

**Karol Kuźmicz**

University of Białystok

Poland

e-mail: [k.kuzmicz@uwb.edu.pl](mailto:k.kuzmicz@uwb.edu.pl)

ORCID: 0000-0002-3914-5499

## LOVE AND FEELINGS IN SOCIAL UTOPIAS

**Abstract.** Many people have been concerned with love for centuries, not only the hearts and minds of poets and writers, but also philosophers and scientists. Reflections on love can be found in utopian texts. Authors of utopias put love in different contexts. In general, they try to understand, define, and describe it, and they rely on their personal experiences. Love surely permeates utopias and the people who live in them. The purpose of this article is to confirm the assumption that love permeates utopias and the lives of their inhabitants, who do not ponder over and talk much about love, but simply love. They do not think and do not talk so much about love – they just love it. This article describes whom and what people of utopias love? In the author's opinion, utopia as a literary genre was often a romance novel that included love as a moral, legal, religious, and social category.

*Keywords:* God, happiness, law, love, matrimony, totalitarianism, utopia.

*Motto: "Whoever can love – should love"*

W. Weitling, *Garantien der Harmonie und Freiheit* 1842<sup>1</sup>

### Introduction

There is little surprise in the fact that new social utopias continue to emerge, primarily as projects and plans that are an inexhaustible source of new ideas, especially for organizing people's communal life. They usually remain in the realm of dreams. However, one can try to make them a reality by giving them the form of demands aimed at achieving specific changes in the real world, including improving people's living conditions. Modern utopias, which were pioneered by Thomas More (1478–1535), are always concerned with organizing people's collective life according to certain principles to ensure everyone's happiness (Gr. *eu-topos*)<sup>2</sup>. However, such places

do not actually exist (Gr. *ou-topos*). For this reason, utopias exist primarily in the world of various ideas, mainly of a social, political, and literary nature, although certainly not only there,” as pointed out by Michał Jaskólski<sup>3</sup>. However, utopias still stimulate intellectual and critical reflections<sup>4</sup>, especially those concerning people’s lives and the relationships between them.

In connection with this understanding of utopias, the purpose of this article is to try to find answers to the following questions: How do the inhabitants of utopias understand love? and Who or what do they usually bestow this feeling on? Of course, in order to be able to answer these questions, it is necessary first to present the various ways in which authors of utopian texts that deal with this issue define and describe the states of love. The best method for this type of research is the analytical method using elements of the historical method and the comparative method. By using these methods, we will learn what used to be the most common object – or perhaps rather the subject – of love in selected texts considered utopian that have been published over the centuries. Their analysis, especially the conceptual one – concerning love and the consideration of its states in historical and comparative terms – is to confirm the status of love in utopias as a higher universal and timeless value. This is because in their concepts utopists often tried to reconcile virtually everything that seems irreconcilable, such as the interest of the individual with the interest of the community, freedom with equality, and finally rationality with sentimentality.

In this context, utopias are projects or even plans that are impossible to implement. However, when relating them to the problems of real life, especially social life, one should be aware that life depends on us, and it is we humans as both social and rational beings who can change and shape it. After all, the inhabitants of utopias are human beings, just like us: rational, social, and moral beings at the same time. The important difference, however, is that they live in worlds that unfortunately do not exist in reality. However, the problems they face are the same as ours, as are their weaknesses and strengths. After all, they are people who think, desire, and feel. The important difference that distinguishes us and our worlds comes down to the goals we set for ourselves. In the process, we often waste our time and the meaning of our lives, both individually and as a community. Unlike the inhabitants of utopias, we live our lives focusing too much either on the future or on the past, instead on the present as inhabitants of utopias do. Unlike them, we are irretrievably losing the present. In contrast, inhabitants of utopias are seizing the day. For us, the present is a temporal category that is perhaps too ephemeral, or perhaps too conventional. They simply live in the present, although their worlds do not exist, and we do not know

how to live, even though our lives are real. That is why one of the most important messages conveyed by social utopias is that you can learn to live – only when you know who, and what, is worth loving.

### **Attempts to define love**

In order to clarify what love usually was for the authors of utopias, it is necessary to discuss examples of definitions of this emotional state and the ways of viewing it as a certain intellectual category belonging, however, to the world of higher values. Most authors of utopias viewed and described love as a state of mind as well as a state of body. In their opinion, love could be felt, but one could also try to understand and define it. For example, a French 19th-century writer and philosopher Jules Michelet (1798–1874) viewed love as “an omnipotent stimulus for all sorts of noble deeds and actions.”<sup>5</sup> In this context, love is an omnipotent creative force of the spirit that builds, organizes, arranges, and harmonizes, at the same time, people’s social life described in utopias. This is especially true of utopias referred to as positive utopias, which, unlike negative utopias, always describe a world that is better than the real world. At the same time, they constantly criticize the real world for not being what utopists think it should be. Consequently, the authors of positive utopias are firmly opposed to any changes to what after all works and functions properly in practice. They contribute to people’s efforts to be better by sharing each other’s happiness, or they simply describe how they should love each other. Consequently, the worldviews of the authors of utopias paradoxically turn out to be more conservative than reformist or revolutionary. In their view, what is good should last forever. For this reason, what is good is always worth protecting, sharing, and, most importantly, loving. However, we often lose what we love. Therefore, if at all possible, we should restore what we love<sup>6</sup>. Viewed in this way, love is one of the basic conditions for experiencing happiness in utopias. Without love shown to each other, utopias would make no sense, especially in terms of the moral and social life of their inhabitants.

In his 1817 *The New Amorous World*, Charles Fourier (1772–1837), considered the “genius of utopias”<sup>7</sup>, wrote of love as a state of “incomprehensible passion – like the presence of God in man and an omnipotent organizing force that binds beings together and guarantees social harmony.”<sup>8</sup> The key states in his concept were passions, of which Fourier distinguished as many as twelve, with love being just one of them. He divided all passions into three categories: 1) sensual passions – a total of 5 (sight, hearing, taste,

touch, smell), 2) emotional passions – a total of 4 (ambition, friendship, love, the need for parenthood), and 3) intellectual passions, of which he distinguished 3 (the inclination to compete – get involved in intrigues, to get involved in creative cooperation, and to change)<sup>9</sup>. As Irena Pańków rightly pointed out, “Fourier’s ideal unit is a symphony of senses, feelings, and intellect.”<sup>10</sup> In this way, each person is a harmoniously and comprehensively developing being that loves himself in these passions and, therefore, should love himself and others to the same extent. This Fourier’s concept that involves reconciling one’s happiness with the happiness of others by following one’s natural inclinations (passions) is usually referred to as unitheism<sup>11</sup> or harmonism<sup>12</sup>.

