bourgeois political economy, and develop critically and practically alternative forms of value and labor as inherently emancipatory, which achieve the goal of "self-development."

Thus, to reground the Marxist-feminist critique of capitalist political economy on its human, natural and subjective dimension, requires both a continuation of the work of analysis and critique, and a foregrounding of possible alternatives of liberation by offering the basis and experiences to re-imagine possible forms of emancipated labor, of desirable labor, as Charles Fourier did.

In this article I would like to advocate for revisiting Fourier's materialist and Spinozist socialist philosophy, which centered the labor of social reproduction and the need to restore the link between labor and desire. Re-engaging SRT via Fourier's materialist socialism brings forward an often overlooked dimension of Marx's political economy: the critique of both alienated labor and pleasure, and the project of re-establishing the identity of labor and enjoyment. It is precisely in and from the work of early 19th century French Socialist Charles Fourier that Marx and Engels drew the project of restoring the lost identity of labor and enjoyment, and of enabling a reconnection of the worker with her natural being and her pleasures.² I argue that Marx's materialism inhabits a sort of "second circuit" of its own, which structures (or undoes) from below Marxist political economic theory, a "circuit" or dimension that is rarely brought to the surface but that SRT has the possibility of exploring and unleashing.

Returning to the Spinozist trend of materialism alive in Fourier and very clearly in the young Marx of the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts*, and more subtly in the *Grundrisse* and *Capital* - but also in Engels's work - requires first a reappraisal of Fourier's socialism often dismissed as "utopian."

Early Industrialization and Fourier's Focus on Reproductive Labor

Charles Fourier (1772-1837) developed his materialist critique of capitalist society from the early 1800's through the end of the 1820s in the early moments of industrialization in France, and before the height of the industrial revolution and the generalization of large scale factory (Granter). The industrial boom in Europe, which as Eric Hobsbawm reminds us began rather in the 1830s, came even later in France. And it was only in the 1840s that the "characteristic social problems of industrialism - the new proletariat, the horrors of uncontrolled breakneck urbanization - were the commonplace of serious discussion" (Hobsbawm, *Age of Revolution* 173). Yet, as William Sewell has argued while "to speak of France in the first half of the nineteenth century as an industrial society may be an exaggeration," "what now appears as the hesitant beginnings of a long and slow development seemed to be a major departure to contemporaries even a very few steam engines or blast furnaces or spinning mills could make a powerful impression on people who had never seen them before" (143).

Fourier was a first-hand witness of the first effects the structural social transformations brought by industrial capitalism, of the transition from the "old" to the "modern" socio-economic world in the aftermath of the French Revolution. The Revolution Fourier lived through had destroyed the pre-existing "hierarchy of bodies and communities" from the *ancien régime*, and instituted instead a nation of individual citizens, "whose labor on nature - their 'industry' - gave rise to property" at least in theory, setting the ground for a new "industrial society" understood at the time as a "voluntary association of productive citizens" (Sewell 144-145).

Between 1791 and 1816 Fourier travelled throughout France as a commercial representative, going to major industrial sites such as Paris, Lyon, Marseille, or Rouen. (Beecher, *Fourier*). At that time France was still a mostly rural country, for in 1806, only 37 towns had more than 20,000 inhabitants, adding to a total of 6.7% of the total population (INSEE, 1).⁵ Still, at that time Paris already had half a million

² For a comprehensive account of the influence of utopian socialism on Marx and Engels see Hobsbawm "Marx, Engels and Pre-Marxian Socialism"; and Leopold. For a reappraisal of the importance of Fourier in Marx's socialism see Abensour.

⁵ See also Moret..

inhabitants, which was set to double by 1850. Fourier saw first-hand the deep social changes brought by the fast development of urbanization and industrialization, especially the extremely long working days of both working class women and men (for women accounted for roughly 30% of the workforce in the early phase of industrialization), and the rapid and violent process of separation of the sphere of production and that of social reproduction (Offen, 211).⁶ Indeed, from his first major work on (*The Theory of the Four Movements*, 1808) Fourier perceived the rapid institutionalization of a new hierarchical relation between the factory and the household, between productive labor and reproductive labor, and how this hierarchy was replicated between the industrial city and the agrarian countryside.

The city, and especially Paris, was becoming a theatre of inequalities, and the place where a new incoherent and duplicitous political economy was quickly developing, an economy led by "commerce" and greed, where labor itself had lost its inherent meaning and become a degrading imposition for millions of workers. As John Butt mentioned in relation to Robert Owen, a Welsh social utopian of the same generation as Fourier, "there was a common place fear that society was in a process of disintegration" (Butt x). In such a context, one can better understand Fourier's impulse to move away from the city and the world of commerce and industry, and his desire to restore this broken link, between production and reproduction, a coherence of the labor process. Fourier saw in the labor of social reproduction a form of labor that could rebuild the social bond, because it would be grounded labor in a contained and coherent political economy at a human scale and reconnect it to nature. It is in a re-envisioned and emancipated sphere of social reproduction that production can be directly linked again to consumption, labor can become "attractive" again and foster individual development, and relations of care, love and sex can be cultivated in a non-alienating way.

The Hegemony of Reproductive Labor and Social Reproduction in Fourier's Socialism

Fourier's socialist project was sustained by his theory of "attractive industry," that is, of a new social organization of labor in the Phalanstery aimed at rendering labor "attractive" again, which was fully developed in the three volumes of the *Theory of Universal Unity* (1822-1823) and then popularized in the *New Societary and Industrial World* (1829).⁷ In the former work Fourier asserts that "in order to attain happiness, it is necessary to introduce it into the labors which engage the greater part of our lives. Life is a long torment to one who pursues occupations without attraction" (*Theory of Universal Unity* 147).⁸

In both works he proposed a reorganization of the social division of labor that would radically re-center and expand the sphere of social reproduction understood in the broader sense Johanna Brenner and Barbara Laslett gave to it: "among other things, social reproduction includes how food, clothing, and shelter are made available for immediate consumption, how the maintenance and socialization of children is accomplished, how care of the elderly and infirm is provided, and how sexuality is socially constructed" (314).

