**Algorithmic dreams – and how it could be otherwise**

With the rise of Google and social media, algorithms have become foregrounded as automated curators of content on the web. The prevalence of opaque, corporate web algorithms often become an occasion for critique and concern. This is related to the argument that algorithms are political, even when they cloud themselves in algorithmic objectivity (Gillespie 2010). But what if the politics of web algorithms is not just taken as threatening, but also as a contemporary example of ’everyday utopianism’, as the session organizers put it with a quote from Riles (2011:178)? Pursuing this idea with inspiration from the work of Boltanski and Thévenot (2006), we may expect that web algorithms such as those of Google and Facebook do not just order content on the web in opaque and automated ways, these algorithms also need to make available a justification of their orderings. In this paper we ask what web algorithms have to offer if they are read as (utopian) political philosophies that rely on particular dreams about a just social order. We examine the ’high-profile’ algorithms of Google, Facebook and Twitter, arguing that each offers a quite different vision of how public attention should be organized. One of the advantages of asking about the visions of web algorithms, we think, is that these devices are removed from the position of all-powerful manipulators. Indeed, users must be expected to tinker with algorithmic devices in all sorts of ways, which is exactly what makes it relevant to think of algorithmic orderings as dreams that are never fully realized. A second advantage is that contrasting existing algorithmic utopias makes it possible to dream about how it could be otherwise in more specific ways, which is what we end by doing with some less famous algorithmic interventions (Birkbak and Carlsen 2016).