The ambiguity of the French word “passion” is pointed out by Janina Majler, who translated it as: appetite, ardency, need, or inclination<sup>13</sup>. Besides, the French phrase *passion de la déraison* can be translated not only as an incomprehensible force, but also such an emotional force that is literally absurd or even contrary to reason<sup>14</sup>. This irrational nature of love corresponds to the early Christian concept of this divine emotion in Tertullian (160–240). After all, in his view, all divine virtues (faith, hope, and love), including above all faith in God, were considered absurd (*Credo quia absurdum*). Very similar was the argumentation of another French utopist, Claude Henri de Saint-Simon (1760–1825), who even saw the revival of all of Christianity in fraternal love, consistent with the original message of the gospel of love preached by Christ. In his opinion, it is love for God and the neighbor that gives a unified character to all the feelings of believers and to the basic principle that “all men should be brothers to one another.”<sup>15</sup> Following this principle, it is necessary to help those in need, especially the poorest and lowest in the social hierarchy, in every possible way, including through institutions<sup>16</sup>. As can be clearly seen, this principle is both moral and social, since humanity is one big family in the eyes of nature and God, its creator.

These examples also show perfectly how diverse in their message the ideas of the utopists were. Just as Fourier is considered today one of the most important precursors of, among other things, feminism, free love, or even the sexual revolution, Saint-Simon is considered an advocate of building an all-human community, not only through modernization (industrialization) and fraternity, but also through the traditional way of loving one’s neighbor in the spirit of a renewed Christianity.

In this context, utopists suggest treating basically every passion first and foremost as an emotional state. It always involves irrational feeling and cognition, but also a certain action. In order to be able to understand

it and comment on it in a reliable manner, one must first experience it. Nevertheless, many utopists approached the issues of feeling and showing love as they would approach any human problem that can be described and that one can attempt to define. According to their various concepts, love can even be controlled and rationally<sup>17</sup>, including legally, regulated. This relates to such institutionalized human relationships as, for example, family, marriage, guardianship, sexual life, maternity and paternity, through at least the regulation of appropriate age, origin, physical and mental state, including sexual development, but also social functions performed, talents and abilities, work performed, or other often individual predispositions. After all, we<sup>e</sup> have been doing this for centuries in the real world, trying to define and regulate the above issues ourselves in a way that is as rational as possible and best suited to our times. As it turns out, utopian texts perfectly fulfill their role that involves intellectual creation of alternative worlds and speculation on the implementation of something we consider unrealistic or impossible.

To summarize how love is viewed in utopias, one can say that it is a basic human right. At the same time, it is the highest, natural, and universal right, and is related to people's affection and goodwill, manifested primarily in mutual respect and kindness. On the one hand, love is a universal right whose place is in the emotional sphere – the so-called order of the heart; on the other hand, it is part of the volitional sphere, which involves will – always and in all respects, especially moral, a good and universal will<sup>18</sup>. It can even be said that mutual love reigns, and therefore governs and directs everything, in utopian lands. This is why each inhabitant of a utopia loves himself or herself in the first place. This love, of course, is not a self-ish or narcissistic self-admiration, because the law of mutual love requires everyone to love virtually everyone else to the same extent as oneself: one's neighbor, including both relatives and strangers, newcomers and visitors, and even criminals and enemies – and to see in everyone a human being deserving love. At the same time, the neighbor's personality and worldview must be respected; showing mutual love is only intended to affirm the personal dignity to which every person is entitled without exception.

### **1. On the perfection of the law of love**

In a special way, utopias teach to love those who no one seems to love anymore: those in need of help or in any kind of need, such as the sick, the lonely, orphans, widows, the elderly, etc. Love in utopias is therefore perfect, as it can only be shown as offered and felt by others as a gift. If we were to compare the qualities of love defined in *St. Paul's First Letter*

to the *Corinthians* to the mutual love presented in utopias, then we would all have to agree that they are virtually identical: "love is patient, love is kind. It does not envy, it does not boast, it is not proud. It is not rude, it is not self-seeking, it is not easily angered, it keeps no record of wrongs. Love does not delight in evil but rejoices with the truth (...). It always perseveres..."<sup>19</sup> In a word, it should be said that in the lands of utopias only those of us could live who are able to love in precisely such an unconditional way. Viewed in this way, love can be likened to a direct ticket that guarantees that one will arrive in paradise; without having it in one's heart, one can never reach that paradise.

When analyzing the history of utopias, it is impossible not to notice that most of their authors were Christians, and often belonged to the clerical state. This was due not only to religious and cultural traditions, but most importantly by the more thorough education of this social group compared to other groups starting in the period of feudalism. Therefore, the full picture of the worldview of the authors of utopia should be supplemented with a kind of intellectual and mental longing, so to speak, on their part, for some kind of better world. Obviously one that is better than the real world. At the same time, this world is most often identified by philosophers with the world of ideals, or higher values and virtues. In religions, it is identified with heaven or paradise. This is the eternal world that, under certain conditions – proper love and conduct based on it – can be achieved, but only after death. Accordingly, the inhabitants of a utopia, in addition to mutual love, usually love a deity, who, as Jerzy Szacki wrote, "becomes the personification of a certain social ideal."<sup>20</sup> Love for God, but also for his laws and nature itself, involves religious worship of someone who is himself perfect love (mercy) and the source of all love. This becomes the most important divine, and therefore Christian, law, which on the one hand commands to love everyone, even enemies, and on the other hand entitles everyone to love, which everyone receives, as long as he or she sincerely desires it<sup>21</sup>. This is because: "Law is love! God is love! It is I who speak to those whom you frighten. With John stops the harsh law and the threatening prophets who foretold me. (...) After John comes the Kingdom of God, the Kingdom of love. And I say to the humble: Enter it, it is for you. And let all who have good will attempt to enter it."<sup>22</sup> Thus, a man of good will is someone who has a pure – that is, sincere – heart that is always open to love. This makes him ready to truly love and show mercy selflessly. Such people live in utopias, and to describe their lives any one of them could recite words from the Psalm of David: "I delight to do your will, O my God; your law is within my heart."<sup>23</sup> An excellent example of this is the

utopia of Stanisław Leszczyński (1677–1766), in which the divine law of love is the most important law in force in the Kingdom of Dumocala described by the author<sup>24</sup>. Its inhabitants, recognizing themselves as the work of God's hands, all owe him love, which cannot be more nobly proved than by loving one another<sup>25</sup>.