The attractiveness of labor for Fourier is mainly to be found in the labor process itself, but not in every kind of labor. It is the labor of social reproduction, that is, the labor inhabited by the logic of the production and reproduction of life, that can become more immediately and naturally attractive. In the *New Societary and Industrial World* (1829) work activities are broken down and reorganized into "series" with a mathematical formula. There "manufacturing" series, the industrial production of commodities, will only occupy 20 out of 135 series (Fourier, *Nouveau monde* 135-139). Thus, in Fourier's socialist vision roughly 85% of the necessary labor to be performed will be reproductive labor: there will be 30 work series devoted to livestock farming or rather to the cultivation of the "animal kingdom," 50 devoted to agriculture or the "vegetal world" producing food for immediate consumption, and finally around 40 series devoted to "domestic labor," which are carefully numbered and detailed as follows:

1.2.3. The Storehouse Series for hay, vegetables, and fodder... - 4.5.6. The Wine cellar... - 7.8.9. The Fruit Cellar ...- 10. The Ground cellar. - 11. The oil store. - The General seed shop. - 13. The Dairy, minus the Cheese factory (14. 15.) - 16. Waiters and Rooms-servants who serve tables and lodgings. -17. Furnishers, maintenance of furnishing from mirrors to pots and pans. -18.19 Irrigation, including care of pumps and pipes. -20. Nursery maids... -22. The Nurses, and Nurse-men, working with children who are 2 to 3 years old in order to ascertain and develop their industrial vocations. -23. The Mentors and Mentorines, working with children 3 to 4 ½ years old to draw out and evaluate their personalities... - 24. Medicine.... - 25. Teaching, much more extensive than in the civilized state. I include here agricultural and manufacturing education. - 27.28. The Little Hordes and Little Bands. - 29.30.31 Harmony, both vocal and instrumental... -32. The Drama...-33. The

⁶ On the social transformation of Paris in the 19th century see also Gribaudy; Harvey, and Hazan.

⁷ On Fourier's social philosophy see Debout; Hemmens, and Tacussel.

⁸ Quoted in Fourier, *Selections* 166.

Opera, all types. -35.35 Choreography and Gymnastics. 36 Periodic Drudge Duty. (Fourier, *Utopian Vision* 285-286)

Furthermore, Fourier proposes to do a careful selection of industrial operations, because "the goal is to establish between manufacturing and agriculture, a convenient reciprocity that will allow these two types of industry to contribute to each other's success" (*Nouveau monde* 139-140). Manufacturing series and branches need to be chosen according to the criteria that will stimulate the "cabalist passion," that of productive emulation and interest and also according to "local interest," and local possibilities (140). There is for example no sense in developing intensive textile production if there is not cotton production in the phalanstery.

The centrality of reproductive labor, however, is not accidental. Fourier perceived that these forms of labor, which have been disregarded and rejected by industrial capitalism as "unproductive," were the ones that better managed to partially escape the increasing alienation of "civilized industry," and Marx was right to assert that "Fourier, like the Physiocrats, regarded agriculture as at least the best form of labour" ("Manuscripts" 345). One clear reason for this preference is Fourier's hostility to the world of commerce and the world of commodity production. Fourier is interested in reproductive labor, that is in forms of labor production for immediate consumption, because the alienating mediation of commerce, or false exchange, can be entirely avoided. In the sphere of social reproduction use values are produced for their own sake, not because of an abstract demand of the market.

Yet, the avoidance of the market alone does not explain the preference for agriculture and cooking in the phalanstery. The second reason behind the revalorization of reproductive labor is the elimination of another mediation between man and nature, that of the machine. In the labor of cooking, gardening or caring, Fourier perceived a still unbroken sensuous dimension of labor, and therefore the possibility of renewing a sensuous, pleasurable and passionate relation with nature, including our own human nature.

In Fourier's emancipated version of a sphere of social reproduction, labor is performed for immediate consumption, and in this proximity and cycle of production for reproduction of life the human relation with nature is re-established, and the sensual and affective dimension of labor is reactivated. The phalanstery is designed to be an inverted form of industrial capitalism not only in the organization of labor, but also (and this is a difference with Marx) with the kinds of labor performed, for machinery and manufacturing are to be reduced to the minimum, and human direct contact and interaction with nature to be both maximized and intensified.

Social reproduction theory has shown how the integration of commodity production and the reproduction of labor-power in capitalism is neither harmonious nor a horizontal one. As Bhattacharya argues: "in capitalism productive labor for the market is the sole form of legitimate "work," while the tremendous amount of familial as well as communitarian work that goes on to sustain and reproduce the worker, or more specifically her labor power, is naturalized into nonexistence" (2).

Fourier's socialism does not mechanically invert this capitalist hierarchy, by valorizing the labor of social reproduction at the expense of the industrial one. Rather, Fourier wants a total reabsorption of industrial labor or manufacturing into the sphere of social reproduction. What Fourier rejects is the historical aberration of separating the production of use values from the social cycle of production and reproduction of life, that is the historical and social separation of both spheres or circuits accomplished by capitalism. His socialism aims instead at re-establishing the interconnectedness of the whole process of production and reproduction of life.

Cooking as Propaedeutics

Of all of the forms of reproductive labor Fourier cherished, he held cooking, which he elevated to almost a science in his tirades on "gastrosophy," in the highest esteem (Levi). Cooking provides in a condensed form both the radical experience and the political formula of a new socialist political economy, that of social harmony, and this is why Fourier argues it entails a double value: "the art of cooking, which is held in such contempt by the philosophers, has the same effect on agricultural emulation that grafting has on fruit: it doubles the value" (*Utopian Vision* 287).

