

# Editor's Introduction

## Imagining a Better World: A Survey of Feminist Utopian Literature

By ALEXANDRA W. LOUGH\*

*When studying or imagining a eutopia, a happy place, we experience a rite of passage to a better future. As we dream of the not yet known, we change our conception of the possible. As we try to imagine the unimaginable—namely, where we're going before we're there—we move toward new and as yet unrealized ends. (Kessler 1985: 189)*

The dominant story of Western culture in the past two centuries has been one derived from Thomas Robert Malthus and Charles Darwin, presented in terms of biological determinism and uncompromising economic competition. A society based on these principles will eventually devour itself through the destruction of nature and the human spirit. That story has been particularly devastating to women, minorities, and the poor. There is a desperate need for alternative stories to reveal the sickness of our current system and to present strategies for change. To paraphrase novelist Marge Piercy (2003), if you cannot imagine anything different, all you can ask for is more of the same. The world needs a heavy dose of social dreaming and the work of feminist utopian fiction offers a fertile place to begin.

Unable to fully develop within the confines of patriarchal culture, women authors have imagined new and highly intricate societies within which their female protagonists are able to achieve their full human potential. Women have tended to craft different types of utopias than men. As Carol Farley Kessler (1995: xviii) has aptly observed: "Women more than men imagine utopias where the intangible features of human existence receive more prominent consideration."

\*Holds a PhD in American history from Brandeis University (2013). Currently, assistant editor of the six-volume series, *The Annotated Works of Henry George* (Farleigh Dickinson University Press). Previously, Director of the Henry George Birthplace, Archive, and Historical Research Center.

American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Vol. 77 No. 5 (November, 2018).

DOI: 10.1111/ajes.12255

© 2018 American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Inc

Whereas men tend to stress alternative economic and political policies as ends in themselves, women's utopias "are more likely to include these matters primarily as they provide a *means* to the social end of fully developed human capacity" (Kessler, 1995: viii, emphasis added). As a result, the utopias imagined by women often emphasize community, balance, freedom of expression, and love.

This is not to suggest that women authors are not concerned with public policy. In fact, the state plays a dominant role in the feminist utopias of the late-19<sup>th</sup> and early-20<sup>th</sup> centuries. As many of the works surveyed in this volume demonstrate, the societies proposed by women at that time often reflected the policy goals of Progressive reformers. These goals included laws mandating universal education, limiting working hours, regulating marriage, and prohibiting the procreation of those who possessed undesirable traits, such as mental illness or physical disabilities. Through a combination of eugenics and evolutionary advances, the utopian worlds of Mary E. Bradley's *Mizora* (1880–1881) and Charlotte Perkins Gilman's *Herland* (1915), for example, exist without men or vices such as crime, violence, and greed. As the authors in this issue make clear, however, in imagining utopias with strong states, even those that promoted and supported feminist goals, fin de siècle utopian writers imagined rather white-washed worlds where the rights and interests of minority groups were suppressed or altogether ignored.

That women utopian authors tend to stress life's intangible features—i.e., love, cooperation, balance, etc.—might stem from the recognition of the need by female writers to challenge the more subtle or hidden aspects of patriarchy. In this regard, the utopias imagined by women have sometimes expanded upon the goals and methods of the women's rights and feminist movements of their time. Historically, the efforts of these movements have been appropriately focused on securing women's political and economic rights—the right to vote, hold office, become educated, and earn equal pay for equal work. Long before any of these rights were won, however, women writers recognized that political and economic disenfranchisement comprised just one part of a much more ubiquitous system that kept women from realizing their full human potential. In addition to suffrage, society needed to transform the way it viewed biological difference and

reacted to expressions of femininity. A continuous thread throughout the articles in this issue explores how feminist utopian fiction has engaged with the larger social movements of the time.

### 19<sup>th</sup>-Century Feminist Utopianism

Four of the articles in this issue (by Purdy, Zolciak, Lake, and Bowers) evaluate feminist utopian works published in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The works reviewed by authors in this issue include Mary Shelley's *The Last Man* (1826), Mary Griffith's *Three Hundred Years Hence* (1836), Margaret Fuller's *Woman in the Nineteenth Century* (1845), Mary E. Bradley's *Mizora* (1880–1881), Elizabeth Corbett's *New Amazonia* (1889), and Alice Ilgenfritz Jones and Ella Merchant's *Unveiling a Parallel Universe* (1893). The subject of these works demonstrates the wide variety of approaches of female authors to imagine better worlds for themselves and other women. For early-19<sup>th</sup>-century feminist utopian writers, such as Mary Shelley and Mary Griffith, improving the lives of women often meant working within the confines of Victorian social mores and prevailing definitions of femininity.

In her article in this issue, Lillian M. Purdy argues that as the first known utopian text written by an American woman, *Three Hundred Years Hence* by Mary Griffith began a "literary conversation on women and marriage, including women's rights and gender equality." Set 300 years in the future, the lives of the women in Griffith's world have vastly improved, according to the male narrator, through gender equality and the reshaping of particular cultural and social institutions, including marriage and education. As Purdy points out, Griffith's utopia is "descriptive" rather than "prescriptive": while the author brilliantly displays her vision of a more perfect society, she fails to explain how it was achieved or how it could be sustained.