At this point it is worth quoting again the controversial utopist Charles Fourier. In his opinion, “the fiery love of God, the vibrancy of faith and hope are the best guides that can lead to the search for the judgments and will of Providence.”<sup>26</sup> Unfortunately, the diagnosis made by this “social watchmaker and apostle of unbroken harmony”<sup>27</sup> is very pessimistic, because there is less and less love in human civilization, and both for people and for God. Utopists, however, longed so much for this perfect world that they probably loved it themselves. They dreamed of it and wrote about it again and again, thus encouraging others to believe in this better world – as well as in God – and perhaps even try to change this world in the likeness of a model that, in their opinion, was ideal. At the same time, they were well aware of the fact that without love it is impossible to do anything to build a perfect world. Without love, it is impossible to make the temporal world better, which is a very realistic matter, nor is it possible to obtain salvation after death, which remains a matter of faith.

This is because social utopias teach mutual love and respect for each person for the fact of being and for what they are. They teach to love everyone without exception, both with their strengths and weaknesses, not because of their position in the society. At the same time, one should love every human being, but despise and even abhor all their flaws. This is how utopists write about the need to fight against human weaknesses and vices, but never against people themselves, even the worst among them. Historical examples that speak of the effectiveness of governments in totalitarian states as perfectly functioning criminal systems, boil down to the fact that specific and innocent people were always considered the cause of all problems. This is because totalitarian ideologies assumed that the society's problems could be solved by eliminating people whom they deemed to cause those problems. Therefore, unlike negative utopias, positive utopias are created for good people who think of others as they think of themselves. In other words, good people always love and want to be loved. Negative utopias and totalitarian systems, on the other hand, are always created against specific people whom they simply hate as their enemies and a threat. For this reason, in totalitarian systems there is no room for love, and those in power impose their beliefs on people and, through constant orders and prohibitions, strictly define what is necessary to achieve happiness. The former

always leave some choice and show the possibilities of pursuing individual happiness, which can be simultaneously reconciled with the happiness of others – a condition for which is mutual love. The latter, on the other hand, do not even leave any illusions about the enslavement of the individual and the deprivation of all subjective rights, in the name of the operation of a totalitarian system that is criminal to the bone because it is not founded on love, but solely on hatred of others<sup>28</sup>. As Hannah Arendt (1906–1975) noted, ideology and terror then become the natural, and essentially the only form of government<sup>29</sup>.

In this context, the first type of love described in utopias should be described as personal, or personalized. The second involves answering the question of what else the residents of a utopia are in love with, although this also concerns people, but no longer in such a direct way as in the first case concerning other people and God. In a list of what utopists most often consider as things worthy of love, including the pursuit of them as goals of human existence, the first place has to be given to the higher values associated with the world of ideals. Following Plato as the creator of the first so-called objective idealism, one should consider justice as the most important idea and, at the same time, the embodiment of the ideal of the good in people's communal life (especially in a state). Of course, one must not forget other ideas that are equally important for utopists such as: truth, beauty, peace, further freedom, equality, fraternity, etc., instead of focusing only on Platonic ideas that affect people's social life.

The second group of things, after ideals, that inhabitants of utopias love, are include virtues, for example the classical ones, such as wisdom, courage, and temperance, and the religious ones, related to God's grace, such as faith, hope and, most important of all, love. Other virtues present in utopias, in my opinion, include diligence, truthfulness, reliability, modesty, generosity, and kindness – in general, all righteousness understood as honesty. In addition, inhabitants of utopias love nature and perfectly understand what we often forget: that people are part of it. Inhabitants of utopias approve and uphold qualities associated with the functioning of nature such as harmony and order, always obey nature's eternal and unchanging law. Residents of utopia love all life, especially life in harmony with nature and its simplicity. John Jacques Rousseau was very right when he wrote about people becoming increasingly unhappy when they move away from nature. It seems that the slogan of "return to nature," which he proposed when criticizing the development of man's culture and civilization, is still a very valid, but probably even more unrealistic and therefore utopian idea<sup>30</sup>.

The last important element to pay attention to in the context of love in the lands of utopia is love for the fatherland. Residents of utopia show it at every level of social life from love in the family, the neighborhood, and the local community (village, city, commune) to love in the perfect community, the state. The latter, and especially its interest, is viewed as a common good. Unlike us, they are able to reconcile the interests of the community with their individual interests. In our world, I think this is what remains the most utopian and impossible to reconcile. The reason for this is that we are unable to love others to the same extent we love ourselves. At the same time, the patriotism of residents of utopias is authentic: it is sincere and selfless, and can serve as a model for us due to the fact that they are able to offer others more than just to take, demand, and constantly claim something for themselves, especially absolute obedience and sacrifice in the name of an ideology<sup>31</sup>.

Even at this point, in order to understand the proper meaning of utopian thinking, one can imagine a large pot of water placed over a fire, into which a variety of ingredients are thrown. The result of our cooking is to be a dish that is full of harmony, and therefore perfect, in which everyone will find a taste that is best for him or her, but tastes good for everyone at the same time. The vegetables in this dish could be the ideas mentioned above, while the spices could be the virtues. Other additions that enrich the whole dish are all the other qualities and factors that help mutual love to bring everything and everyone together in the pot – the land of a utopia. Such a dish will never be lacking there, especially since everyone can eat as much of it as they want..

## **2. On the different states of love in selected social utopias**

If I could choose one of the many problems addressed in social utopias that is closely related to love and, at the same time, is still considered to be very relevant, I would definitely choose marriage issues. It can even be said that these issues comprise all male-female relations, sometimes referred to as the battle of the sexes, linked to gender equality and women's emancipation. However, looking at these social relations from the perspective of the perspective of the past time, it turns out that this was once a very serious problem, especially if we treat it as a topic of political and legal dispute. Marriage has for centuries been treated as a kind of contract, and therefore a deal, often involving factors related to lineage, where too much or no attention was paid to the feelings of the individuals entering into it. Institutionalizing marriage and giving it legal status contributed to the emergence of certain regulations related to its functioning.