From a practical point of view the joy of cooking itself "serves to initiate workers in industrial attraction," cooking is pleasurable, and contributes to the liberation of desire. The practice of cooking produces an irresistible and almost universal effect: "to develop a great variety of tastes of all types of food," that is, to develop through consumption taste and human sensibility to an ever-growing variety of physical pleasures, or what Fourier calls a sort of natural "luxury" (*Utopian Vision* 281). The activity of cooking is the place for the multiplication of nuances in taste, for the productive expansion of sensual desire: "The penchant for nuances in the cooking and preparation of food springs up whenever it is not

repressed" (281). It also demonstrates the inadequacy and the cruel limitations of the capitalist mode of production: "I know it would be impossible to satisfy this multiplicity of tastes in civilization. A household would be ruined if it tried to prepare food in half a dozen ways for the father, mother, children and servants" (281).

Yet there is a second and specific quality in cooking: its experience brings forward the theoretical elements of a new political economy that puts consumption (and not profit or the abstract demands of the market) at the center of the process of production. Cooking is rooted in experience of both producing a meal and consuming it. In it, production and consumption are neither separated or alienated from each other, rather, cooking requires a constant back and forth between production and consumption, between preparation and tasting, a work of the bee so both activities, become reciprocally adjusted the one to the other, establishing a continuum in the experience (284).

In fact, Fourier does not propose only a new division of labor, but also a new theory of value or "wealth": "In Harmony real wealth is based on: 1) The greatest possible consumption of different kinds of food; 2) The smallest possible consumption of different kinds of clothing and furniture" (288). What is produced, or rather reproduced in the political economy of the phalanstery is then a re-animating relation with nature.

Fredric Jameson argued that there is in Fourier's socialism a social ontology, a "coordination of base and superstructure, so to speak: in other words the ways in which the individual passions (cultural) themselves take charge of and organize the figures of the mode of production itself (the "infrastructure" or shape, size and dynamic of the various groups)" (246). The subsumption of productive labor into social reproduction is also accomplished in Fourier in the labor process itself, in the reconnection of production to consumption, and not only in the reorganization of the social division of labor. As Jameson notes, the homology between production and reproduction, and between production and consumption, is akin to the "identification of the two fundamental levels of being," Body and Mind, in the Spinozist ontology of nature (246).

Socialist Social Reproduction or the Natural Reproduction of Nature

For Marx, under capitalism productive labor is the labor that produces surplus value, but also, as generally all labor does, that "reproduces the capital-relation itself": "The capitalist process of production, therefore, seen as a total, connected process, i.e. a process of reproduction, produces not only commodities, not only surplus-value, but it also produces and reproduces the capital-relation itself; on the one hand the capitalist, on the other the wage-laborer" (*Capital I*: 724). The question posed to socialism, then, is: What social relation is to be reproduced in a socialist society? Or in other words, what does socialist social reproduction look like?

For Fourier, it is not enough to break labor free of its relation to capital and to end the subordination of reproductive labor to productive labor, and the subordination of consumption to production. Labor and human activity must become "productive" again in a radically new way, they must provide an experience of fulfillment and thriving, they must produce life, and a joyful and liberating relation with nature, and the way to do this is by bringing forward the immanent desire and pleasure of the labor activity itself.

The subtitle of *New Industrial World*, "Natural Societary Method," is to be interpreted in a clearly Spinozist materialist way. Fourier's method consists precisely in rebuilding a new society following Nature's own method, yet Fourier does not have a normative conception of nature. Labor is the place where humans express their natural self, their inner passion or desire, understanding expression in Spinozist terms as "the revelation of, or encounter with that which already existed, that which was always immanent" (Fox 47). And the first thing that already exist are our passions and desires, often repressed and unsatisfied.

As Fourier argues, "if we want to reveal nature's wishes we need to forget what should be, i.e. duty, and analyze what is" (*Theory of Four* 75). Nature is already present in us, through passions and desires, we just need to learn to listen to them, and follow them. Or as the young Marx put it in a famous letter to Ruge in 1843: "For the dream to become reality, it is sufficient that, here and now, humanity be aware of its ancient desire in order to give it existence, to actualize and see the birth of a new society" ("Letter" 145).

The method and science of constructing series are there to stimulate the Spinozist *conatus* or our fundamental desire for preservation and expression that Fourier calls "passionate attraction." Passionate attraction in labor or in affectionate exchanges is to be distinguished from a sort of mechanical or alienated attraction, that is, from an external action produced by an outside force instead of being caused by an inner desire. Breaking with the Newtonian mechanical model, and borrowing a Spinozist

model of expression, Fourier redefines attractive labor as a self-renewing form of labor, a labor whose intrinsic qualities and experience activates the human subject to keep going and encourage others.

Passionate attraction then is also opposed to duty and any moralization of work, "duty is man-made, attraction comes from God." "Instead of trying to correct the passions" Fourier argues we should "try to discover nature's motives in giving the passions a dynamic so different from duty's" (*Theory of Four* 75). This is why he insists repeatedly that the "new order" will not "change the passions in any way: neither God nor man can do that; yet it is possible to change their course without altering their nature" (13). To "alter" the nature of our existing passions, which are warped up, bottled up, and repressed, means for Fourier to build a new social arrangement where passions will have "changed their course," redirect their internal energy and mode of expression and realization "without having changed their nature or their ultimate aim" (13). "What I want to do is to open up new opportunities and give them three or four times the scope to develop that they have in the incoherent order we live in" (14). The key to developing this passionate attraction does not rely on any external force (a new state or constituent power), but on a different practical experience of the world and ourselves through emancipated labor. The key to enabling or developing a fulfilling passionate attraction towards our practical activity and in our social and love relations is already present and inscribed in ourselves, because "passionate attraction is the impulsion given by nature before reflection, and persisting despite the opposition of reason, duty and prejudice" (17).

The Socialization of Domestic Labor and the Emancipation of Care Work

Passionate attraction is to be socially developed for Fourier in three parallel ways, all of them corresponding to forms of reproductive labor: the development of "luxury or the pleasure of the five senses," the development of "affectionate relations" in groups and social groupings through social services and care work, and the "mechanism of passions, personalities and instincts" which guarantees the "universal unity," namely, the unity of society as a whole, and of society with nature, in a harmonious way (*Nouveau* 47). The importance of developing the "luxury" of our senses is one of the reasons why for Fourier "work with plants and vegetables is preferable to work in manufactures because it has more intrinsic attraction," and in fact "the care of animals is preferable to work with plants and vegetables" (*Utopian Vision* 284). Yet the most important area of passionate attraction is that of "affectionate relations" or care work, which Fourier will further develop in the *Nouveau Monde Amoureux* from 1816 (the *New Amorous World* – still untranslated), which was censored by his major disciples such as Victor Considérant, and remained unpublished in France until 1967 (Beecher, "Parody"; Wark).

Fourier esteemed that "three-fourths of the women who live in cities and half of those who live in the country" are unproductive workers: "They are unproductive because they are absorbed in household work which entails the wasteful duplication of functions. This is why the political economists consider a women's working day to have only one-fifth the value of a man's" (*Utopian Vision* 131). The same goes for "three-fourths of all household servants," "most of the work that they do, not counting gardening, is unnecessary. This is especially true of kitchen work" (131).

In contrast, in the new emancipated society, the "societary state," or Harmony, "men and women will be asked to perform only those domestic tasks for which they are suited. This will reduce to one-fourth or one-fifth the number of people required by the current system of isolated households and incoherent families" (132).

Yet, Fourier is not proposing to increase the productivity of reproductive labor by industrializing it at a large-scale level, as Marxist socialists have traditionally argued. Marx and Fourier offer in fact two alternative forms of socialization of domestic labor, which will eliminate wasted time, energy and the reduplication of tasks. In the classic Marxist understanding this form of labor is considered inherently alienating, and lacking any potential value, the labor time devoted to needs is to be reduced to its bare minimum, and thus mechanization (and today robotization) would be the best solution for it. Fourier, however, sees in the labor of social reproduction an incipient form of resistance to capitalist alienation that must be radicalized under socialism, and as a place to re-engage our relation with nature in a pleasurable way.

Fourier also devoted particular attention to the emancipation of what today we have labeled emotional or care work, such as nursing, education, mentoring, cleaning, etc. that he called "domestic service." Fourier envisions a new "mechanism of free collective domestic service," where the labor itself will not be mediated by money (waged labor will be abolished), and servants, or which he relabeled "pages" and "pagesses" would only be assigned to perform tasks they like for people they have affection for. In this future society "domestic tasks, like all the other kinds of labor on a Phalanx, are managed by series which assign a group to each variety of work," the purpose being "to serve a Phalanx collectively," for "no member of a community in Compound Harmony ... will be a hired servant," and yet

"the poorest man will constantly have fifty pages at his service" because everyone will be serving everyone (312).

Thus, in Harmony, domestic service itself will not be abolished, it will be emancipated. What will be abolished is the material infrastructure that enables "the personal domination that debases a man by putting him at the mercy of another's whims." The relation of master and servant is to be liberated from within, so all service is truly and authentically "affectionate service." In Harmony we will be able to care, nurse, clean and cook for the people we love, and this specific form of "labor," maybe the most interpersonal and intimate, will be mainly the place for the production and reproduction of social affect and interpersonal love: "in this way every servant, whether man or woman, will be motivated by friendship, love, or some other form of affection, no matter what kind of domestic work he or she chooses" (313).

Labor and Pleasure in Fourier and Marx's Socialisms

Fourier summarizes his socialist project as that of rendering labor "attractive" and "pleasurable" in a simple and enlightening formula: "Each member will encourage others in their work because each member will perform only the task that pleases him" (*Utopian Vision* 129). In Fourier's new social division of labor the collective experience of pleasure at work (for in Fourier's socialism we always work in groups), translates therefore into a new social relation to labor: work is never to be coerced, only positively encouraged and desired. Each member will encourage others to work out of generosity because work itself will be enjoyable, and the place to (re)establish a social bond of reciprocal happiness. When properly arranged following our three social passions—that is, in short and varied sessions stimulating the "papillone" (or butterfly) passion, adequately appealing to our personal inclinations through the "composite" (or enthusiastic) passion, and to our sense of emulation through the "cabaliste" (or intriguing) passion—labor is to be something one equally desires for oneself as for others, it is to be self-generating or *causa sui*, to borrow the Spinozist formula.

Fourier's formula of guiding criteria for a socialist political economy can be compared and contrasted with the one later popularized by the Marxist movement, following Marx's synthesis in the *Critique of the Gotha Program* (1875): "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." (*Marx-Engels* 531). In 1875, Marx appears to have neglected desire and pleasure, and reduced the criteria to allocate labor to two elements: "ability" and "needs." Yet I argue that neither Marx nor Engels ever really neglected the project of making work desirable or pleasurable again, they just left the question of pleasure on the back burner so to speak. Marx's and Engel's early philosophy, where the Fourierist concern of re-associating labor and pleasure is very much present, suffered a brutal amputation by Stalinism, yet this is a thread continuously present in their political thought.

In the quoted passage from 1875, Marx was arguing against Lassalle's abstract programmatic demand of simply equating the project of socialism to that of "emancipating labor" through the "co-operative regulation of the total labor, with a fair distribution of the proceeds of labor" (528). Marx is actually objecting to leaving the labor process intact: it is not enough to redistribute the products of labor, the labor process itself needs to be overhauled, because labor has become "only a means of life," and needs to become again "life's prime want," an object of desire or rather an equivalent of it (531). In his polemic with Lassalle, Marx was indirectly alluding to his earlier elaborations of alienated labor from 1844 and 1845.