Actually, since the beginning of the so-called private law (*ius privatum*), which defines the relations between individuals, there have been branches of civil law, which are specialized today, such as, for example, personal marital law and property law, which constitute part of family law. After all, utopias, like modern codes, include such institutions as adoption, parental authority, guardianship, and custody, as well as issues concerning the dissolution of marriage, including the permissibility of divorce. These issues, usually serious and difficult, were approached just as seriously, although sometimes deliberately with a wink. It is worth mentioning the literary possibilities of expressing oneself on a given topic, for example in the form of a drama. One of the first such works, most often considered a black comedy, that should be mentioned is Aristophanes' ancient play "Women in Parliament". The image of sovereign power of women liberated from the patriarchal power of men was reduced to a question of legislation appropriate to the community. All male-female affairs, including sex life, which was to be defined by fundamental law, was regulated in, one may say, a revolutionary manner. According to the law, the newly introduced freedom of erotic life was allowed under the following condition: if you want to have intercourse with younger women – you must first have intercourse with the oldest of the women. The proposed regulation should certainly be viewed as an entitlement that women have granted themselves and as an obligation incumbent on men. The universality of the message of Aristophanes' work can be viewed a bit more broadly than just male-female relations. They should be related first and foremost to the value and price that each individual, or group, is willing to pay in giving up, in a community, their benefits, rights, or freedoms. From the play, we know why, and in favor of whom, women resigned themselves to their fate: they did it for the safety and protection provided to them by men. It is worth considering – perhaps elsewhere, not in this article – in the name of what we as people, subjects, citizens, and even as a sovereign still do it.

Very similar in tone, albeit without as much exposure of eroticism, are most of the comedies written by the French playwright, second most important after Molière, and utopian living in the late 17th and early 18th centuries, Pierre de Marivaux (1688–1763). His works, such as *Love and Truth*, *Harlequin Brightened by Love*, *he Surprise of Love*, *The Game of Love and Chance*, *The Triumph of Love*, *The Little Master is Punished*, *Successful Strategies*, *The School of Mothers*, and *Careless Vows*, include those classified as utopian, e.g. *Slave Island* (1725), *The Island of Reason* (1727), and *The New Colony* (1729). The full French title of the latter is particularly

telling: *La Nouvelle Colonie ou la Ligue de femmes* (The New Colony or the Women's League). The play is set in ancient times, on an island to be settled by Greek colonists. However, only men are legislators; their dominant position in social life, especially in administration, education, politics, and the military, is to be guaranteed by the law they prepared for all islanders. This becomes a major cause of discontent and, as a result, a spark that ignited a rebellion by women demanding equal rights, the same as those granted to men. Women even present an ultimatum and set an hour-long deadline for meeting their demands. They declare that they will leave if they are rejected. Eventually, as a result of an intrigue planned by men, women, fearing a fake foreign invasion, decide to give up their new rights in exchange for protection and security. A similar message, yet certainly not related to comedy, but rather to the tragic life of its author, is expressed in the utopian "Declaration of the Rights of Woman and the Female Citizen" of 1798<sup>32</sup>. The author, Olympia de Gouges (1748–1793), before she gave her life on the guillotine, advocated and highlighted the role of women as human beings and citizens. For example, seeing "the source of all sovereignty in a People," she viewed a People as a union of men and women, equally free and equal before the law<sup>33</sup>.

Equally interesting proposals on the subject of male-female relations and the institution of marriage were expressed by the author of the first modern utopia, Thomas More (1478–1535). This educated lawyer wrote that the inhabitants of Utopia observe monogamy, and their unions are supposed to last until death. In addition, "... they think that if they were not strictly restrained from all vagrant appetites, very few would engage in a state in which they venture the quiet of their whole lives, by being confined to one person ..." <sup>34</sup> and "... none are suffered to put away their wives against their wills, from any great calamity that may have fallen on their persons, for they look on it as the height of cruelty and treachery to abandon either of the married persons when they need most the tender care of their consort ..." <sup>35</sup> Besides, the Utopians "imagine that too great easiness in granting leave for new marriages would very much shake the kindness of married people." <sup>36</sup> However, on a case-by-case basis, "the Senate dissolves the marriage and grants the injured person leave to marry again (...) in the case of adultery or insufferable perverseness," and "when a married couple do not well agree, they, by mutual consent, separate, and find out other persons with whom they hope they may live more happily." <sup>37</sup> A person wronged in marriage can enter into a new relationship while, "the guilty are made infamous and are never allowed the privilege of a second marriage." <sup>38</sup> All the more so, since all, even unmarried "the adulterer and the adulteress are condemned

to slavery, yet if either of the injured persons cannot shake off the love of the married person they may live with them still in that state, but they must follow them to that labour to which the slaves are condemned, and sometimes the repentance of the condemned, together with the unshaken kindness of the innocent and injured person, has prevailed so far with the Prince that he has taken off the sentence And it sometimes happens that the grief of one spouse and the self-sacrificing love of the other manages to arouse the pity of the prince, who restores the freedom of both.”<sup>39</sup> In addition, they practice the custom of looking at prospective spouses naked before marriage, since “[a]ll men are not so wise as to choose a woman only for her good qualities, and even wise men consider the body as that which adds not a little to the mind.”<sup>40</sup>

A very similar point of view on marriage issues was presented in *The City of the Sun* by another Renaissance utopian, Tomasso Campanella (1568–1639). The inhabitants of the City of the Sun he describes link issues of marriage, parenthood, and child rearing closely not so much to their own well-being, but to that of the state. In general, they are united by lot, as there is no ugliness between them, and they identify beauty as a sign of goodness with “tallness and strength.”<sup>41</sup> “Therefore, if any woman dyes her face, so that it may become beautiful, or uses high-heeled boots so that she may appear tall, or garments with trains to cover her wooden shoes, she is condemned to capital punishment.”<sup>42</sup> Therefore, any living being is considered naturally beautiful if its external shape indicates strength and health, which are guaranteed by the corresponding inherent qualities of the individual and his or her offspring<sup>43</sup>. However, in a situation “if at any time a man is taken captive with ardent love for a certain woman, the two are allowed to converse and joke together and to give one another garlands of flowers or leaves, and to make verses. But if the race is endangered, by no means is further union between them permitted. Moreover, the love born of eager desire is not known among them; only that born of friendship.”<sup>44</sup>