The *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts* outline the multi-faceted alienation of humanity under capitalism, in particular its alienation from "sensuous nature", of nature as a means and as a medium of life ("Economic" 325). In it Marx famously stated "man lives from nature, i.e. nature is his body, and he must maintain a continuing dialogue with it if he is not to die" (328).¹¹ A year earlier in an 1843 article in the *New Moral World* reviewing Fourier's socialism, Engels stated that :

Fourier goes on *proving the identity of labor and enjoyment*, and shows the irrationality of the present social system, which separates them, making labor a toil, and placing enjoyment above the reach of the majority of the laborers; he shows further, how, under rational arrangements, labor may be made, what it is intended to be, an enjoyment, leaving everyone to follow his own inclinations. ("Progress of Social Reform" 395; Emphasis added)

This conception was still present in Engels' 1878 *Anti-During* where he restated:

¹¹ See also Butler.

The old mode of production must therefore be revolutionized from top to bottom, and in particular the former division of labor must disappear. Its place must be taken by an organization of production in which ... productive labor, instead of being a means of subjugating men, will become a means of their emancipation, by offering each individual the opportunity to develop all his faculties, physical and mental, in all directions and exercise them to the full — in which, therefore, productive labor will become a pleasure instead of being a burden. Today this is no longer a fantasy, no longer a pious wish. (*Anti-Durhing* 279-280; emphasis added)

If Marx and Engels "borrowed" from Fourier one of the core missions of socialism, the possibility or rather the political necessity of restoring the "identity of labor and enjoyment," the question remains, however, why the question of pleasure was not brought to the forefront in their own writings, why it had to be toned down, or rather buried in Marx's works in such a way as it could go unperceived by the reader. And the answer to this question can only be found in Marx's own analysis of the alienation of desire and pleasure themselves in capitalism.

Marx's Critique of the Alienation of Pleasure in Alienated Labor

Fourier inspired Marx to reflect further on the brutal separation between pleasure and labor accomplished by the capitalist mode of production. This very issue, which stimulated Fourier's creative imagination to envision a new society, became for Marx an object of critique of alienated labor. In the *Manuscripts* Marx brings forward the "essential connection" between this separation and property relations: "If the product of labor does not belong to the worker, if it confronts him as an alien power, then this can only be *because it belongs to some other man than the worker. If the worker's activity is a torment to him, to another it must give satisfaction and pleasure.* Not the gods, not nature, but only man himself can be this alien power over man" ("Manuscripts" 330-331; emphasis added). The separation of labor and pleasure presented in the social relations of production is itself embodied in the expropriation of both the product and process of labor, and maintained and reproduced through the social relations of property.

Marx's analysis of the alienation of pleasure goes further, for this separation or alienation of one's enjoyment is not only present "in the activity of labor itself" but also expands to the workers' relation to her own body (326). The dissociation of pleasure from work in the worker leads to the alienation of pleasure from her own physical existence, so that pleasure can only exist in the body of the bourgeois. The worker's physical existence is reduced to mere survival, her bodily activities such as "eating, drinking and procreating" are degraded to mere "animal" functions because they are "abstracted from other aspects of human activity, and turned into final and exclusive ends" (327).

The pleasure of eating for the worker is pure animal pleasure, thus alienated pleasure, but this can also be said of the pleasure of the bourgeois: "To be sure, the industrial capitalist also seeks enjoyment... his enjoyment is only incidental, a means of relaxation; it is subordinated to production, it is a calculated and even an economical form of pleasure, for it is charged as an expense of capital" (Marx, "Manuscripts" 368). In Marx's analysis pleasure is separated from the body of the proletarian, and embodied, in an alienated form, an "economic form of pleasure" in the body of the bourgeois, who can only experience it in a both calculated and ephemeral way (366). The body of the bourgeois is inhabited by a cruel and vampiric form of pleasure which feeds from the pain it exerts on other exploited bodies, and it "regards the slave labor of others... as the prey of his desires" (366). Capitalism has perversely transformed alienated pleasure into an engine for its own development, to the point that capitalist production itself seems to be driven by the "inhuman" desires of the alienated bourgeois body: "the fact that the expansion of production and needs becomes the inventive and ever calculating slave of inhuman, refined, unnatural and imaginary appetites" (358-359).

The ambivalence of Marx towards the experience of pleasure in capitalist society is a result of the fact that bourgeois subjectivity has become the new and seemingly absolute norm for pleasure, and in it pleasure has become alienated by the logic of capitalism itself. When the worker suffers, she suffers from the pleasure of the bourgeois body, and when she experiences pleasure, she experiences only alienated pleasure in a bourgeois form. The risk for Marx is that the experience of pleasure will lead to further alienation, that the more the worker will experience alienated pleasure, the more she will increase her own bodily alienation, and ultimately inhabit a form of bourgeois subjectivity. The fear in Marx is that capitalist alienation has separated completely the workers from her body and from nature, and that pleasure cannot serve as a reliable guide to political liberation. For Fourier, however, pleasure, and more particularly the pleasure experienced in re-arranged forms of reproductive labor, was envisioned as a possible site of anti-capitalist resistance and of re-envisioning a society free of alienation, that is, a site from which an experience of exteriority to capital can be reconstructed.

Socialism and the Emancipation of Desire

Where both Marx and Fourier coincided, however, is in the need for socialism to provide a full emancipation of human desire. In the *German Ideology*, Marx polemicized with Stirner's developmental doctrine of the fixation and emancipation of desires, arguing that the question of whether or not human needs became "fixed," that is alienated, or became "freed," and took many forms, was not a matter of historical evolution, but was determined instead by the existence of "material circumstances" to satisfy them (Thomas). In the absence of material means to satisfy basic needs, those needs become mental "fixations" that take over one's whole libidinal system. Marx, however, directed his polemic in a new direction, for the problem with capitalism is not only the fixation of desires because of its systematic failure to provide for basic needs, but the fact that the alienation and fragmentation of the labor process itself produces another kind of fixation or distortion for the harmonious development of human needs and desires. The result is "the one-sided development of one quality at the expense of the rest," the monstrous over-development of some particular needs or desires, and the atrophy of others.

Marx recognizes that capitalism, by expanding human productive capacities through machinery and technology, and by constantly creating new needs and desires, has expanded the horizon of the desirable, and projected humanity into a new era of unfixed and unlimited needs and desires. It has also revolutionized our affective structure by creating the material conditions that would "allow all-round activity and thereby the full development of all our potentialities" or desires. Yet, while opening up these possibilities, capitalism condemned workers to a "one sided development," and as Bhattacharya argues to a social destiny of suffering and frustration, for it seeks to "limit the needs and consumption of the working class," while on the other hand it "creates new needs... with new commodities" (79).

In the Marxist project there is a political theory of liberation of desire, not only of labor, or rather a connection between the emancipation of labor and that of desire. In the early Marx we can find the second part "missing" - maybe because implied - of the 1875 formula. In the 1844 *Manuscripts*, Marx declared that "private property does not know how to transform crude need into human need. Its idealism is fantasy, caprice and infatuation" ("Manuscripts" 359). What is implied here is that socialism must learn to give a human form to our raw needs and desires. It is not a matter of providing for them social and material means for their satisfaction that will not incur in further alienation. In the *German Ideology*, in a part that interestingly Marx crossed over, states: "The Communists have no intention of abolishing the fixedness of their desires and needs - they only strive to achieve an organization of production and intercourse which will make possible the normal satisfaction of all needs, i.e. a satisfaction which is only limited by the needs themselves" (*German* 273).

One can interpret this passage as the equation of communism with a restoration of a stability of needs, as the return to a harmonious social order based on static desires corresponding to basic or "natural" needs - to be contrasted with the "imaginary" ones capitalism has developed in us. This is the position of neo-Hegelian Marxists, which Derrida summarized as the reduction of communism to "the appropriation, in abundance, of everything that can respond to need or desire, the cancelation of the gap between desire and need suspends any excess, any disadjustment, in particular in work" (90). Communism here operates in an imaginary zero-sum game between needs and the existing means to satisfy them. It assumes that happiness is achieved in the triple identity of needs, desires and means. In the name of the abundance of means, communism will eliminate, regulate or harness the proliferation or excesses of needs and desires, setting as a normative standard for the desirable what already exist, what is being socially produced and distributed.

Yet there is another possible reading of Marx, closer to Fourier. For the latter the problem of our contemporary industrial civilization is precisely that "we have few passions and hardly sufficient means to satisfy a quarter of them; this is why our globe is for the moment one of the most miserable in the universe" (Fourier, *Theory of Four* 95). If "happiness" as Fourier asserts in the *Theory of the Four Movements*, "consists in having many passions and many means of satisfying them," the main goal of socialism, is to resolve such a painful disproportion by producing an abundant multitude of means and passions (95). Needs, desires and means entertain here a dialectical relation: they proliferate and stimulate each other. Therefore, we must produce the means to satisfy our passions or desires, and expect that those new means of production will not only satisfy but also generate new desires and pleasures.

One can in fact read Marx's vision of communism in this very way, as the organization of production to provide not only the means of satisfaction of existing needs but also the material conditions for the development of new desires, for he points out, quite importantly, that the "normal satisfaction of all needs, i.e. a satisfaction which is only limited by the needs themselves." If one reads Marx carefully the only "normative" standard to limit or evaluate needs, their degree of satisfaction is given "by the needs themselves," which here, as Fourier's passions, are self-regulating. In this alternative reading of Marx

with Fourier, one is not to be afraid of excessive desires, but of excessive limitations or obstacles to their satisfaction. The "fixity" of needs and means of satisfaction, in this liberated version of communism, implies the idea that to each desire must correspond a material means to satisfy it. It thus asserts a right to pleasure, or to the satisfaction of desires, as a guiding principle of the communist political economy.

This is precisely the definition of communism as the "realm of freedom" present in the economic manuscripts for *Capital* by the late Marx:

The realm of freedom really begins only where labor determined by necessity and external expediency ends; it lies by its very nature beyond the sphere of material production proper...This realm of natural necessity expands with his development, because his needs do too; but the productive forces to satisfy these expand at the same time. ...The true realm of freedom, the development of human powers as an end in itself, begins beyond [the realm of necessity], though it can only flourish with this realm of necessity as its basis. (*Capital* III: 958-959).

The realm of freedom is precisely where labor is not determined by necessity anymore, it is where labor can be motivated by desire and self-development, it is thus where "human powers," practical activity and desire can expand "beyond the sphere of material production proper." To go "beyond" the sphere of material production requires precisely to go back to what lies beneath it, to what is simultaneously presupposed as necessary and negated by it: the "realm of natural necessity," which is socially produced, that is the sphere of social reproduction. Communism will not eliminate the realm of needs, it will emancipate labor from need, which in return will also emancipate desire from need, so that one could desire what one does not need, or does not need yet, for unforeseen desires and pleasures will expand and develop "the realm of natural necessity." New desires will generate new needs, which will generate new means and so on and so forth. The liberation from within of the "realm of natural necessity," that is of the sphere of social reproduction, is akin to Fourier's call to re-develop passionate attraction in all forms of labor, especially those engaged in social reproduction.

Materialist Philosophies of History

Both Marx and Fourier share the desire of replacing the capitalist economic order through a new system geared to satisfy humanity's needs and desires, including the desire of making work enjoyable again. Marx's realist strategy echoes and responds at the political level to the hierarchies established by the capitalist system itself, the primacy of production over social reproduction, and of production over consumption. Dismantling the system requires an order of execution, which entails *first* the expropriation and transformation of its core. This is why the necessary beginning to radically transform and replace capitalism is the restructuring of industrial or productive labor, for that is the core of the capitalist profit-making machine. And it is also necessary that this goal be realized by the social subject constituted by these social relations: the industrial proletariat in alliance with the rest of waged and unwaged proletarians and dispossessed. Political organizing and revolution will have to begin at the hidden and well-guarded center of capitalist production, the industrial sector. Marx, applying Hegelian logic, proposes to turn the logic of capital against itself from within itself.