Other interesting examples regarding conjugal law come from the *Code of Nature* of French Enlightenment thinker Étienne-Gabriel Morelly (1717–1778). In this social utopia, the author collected and defined all the most important regulations related to marriage, in one chapter titled *Conjugal Laws that would do away with all debauchery* (13 articles) and *Educational Laws that would prevent the consequences of the blind indulgence of children by their parents*. (12 articles). According to the first article of the conjugal law: “Every citizen will be married as soon as he has reached the marriageable age; no one will be exempt from this (...).”<sup>45</sup> However, the article does not specify the specific age of men or women with an obligation or even

an order to marry. An exception to this rule is the possibility of choosing celibacy after the age of 40. It should be noted that, in principle, getting married, and consequently having children and raising them, are the primary duties of adult inhabitants of most utopias. The marriage ceremony is public, and the marriage is a contract that can be terminated or continued after 10 years. According to the second article, “[t]he marriage ceremonies will be held publicly in the beginning of each year. The young people of both sexes will be brought together in the presence of the city Senate; every boy would choose the girl that pleases him and, after obtaining her consent, will take her as his wife.” According to the third article, “The first marriage will be indissoluble for a period of ten years, after which divorce will be permitted, either at the consent of both partners in the marriage, or of one only....” Further articles (4–10) focus on divorce as a permissible institution, if despite attempts, the spouses have failed to reach reconciliation through persuasion. Divorced persons are allowed to remarry no sooner than six months after the divorce and only with others also divorced and not younger than themselves or their former spouses. Interestingly, in the event of a divorce, the children of both sexes are to stay with the father, and possibly the new wife will be considered their mother<sup>46</sup>. Perhaps the most famous natural law described in Morelly’s *Code of Nature* is the obligation incumbent on all mothers, unless their health does not allow it, to breastfeed their children during their first year of life, even if they become divorced<sup>47</sup>.

Jean Meslier (1664–1729), the famous parish priest of Etrépigny, also wrote much in his *Testament* about the real human suffering in marriages and families, where no love, respect, or kindness is shown to each other. From the perspective of many years of critical reflection and his personal experience as a Catholic priest somewhere in the French countryside, he wrote that it would be much better if: “... men, and particularly our Christ-cultists, did not make marriages indissoluble as they do, and if, on the contrary, they always left their unions and conjugal relationships free among themselves, without forcing each other, i.e., either the men or women, to remain inseparably together all their lives against their inclinations, we would certainly not see as many bad marriages and households as there are, and there would not be as much discord and dissension as there is between husbands and wives.”<sup>48</sup> These words, written almost 300 years ago, clearly indicate the importance of the problem of the indissolubility of the sacrament of marriage, the topicality of which, unfortunately, has not diminished, but has even intensified in the society, despite the introduction of the institution of divorce in secular law. However, as Meslier further wrote in his *Testament*

Meslier, it would still have been better “(...) or men to always have freedom of marriage and conjugal union. It would be much better to raise, nourish, support, and educate all their children equally in good manners, as well as in the arts and sciences. It would be better to look upon each other and love each other as brothers and sisters.”<sup>49</sup>

Wilhelm Weitling (1808–1871) wrote in an equally critical tone about the indissolubility of marriage in his 1842 book *Guarantees of Harmony and Freedom*: “Love is the kernel of the nut, while marriage is the shell. The money system is a maggot that eats and spoils the kernel. The broad masses bite only the bitter and tangy shells. Here is a little definition of our marriages today. Create a free, independent, carefree position for your spouses in the social system and break the unnatural iron fetters with which you handcuff the most contradictory desires and abilities for life. Give back to the spouses the original freedom they had in paradise, and then this disgusting scandal, which keeps the courts busy today, will end.”<sup>50</sup> What should be done and proposed in order to stop this suffering, but not to end life? Weitling proposes the same thing that most utopians of earlier periods did: a contractual divorce for their own good and the good of their family members: “When marriage is not bound by the need for respect, friendship, and love, when even business is no longer such a bond (...) – then dissolve it – for God’s sake, and do not create for each other torments twice and thrice worse than hell!”<sup>51</sup>

## Conclusions

In conclusion, it is worth pointing out another text is considered to be both a utopian text and a popular romance novel of its time. It combines in an exemplary way utopian issues with the emotional problems of its main characters. The work that best fits this description is Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s (1712–1778) *Julie or the New Heloise*, written in 1761. This work, written in the form of love letters exchanged between two lovers, is considered a model romance novel about an impeccable love with strong touches typical of social utopia. After all, *Julie or the New Heloise* one of the most popular works of this type, also in the following centuries, which was probably at least partly due to its inclusion in the Index of Forbidden Books<sup>52</sup>.

The country estate in the alpine town of Clarens presented in the novel represents the author’s idea of the happiest community life where people live in harmony with each other and with the nature around them<sup>53</sup>. According

to Rousseau, only in mutual “harmony of human hearts”<sup>54</sup> is such a life possible, and unfortunately it will forever remain a utopia for most people. The place and the lives of the people there, which the author describes in detail, become the embodiment of ancient Elysium, which was the Ancient Greeks’ idea of a mythological paradise. The souls of people who are guided by virtues in life, that is, heroes, exist in mutual love and truth, and are brothers and sisters to each other, with God as their common father and Nature as their mother<sup>55</sup>. Despite the dominant position of the owner of the estate, in Clarens, there is, “(...) one could say, unification, almost forced by the need for mutual services, until everyone comprehends his own interest in winning the affection of all comrades. (...) This and other similar methods ensure the attachment of one to another, born out of love for the master and subordinate to it. And so, instead of uniting to his detriment, everyone united to best serve him. And whatever interest they had in loving one another, they have an even greater interest in pleasing the master (...).”<sup>56</sup> One may be tempted to say – following Ewa Rządowska – that the “dialogue of two hearts in love” that constitutes the essence of the letters in *Julie or the New Heloise* leads to the creation of an unusual “commune of friends.”<sup>57</sup> Rousseau idealizes not only the estate described and the place associated with it, but above all love itself, without which there can be neither harmony nor happiness. In his view, people cannot really live without love, and life itself ceases to be life without love. Nothing but love is needed to live like the residents of Clarens. Love is therefore an ideal state, similar to the state of nature before the social contract was concluded. You can miss that state, you should even desire it and try to return to it, which simply means trying to love each other. For every manifestation of love, even the most inconspicuous, is nevertheless worthy of our commitment, because it has an attribute of perfection in it.

Like most of the issues that are addressed there, love is idealized in utopias. This is true of the inhabitants of utopian lands as well as the authors of such texts. But can room for perfect love only be found in ideal worlds of utopias? Apparently not. Especially for one basic reason: the possibility of feeling love individually, which is a right inherent in every human. Therefore, as St. Augustine of Hippo (354–430) used to say, he who loves can do whatever he wants<sup>58</sup>. This thought can be a basic condition for living happily in social utopias. Thus, the so-called commandment of love, which absolutely requires everyone to love everyone sincerely and wholeheartedly, should be considered the most important law in all human relations. One must love, first God, and second all others, including oneself. It is certainly a difficult and challenging task, but only for those who do not believe in love

and do not want to love others. Even those who say they cannot love can learn to love, thanks to the messages conveyed in utopias. This is because in utopias, showing love involves, primarily, the ability to share happiness with others.

It seems that we Poles, in particular, can probably say a lot about it. As a nation raised for generations in the spirit of romanticism, we believe like few others in true and perfect love, one that Polish national bard Adam Mickiewicz (1798–1855) dreamed and wrote about. He wrote about it sublimely in Book XII of *Sir Thaddeus: Let's love each other*<sup>69</sup>. It seems that his proposal of community-wide love remains very much utopian and unfortunately still unfulfilled<sup>60</sup>.

In an almost identical tone spoke German philosopher Erich Fromm (1900–1980) in his book *The Art of Loving*: “Society must be organized in such a way that man’s social, loving nature is not separated from his social existence, but becomes one with it. If it is true, as I have tried to show, that love is the only sane and satisfactory answer to the problem of human existence, then any society which excludes, relatively, the development of love, must in the long run perish of its own contradiction with the basic necessities of human nature.”<sup>61</sup> When interpreting these in the context of utopianism, it should be said that love turns out to be the most effective cure for various social diseases (problems), and we should consider any totalitarianism as a system based on hatred as such a disease.

At this point it is also necessary to agree with the statement expressed by Łukasz Stefaniak, who was very critical of utopianism, considering it incompatible with human nature, having idealistic roots, and resulting in totalitarian consequences<sup>62</sup>. The prescription for the problems arising from utopianism, the symptoms of which are cultural monism and the degradation of personal being – is to be, in his opinion – a “civilization of love.” It is the only right and necessary answer to the dangers of all forms of the so-called “social engineering,”<sup>63</sup> because they are inextricably linked to the functioning of all sorts of totalitarian systems, which, in Stefaniak’s opinion, are ideologically rooted in utopianism<sup>64</sup>. He is right in linking the “civilization of love” with Christian love. However, he also points out the importance of Kant’s injunction of the practical imperative as a moral obligation to treat all people in a subjective (purposive) manner<sup>65</sup> and not, as in totalitarianism, only in an objective manner<sup>66</sup>. History, and not only that of the 20th century, has repeatedly confirmed that no one can be forced to love, but unfortunately, people can be forced to hate, always pointing to some ideological enemy. For where this ideological threat appears in utopias, social fear is fed and even fueled, and people are taught to hate,

and not just the enemy. Then we are dealing with negative versions of social utopias, which should warn of the threat of totalitarianism. However, in the real world of politics, often dominated by the rule of psychopaths, utopian visions that are ideologized can become the source of dangerous political agendas,<sup>67</sup> and, worst of all, also the source of draft legislation, which in legal philosophy has been termed “statutory lawlessness.”<sup>68</sup> In conclusion, it should be noted once again that there are utopias (the positive ones) can even be considered textbooks for love. They teach and show how, who, and what we should love. On the other hand, there are also negative utopias (anti-utopias and dystopias), warning of the dangers of the introduction of totalitarian systems. Their tragedy was that they unfortunately became part of the real history of mankind, showing the extent of the madness of the hatred of people’s mutual hatred<sup>69</sup> – a feeling that is the antonym of love.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> W. Weitling, *Gwarancje harmonii i wolności*, translated by E. Werfel, Książka i Wiedza, Warsaw 1968, p. 297.

<sup>2</sup> M. Riot-Sarcey, T. Bouchet, A. Picon, eds., *Dictionnaire des utopies*, Larousse, Paris 2006, p. 243.

<sup>3</sup> See: M. Jaskólski, Utopie, in: K. Chojnicka, M. Jaskólski, eds., *Słownik historii doktryn politycznych*, vol. 6: *T-Z with a Supplement*, Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, Warsaw 2015, p. 266.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. A. Juszczak, *Stary wspaniały świat. O utopiach pozytywnych i negatywnych*, Jagiellonian University Press, Krakow 2014, p. 10.

<sup>5</sup> Quoted after: [https://pl.wikiquote.org/wiki/Jules\\_Michelet](https://pl.wikiquote.org/wiki/Jules_Michelet) (accessed on July 21, 2022).

<sup>6</sup> This is how one can treat Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s slogan of “return to nature,” which is a manifestation of an emotional longing for something lost irretrievably, which every person loves, and to which one longs to return. Besides, according to J.-J. Rousseau, a happy life is a life in harmony with nature; see: J.-J. Rousseau, *Rozprawa na temat: Czy odrodzenie nauk i sztuk przyczyniło się do naprawy obyczajów?*, in: *Trzy rozprawy z filozofii społecznej*, translated by H. Elzenberg, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Krakow 1956, pp. 9–103.

<sup>7</sup> I. Pańków, *Filozofia utopii*, Warsaw 1990, p. 119.

<sup>8</sup> K. Fourier, *Nowy świat zakochanych*; quoted after: C. Jaquier, *Amour*, in: B. Baczeko, M. Porret, F. Rosset, eds., *Dictionnaire critique de l’Utopie au temps des Lumières*, Geneva 2016, p. 67.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. W. Grabski, *Karol Fourier (1772–1837) jego życie i doktryna. Teza doktora przyjęta przez Wydział Prawa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego*, Warsaw 1928, p. 213; J. Majler, *Doktryna etyczna Karola Fouriera*, Warsaw 1965, p. 63ff; M. Sobieszewska, *Karol Fourier i jego wizja organizacji społecznej*, *Studia Iuridica Lublinensia* 2010, vol. XIV, p. 130.

<sup>10</sup> I. Pańków, *Filozofia...*, op. cit., p. 12.

<sup>11</sup> M. Sobieszewska, *Karol Fourier...*, op. cit., p. 131.

<sup>12</sup> W. Grabski, *Karol Fourier...*, op. cit., pp. 212ff.

<sup>13</sup> J. Majler, *Doktryna etyczna...*, op. cit., p. 59.

<sup>14</sup> C. Jaquier, *Amour*, in: *Dictionnaire critique...*, op. cit., p. 54.

<sup>15</sup> H. Saint-Simon, *Nouveau Christianisme. Dialogue entre un Conservateur et un Novateur*, Paris 1825, pp. 8, 11, 57, and 71; see the Polish edition: Idem, *Nowe chrześcijaństwo. Dialog między Konserwatystą i Nowatorem*, translated by S. Antoszczuk, in: *Pisma wybrane*, vol. II, Warsaw 1968, pp. 639–696.