Fourier takes on an alternative route to build socialism, which can be articulated not as opposed to Marx's but as complementary to it, for he aims at reactivating the forces of production operating in the "second circuit," which entail mobilizing the gendered and racialized sectors of the proletariats who perform the labor of social reproduction, in particular workers gendered as women. Fourier proposed to start precisely from what is negated, rejected, excluded and invisibilized in capitalist production: the necessary but also potentially more pleasurable work of social reproduction, and the subject assigned to it in the early 19th century, women and children. Fourier foresees the possibilities of social changes through the reactivation of affect and a reconnection with nature in the sphere of social reproduction.

If for Hegel the engine of historical change is the realization of the idea of Reason, or rationality, and for Marx it is the class struggle framed as the clash between the living forces of production, mainly labor, and the given relations of production; for Fourier, the dynamo of history are the relations of attraction, and the politics of affect: "Each historical period has an attribute which forms the *pivot of mechanism* and whose absence or presence determines a change of period. This attribute is always drawn from love" (*Utopian Vision* 194). By "attribute" Fourier means, in a neo-Spinozist way what our understanding perceives of the existing social order as it expresses as the "full character" or essence of Nature/God in society. Of the many attributes of God/Nature we perceive in the social order (providence, justice, geometry) there are "pivotal attribute" which have the "drawn from love" or affect, those that express and expand the desire or conatus at work in society and become crystallized in social

institutions. The "pivotal attribute" which allowed the change from Barbarism to Civilization for example was "the civil liberty of the wife" (*Utopian Vision* 194). It is the social reconfiguration of affect that enables social change which for Fourier is not to be thought of as a revolution, that is as a change of structure, but as a reorientation of and shift in the existing social structures of affect: "As a general proposition, the Pivotal Attribute which is also drawn from amorous customs gives rise to all others, but the secondary attributes do not give rise to the pivotal and lead only very slowly to a change in period" (194).

Social transformation in Fourier is the result of a dialectical revolution initiated from below, at the level of the living infrastructure, which for Marx would be that of the forces of production, which instead of breaking through the mode of production, just need to re-orient and regroup their productive capacity. Changes in the social relations of affect will lead to changes in the sphere of production and reproduction not through revolution but through de-association and re-association in phalansteries. So that Fourier predicted: "if we adopted the system of amorous guarantees which will be adopted in the sixth period, this measure alone would provide us with a means to escape civilization and to enter the sixth period" (194). As Pierre Macherey stated, Fourier's theory of social change exhorts us to "renounce to revolutionize society from above, as civilization infected social reformers argue, for they believe it is enough to change the institutions or the political regime of a State" (324; my translation).

In Fourier the pivotal attribute is expressed in the degree of freedom of women:

In the fourth period [the pivotal attribute] is the absolute servitude of women; in the fifth period it is the exclusive marriage and the civil liberties of the wife; in the sixth period it is the amorous corporation which assures women the privilege of which I have already spoken.

As a general proposition: Social progress and changes of period are brought about by virtue of the progress of women towards liberty, and the social retrogression occurs as a result of a diminution in the liberty of women. (*Utopian Vision* 195)

Conclusion

If, as Bhattacharya argues, SRT "displays an analytical irreverence to "visible facts" and concepts produced by capitalism, it is fair to state the Fourier's theory displays an analytical boycott of them (2). As Barthes pointed out, Fourier's operation is that of invention rather than that of inversion, and in this sense he almost outdoes the early Marx's project of a "ruthless criticism of all that exists" ("Letter" 145). In the relation of inversion or negation, the new form carries the imprint of what is negated. Yet as Barthes signals, Fourier is inventing something radically new to return to the origin, nature: "the rule of invention is a rule of refusal: to doubt absolutely (more than did Descartes, who, Fourier thought, never made more than a partial and misplaced use of doubt), to be in opposition with everything being done, to treat only of what has not been treated, to stand apart from 'literary agitators', Book People, to preach what Opinion holds to be impossible" (88).

The "utopian" character of his method of critique is precisely that it is grounded entirely outside of capital, aspiring to be almost impermeable to the logic of capital. It departs from and remains outside of it and for this very reason its political theory of liberation is in the form of fiction, and not in that of a critique of political economy. Yet it is not a utopia rooted in nowhere. It speaks from another place which is paradoxically already present in us, that of affect and desire, in order to re-invent another form of human association, a socialism akin to a Spinozist libidinal naturalism.

Social Reproduction Theory has the possibility of exploring these two possible circuits of Marxist theory, the dominant trend of critique and the emergent trend of socialist fiction, not in order to resolve their tension, but to establish their intersections, contradictions and also their possible parallelisms and homologies. In addition to the critique of existing power structures and forms of alienated labor that must materially and strategically be replaced, Marxism also needs to cultivate forms of labor and modes of the labor process where pleasure is not completely negated, and where desire can find fertile grounds to re-imagine a different society and push back against the rule of capital. In its reconceptualization of labor from broader lenses, SRT has the opportunity to forward a vision for emancipated labor that goes beyond its critique of the logic of productivism and profit, one that dissociates labor from need to re-associate it with pleasure, so labor can become productive again in a different fashion, a labor that can be "cause of itself" because it is cause of desire and pleasure.