<sup>16</sup> Ibidem, pp. 12 and 71.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. C. Jaquier, *Amour*, in: *Dictionnaire critique...*, op. cit., pp. 55ff.

<sup>18</sup> This proposal for viewing the emotional-volitional sphere is a reference to both Blaise Pascal's intuitionism (Fr. *l'ordre du cœur*), Immanuel Kant's ethics with its autonomous will of an individual, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau's social philosophy with the universal will (Fr. *volonté générale*) as the legislative force; cf.: I. Kant, *Krytyka praktycznego rozumu*; translated by J. Gałęcki, Warsaw 1972, pp. 58, 73, and 81; See: J.-J. Rousseau, *Umowa społeczna*, translated by A. Peretiatkowicz, Wydawnictwo Marek Derewiecki, Kęty 2007, pp. 28ff.

<sup>19</sup> Św. Paweł, *Hymn o miłości*, 1 Kor. 13, 4–8.

<sup>20</sup> J. Szacki, *Utopie*, Warsaw 1968, p. 47.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. K. Kuźmicz, *O miłosierdziu jako najwyższym prawie*, in: *Versus amicus rara avis est. Studia ofiarowane pamięci Wojciecha Organiściaka*, Katowice 2020, pp. 432ff.

<sup>22</sup> M. Valtorta, *Poemat Boga-Człowieka. Siedem ksiąg*, translated by E. Bromboszcz, book IV, part 71, Katowice 1999, p. 271.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Dawidowy Psalm: *Dziękczynienie i prośba* 40 (39), 9–10.

<sup>24</sup> It should be added that Stanisław Leszczyński's worldview was closely associated with Catholicism, of which he was an ardent defender and follower, which he confirmed in many of his works, including a text considered utopian: *Rozmowa Europejczyka z Wyspiarzem z Królestwa Dumocala*, in: *Rys życia i wybór pism Stanisława Leszczyńskiego, króla polskiego, księcia Lotaryngii i Baru, zwanego Filozofem Dobroczyńcą*, translated by K. R. Niezabitowski, Warsaw 1828.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. ibidem, p. 284.

<sup>26</sup> Quoted after: W. Grabski, *Karol Fourier...*, op. cit., p. 56.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. A. Świętochowski, *Utopie w rozwoju historycznym*, Warsaw 1910, pp. 149–150.

<sup>28</sup> See: H. Arendt, *Korzenie totalitaryzmu*, vol. 1–2, translated by D. Grinberg (parts I and III) and M. Szawiel (part II), Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne, Warsaw 2008.

<sup>29</sup> Ibidem, pp. 229–254.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. J.-J. Rousseau, *Rozprawa na temat: Czy odrodzenie nauk i sztuk przyczyniło się do poprawy obyczajów?*, in: *Trzy rozprawy z filozofii społecznej*, translated by H. Elzenberg, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Krakow 1956, pp. 24, 37, 41ff.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. pp. 58 and 396.

<sup>32</sup> O. de Guoges, *Deklaracja Praw Kobiety i Obywatelki*, translated by R. Michalski, Library of the Academy of Fine Arts in Gdansk, Academy of Fine Arts in Gdansk, Gdansk 2018.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Art. 1 and 3, ibidem, pp. 12–13.

<sup>34</sup> T. Morus, *Utopia*, translated by K. Abganowicz, Poznań 1947, pp. 94–95.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., p. 96.

<sup>36</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>37</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>38</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>39</sup> Ibidem, pp. 96–97.

<sup>40</sup> Ibidem, p. 95.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. T. Campanella, *Miasto Słońca*, translated by L. and R. Brandwajn, Wrocław 1955, p. 37.

<sup>42</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. ibidem, p. 37.

<sup>44</sup> Ibidem, pp. 37–38.

<sup>45</sup> E.G. Morelly, *Kodeks natury czyli prawdziwy duch jej praw*, translated by D. Malewska, Kraków 1955, p. 137.

<sup>46</sup> Ibidem, p. 139.

<sup>47</sup> Ibidem, p. 140.

<sup>48</sup> J. Meslier, *Testament*, translated by Z. Bieńkowski, Kraków 1955, p. 350.

<sup>49</sup> Ibidem, pp. 351–352.

<sup>50</sup> W. Weitling, *Gwarancje...*, op. cit., p. 296.

<sup>51</sup> Ibidem, p. 297.

<sup>52</sup> This work by Jean-Jacques Rousseau was placed in the *Index librorum prohibitorum* by decree in 1806, alongside works by such political and legal thinkers as: Andrzej Frycz-Modrzewski, Francis Bacon, Niccolo Machiavelli, Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Charles Louis de Montesquieu, Immanuel Kant, Benjamin Franklin, and the aforementioned Polish bard Adam Mickiewicz.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. F. Collet, *Histoires des idées de l'Antiquité à nos jours. Précis de culture generale*, Paris 2009, p. 224.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. A. Szacki, op. cit., p. 61.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. J.-J. Rousseau, *Nowa Heloiza*, translated by E. Rządowska, Warsaw 1995, pp. 194–195.

<sup>56</sup> Ibidem, p. 195.

<sup>57</sup> See: E. Rządowska, *Wstęp*, in: *Nowa Heloiza*, op. cit., pp. 12 and 15.

<sup>58</sup> Latin: *Dilige et quod vis fac*; see. St. Augustine, *In epistolam Ioannis ad Parthos, tractatus*.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. A. Mickiewicz, *Pan Tadeusz*, Book XII: *Let's love each other*, Warsaw 1980, pp. 329–356.

<sup>60</sup> The message implies that there will be no love between people without freedom, which is confirmed by perhaps the most famous words spoken in this part of the epic, by Zosia: “Free ourselves, let us make the peasants free as well, (...)” and by the toast made by Thaddeus: “Cheers to the Fellow citizens, Free, equal, Poles! (...)”; Ibidem, pp. 345 and 348.

<sup>61</sup> E. Fromm, *O sztuce miłości*, translated by A. Bogdański, Warsaw 1994, p. 111.

<sup>62</sup> Cf. Ł. Stefaniak, *Utopizm: źródła myślowe i konsekwencje cywilizacyjne*, Lublin 2011, p. 11.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. K.R. Popper, *Spółczesność otwarta i jego wrogowie*, 1. *Urok Platona*, translated by H. Krahelska, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warsaw 1993, pp. 44–47.