Works Cited

- Abensour, Miguel. "The History of Utopia and the Destiny of Its Critique." *The Political Uses of Utopia: New Marxist, Anarchist and Radical Democratic Perspectives*, edited by S.D. Chrostowska and J.D. Ingram, Columbia University Press, 2016, pp. 3-56.
- Barthes, Roland. *Sade, Fourier, Loyola*. U of California P, 1989.
- Beecher, Jonathan. *Charles Fourier: The Visionary and His World*. University of California Press, 1986.
- Beecher, Jonathan. "Parody and Liberation in The New Amorous World of Charles Fourier." *History Workshop Journal*, Volume 20, Issue 1, 1985, pp. 125-133
- Bhattacharya, Tithi. *Social Reproduction Theory: Remapping Class, Recentering Oppression*. Pluto Press, 2017.
- Brenner, Johanna, and Barbara Laslett, "Gender, Social Reproduction, and Women's Self-Organization: Considering the US Welfare State." *Gender & Society*, vol. 5, no. 3, 1991, pp. 311-333.
- Butt, John. "Introduction." *A New View of Society and Other Writings*, by Robert Owen, Dent & Sons, 1977.
- Butler, Judith. "The Inorganic Body in the Early Marx. A Limit-Concept of Anthropocentrism." *Radical Philosophy*, Volume 2, Issue 6, 2019, pp. 3-16.
- Debout, Simone. *L'utopie de Charles Fourier*. Les presses du réel, 1998.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Specters of Marx*. Routledge, 1994.
- Engels, Friedrich. "Anti-Duhring." *Marx and Engels Collected Works*, vol. 25, Lawrence & Wishart, 2010, pp. 5-309.
- . "Progress of Social Reform on the Continent." *Marx and Engels Collected Works*, vol. 3, Lawrence & Wishart, 2010, pp. 392-408.
- Ferguson, Susan. "Intersectionality and Social-Reproduction Feminisms: Toward an Integrative Ontology." *Historical Materialism*, vol. 24, no.2, 2016, pp. 38-60.
- Fourier, Charles. *Le nouveau monde industriel et sociétaire* (The New Industrial and Societary World). Librairie sociétaire, 1848.
- . *Selections From the Works*, intro. by Ch. Gide, trans. by J. Franklin, Sonnenschein, 1901.
- . *The Theory of the Four Movements*. Cambridge UP, 1996.
- . *The Utopian Vision of Charles Fourier: Selected Texts on Work, Love, and Passionate Attraction*. Edited by Jonathan Beecher, Beacon Press, 1971.
- . *Theory of Universal Unity*. Vol. 1, Sonnenschein, 1901.
- Fox, John. *Marx, the Body and Human Nature*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- Granter, Edward. "Industrialism, Utopia and the End of Work." *Critical Social Theory and the End of Work*, Routledge, 2019, pp. 31-50.
- Gribaudo, Maurizio. *Paris ville ouvrière. Une histoire occultée (1789-1848)*. La Découverte, 2014.
- Harvey, David. *Paris, Capital of Modernity*. Routledge, 2006.
- Hazan, Éric. *L'Invention de Paris. Il n'y a pas de pas perdus*. Seuil, 2012.
- Hemmens, Alastair. "Charles Fourier, Utopian Socialism and Attractive Labor." *The Critique of Work in Modern French Thought: From Charles Fourier to Guy Debord*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2019.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. *The Age of Revolution, 1789-1848*. Vintage Books, 1991.
- . "Marx, Engels and Pre-Marxian Socialism" (1986). *How to Change the World, Reflections on Marx and Marxism*, Yale University Press, 2011, pp. 16-47.
- INSEE, "1789-1989, Deux siècles d'urbanisation." INSEE 1989.
- Jameson, Fredric. *Archaeologies of the Future*. Verso, 2005.
- Lebowitz, Michael. *Beyond Capital: Marx's Political Economy of the Working Class*. Palgrave, 1991.
- Leopold, David. "The structure of Marx and Engels's Considered Account of Utopian Socialism." *History of Political Thought*, Vol. 26, no. 3, 2005, pp. 443-466.
- Levi, Jane. "Charles Fourier Versus the Gastronomes: The Contested Ground of Early Nineteenth-Century Consumption and Taste." *Utopian Studies*, Vol. 26, Issue 1, 2015, pp. 41-57.
- Luxton, Meg. "Feminist Political Economy in Canada and the Politics of Social Reproduction." *Social Reproduction: Feminist Political Economy Challenges Neo-Liberalism*, McGill University Press, 2006, pp. 11-44
- Macherey, Pierre. *De l'utopie! (On Utopia)*. De l'incidence éditeur, 2011.
- Marx, Karl. *Capital*. Vol. I, Penguin, 1990.
- . *Capital*. Vol. III, Penguin 1991.
- . "Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts." *Early Writings*. Penguin, 1992, pp. 279-400.
- . "Letter to Ruge, September 1843." *Marx and Engels Collected Works*. Vol. 3, Lawrence & Wishart, 2010, pp 141-145.
- , and Friedrich Engels. *The German Ideology*. Prometheus, 1976.
- , and Friedrich Engels. *The Marx-Engels Reader*. Edited by Robert C. Tucker, Norton, 1978.
- Moret, Frédéric. *Les socialistes et la ville, Grande-Bretagne, France, 1820-1850*. ENS Éditions, 1999.
- Offen, Karen M., *The Women Question in France, 1400-1870*. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Sewell, William H. *Work and Revolution in France: The Language of Labor from the Old Regime to 1848*. Cambridge UP, 1995.
- Tacussel, Patrick. *L'imaginaire radical : Les mondes possibles et l'esprit utopique selon Charles Fourier*. Les presses du réel, 2007.
- Thomas, Paul. "Karl Marx and Max Stirner," *Political Theory*, Vol. 3, No. 2, 1975, pp. 159-179.
- Vogel, Lise. *Marxism and the Oppression of Women*. Haymarket, 2013.
- Wark, McKenczie. "Charles Fourier's Queer Theory." *The Spectacle of Disintegration: Situationist Passages Out of the Twentieth Century*, Verso, 2013, pp. 73-84.

Author's profile: Blanca Missé is an Assistant Professor of French in the Modern Languages and Literatures Department at San Francisco State University. She has a Master in Political Philosophy from the University of Paris X Nanterre (2007), and a Ph. D. in French with a Designated Emphasis in Critical Theory from the University of California Berkeley (2014). She specializes in the Radical Enlightenment, 18th Century French Literature, Francophone literature and culture, 18th through 20th Century French and European philosophy, as well as Marxism and Feminist Theory. She has published on the French Materialist tradition (Diderot, La Mettrie), Marx and Utopian socialism (Fourier), and issues of academic freedom. She is a member of the Executive Board of the San Francisco State University Chapter of the California Faculty Association and is a member of California Scholars for Academic Freedom.

Email: < bmiss@sfsu.edu >