<sup>64</sup> Ł. Stefaniak, *Utopizm: źródła myślowe...*, op. cit., pp. 11 and 206.

<sup>65</sup> A key to the implementation of a utopia that we could use is Immanuel Kant's practical imperative prescribing the treatment of every human being as an end in itself; cf.: K. Kuźmicz, *Realizacja utopii*, in: M. Szyszkowska and T. Kozłowski, eds., *Tolerancja*, Warsaw 2003, pp. 134–137.

<sup>66</sup> Ł. Stefaniak, *Utopizm*, op. cit., p. 207.

<sup>67</sup> The Hungarian sociologist Karl Mannheim (1893–1947) wrote more extensively about the possible relations between ideology and utopia, and the effects that these relations can produce; see: Idem, *Ideologia i utopia*, translated by J. Miziński, Wydawnictwo "Test", Lublin 1992.

<sup>68</sup> G. Radbruch, *Ustawowe bezprawie i ponadustawowe prawo*, in: Idem, *Filozofia prawa*, translated by E. Nowak, Warsaw 2009, pp. 244–254.

<sup>69</sup> See: I.S. Grat, ed., *Człowiek przeciwko człowiekowi. Filozofia polityka i prawo a systemy totalitarne*, Wydawnictwo Prymat, Białystok.

## R E F E R E N C E S

- Arendt H. (2008), *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, vol. 1–2, translated by D. Grinberg (parts I and III) and M. Szawiel (part II), Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne, Warsaw.
- Campanella T. (1955), *Civitas solis poetica. Idea reipublicae philosophicae*, translated by L. and R. Brandwajn, Zakład im. Ossolińskich, Wrocław.
- Chojnicka K., Jaskólski M. (2015), *Słownik historii doktryn politycznych*, vol. 6: *T-Z with a Supplement*, Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, Warsaw, pp. 266–275.
- Fromm E. (1994), *The art of loving*, translated by A. Bogdański, Wydawnictwo Sagittarius, Warsaw.
- Grat I.S. (2008), *Człowiek przeciwko człowiekowi. Filozofia polityka i prawo a systemy totalitarne*, Wydawnictwo Prymat, Białystok.
- Grudzińska A., *W poszukiwaniu racjonalnej organizacji społeczeństwa: Tomasz More, Robert Owen a praktyka kibuców*, "Studia nad Autorytaryzmem I Totalitaryzmem" 2019, vol. 41, nr 2, s. 147–163.
- Guoges O. (2018), *Déclaration des droits de la femme et de la citoyenne*, translated by R. Michalski, Library of the Academy of Fine Arts in Gdansk, Academy of Fine Arts in Gdansk, Gdansk.
- Grabski W. (1928), *Karol Fourier (1772–1837) jego życie i doktryna. Teza doktora przyjęta przez Wydział Prawa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego*, Warsaw.
- Jameson F. (2011), *Archaeologies of the Future: The Desire Called Utopia and Other Science Fictions*, translated by M. Płaza, M. Frankiewicz, A. Misk, Jagiellonian University Press, Eidos, Krakow.

- Jaquier C. (2016), *Amour*, in: B. Baczeko, M. Porret, F. Rosset, eds., *Dictionnaire critique de l'Utopie au temps des Lumières*, Georg Editeur, Geneva.
- Juszczyk A. (2014), *Stary wspaniały świat o utopiach pozytywnych i negatywnych*, Jagiellonian University Press, Krakow.
- Kant I. (1972), *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*, translated by J. Gałęcki, Warsaw.
- Majler J. (1965), *Doktryna etyczna Karola Fouriera*, Książka i Wiedza, Warsaw.
- Mannheim K. (1992), *Ideologie und Utopie*, translated by J. Miziński, Wydawnictwo "Test", Lublin.
- Meslier J. (1955), *Testament*, translated by Z. Bieńkowski, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Krakow.
- Mickiewicz A. (1980), *Pan Tadeusz czyli Ostatni zajazd na Litwie. Historia szlachecka z r. 1811 i 1812 we dwunastu księgach wierszem*, Book XII: *Kochajmy się*, Czytelnik, Warsaw.
- Morelly E. G. (1955), *Code de la nature, ou Le véritable esprit de ses lois de tout temps négligé ou méconnu*, translated by D. Malewska, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Krakow.
- Morus T. (1947), *Utopia*, translated by K. Abganowicz, Instytut Wydawniczy Kultura, Poznan.
- Pańków I. (1990), *Filozofia utopii*, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Warsaw.
- Popper K. R. (1993), *The Open Society and Its Enemies, 1. The Age of Plato*, translated by H. Krahelska, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warsaw.
- Radbruch G. (2009), *Gesetzliches Unrecht und übergesetzliches Recht*, in: Idem, *Filozofia prawa*, translated by E. Nowak, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warsaw.
- Riot-Sarcey M., Bouchet T., Picon A. (2006), *Dictionnaire des utopies*, Larousse, Paris.
- Rousseau J.-J. (1956), *Discours sur les sciences et les arts*, in: *Trzy rozprawy z filozofii społecznej*, translated by H. Elzenberg, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Krakow.
- Rousseau J. J. (1995), *Julie ou la nouvelle Héloïse*, translated by E. Rzadkowska, Morex, Warsaw.
- Rousseau J.J. (2007), *Du contrat social*, translated by A. Peretiatkowicz, Wydawnictwo Marek Derewiecki, Kęty.
- Saint-Simon H. (1968), *Nouveau christianisme – Dialogues entre un conservateur et un novateur*, translated by S. Antoszczuk, in: *Pisma wybrane*, vol. II, Książka i Wiedza, Warsaw.
- Sobieszewska M. (2010), *Karol Fourier i jego wizja organizacji społecznej*, *Studia Iuridica Lublinensia*, vol. XIV, pp. 125–133.
- Stefaniak Ł. (2011), *Utopizm: źródła myślowe i konsekwencje cywilizacyjne*, Catholic University of Lublin Print, Lublin.

Szacki J. (1968), *Utopie*, Wydawnictwo Iskry, Warsaw 1968.

Świętochowski A. (1910), *Utopie w rozwoju historycznym*, Nakład Gebethnera i Wolffa Kraków, G. Gebethner i Spółka, Warsaw.

Weitling W. (1968), *Garantien der Harmonie und Freiheit*, translated by E. Werfel, Książka i Wiedza, Warsaw.

Valtorta M. (1999), *Poemat Boga-Człowieka. Siedem ksiąg*, translated by E. Bromboszcz, book IV, part 71, Katowice.