While Purdy appropriately acknowledges the limitations of Griffith's text as a work of feminist fiction, she appreciates the author's contribution to the mid-century women's rights movement, pointing out the areas where Griffith's imagined world foreshadowed the reforms that Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton would later champion. Among these reforms were inheritance laws granting a wife possession of her husband's assets upon his death and divorce laws that

afforded women the right to legally separate from alcoholic husbands without losing custody of their children or suffering economic hardship. Additionally, Purdy argues that educational reform imagined by Griffith “accurately predicts an expanded government that will legislate in many aspects of American life.” These advances include early childhood education and expanded opportunities for women to receive practical training in financial accounting and other fields previously reserved to men.

The primary shortcoming of *Three Hundred Years Hence* as a work of feminist utopian fiction, according to Purdy, largely results from Griffith’s failure to challenge the 19<sup>th</sup>-century vision of “true womanhood.” During this period, women were expected to conform to the four virtues of piety, purity, submissiveness, and domesticity, displayed by all of the women in Griffith’s work. Still, the work is significant, Purdy concludes, in the way that it presents “an early attempt by an American woman to use a utopian vision to reformulate American domestic and cultural life,” which, she also notes, “provides a foundation for later writers,” including Harriet Beecher Stowe and Charlotte Perkins. Thus, while Griffith’s utopia certainly contains feminist “blindspots,” the work raises important questions about the institution of marriage and how it could be reformed to improve the lives of women and strengthen families. In so doing, *Three Hundred Years Hence* helped inform the policy goals of the mid-century women’s rights movement.

On the other side of the Atlantic Ocean and on the other side of the utopian genre, Mary Shelley’s *The Last Man* (1826) provides a glimpse of an early-19<sup>th</sup>-century woman’s attempt at free psychological expression. Olivia Zolciak’s article in this issue makes a compelling argument for the work’s significance as a feminist novel that serves as a precursor to contemporary apocalyptic fiction. Zolciak shows how critics failed to see how Shelley differentiates her literary voice from other influential writers in her life, including that of her late husband Percy Bysshe Shelley. Although feminist scholars have disregarded *The Last Man* for its failure to challenge the prevailing images of women in fiction as either angels or monsters, Zolciak suggests that this perspective overlooks the strength of Shelley’s female characters

and their usefulness in allowing Shelley to work through anxieties stemming both from personal tragedies and contemporary events.

Zolciak locates the significance of Shelley's *The Last Man* in the author's demonstration of what she terms "anxiety of illness and authorship." At the time she wrote *The Last Man*, Shelley was suffering from a host of anxieties and fears arising from the drowning of her husband and an intense desire to protect her son, the only remaining member of her immediate family. Additionally, Shelley possessed an insatiable desire to establish an independent literary voice, separate from that of her poet husband and philosopher parents, William Godwin and Mary Wollstonecraft. Given these anxieties, the setting of *The Last Man* in a future world ravaged by plague and the characters, most of whom represent important figures in Shelley's life, reflect the author's desire to work through her own personal demons, so to speak. When analyzed through the lens of psychoanalytic theory, Zolciak argues, the influence of *The Last Man* to the "continuously growing genre of post-apocalyptic literature in the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries" becomes especially apparent. Zolciak concludes her essay with a comparison of the similarities between *The Last Man* and Stephen King's *The Stand* (1978).

The current conception of feminism as an ideology that promotes complete equality for men and women provides a poor lens through which to examine the utopian and apocalyptic works of early 19<sup>th</sup>-century female writers. However, this egalitarian framework becomes less problematic when looking at the utopian worlds imagined by women writers at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. As demonstrated by Christina Lake and Elinor Bowers in their articles, the feminist utopian worlds of the mid- and late-19<sup>th</sup> century provide the first examples of societies comprised of and governed solely by women. While the majority of women in these worlds retain many of the same virtues associated with early-19<sup>th</sup>-century femininity—chastity and motherhood, in particular—in linking women's independence from men to social progress and harmony, they embody a very long thread in feminist utopian literature.

What changed in the 50 years between the publication of Shelley's *The Last Man* and Mary E. Bradley's *Mizora*? For one, women in the United States and the United Kingdom launched the first organized movement,

also known as “first-wave feminism,” for women’s rights. Led by Susan B. Anthony, Lucy Stone, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton in the United States and by Barbara Bodichon and Bessie Rayner Parks in the United Kingdom, the women’s movement successfully lobbied local and national governments to pass a host of reforms that secured property rights for married women, legalized divorce, expanded educational opportunities for women, and, in some localities, granted suffrage to women.<sup>1</sup> In 1918 and 1920, respectively, women in the United Kingdom and the United States won the right to vote in national elections.

Another major development during this time was the proliferation of utopian literature. According to utopian studies scholar Lyman Tower Sargent (1976: 278–279), of the 400 utopias published in English between 1516 and the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, 160 (or 40 percent) appeared in the seven years between the publication of Edward Bellamy’s *Looking Backward* in 1888 and H. G. Wells’ *The Time Machine* in 1895.<sup>2</sup> Additionally, as Lake notes in her essay in this issue, at least 65 of these utopian works were written by female authors, suggesting that the genre was becoming a particularly popular vehicle for the exploration of the interests and concerns of women.

Sargent (1976: 278) identifies three major themes in late-19<sup>th</sup>-century utopian literature: the establishment of an equitable economic system, communitarianism, and “the woman question.” While all three themes are present in the works analyzed in this issue, so too is the theme of scientific progress. In fact, through the sometimes unsettling combination of scientific advancement and eugenics, the utopias imagined by women in the late-19<sup>th</sup> century featured the first examples of “separatist societies,” comprised solely of women. As Lake argues in her article, the “alliance between evolutionary science and feminist activism” allowed late-19<sup>th</sup>-century women “their own sphere of influence prior to full inclusion in the social citizenship not yet available to them through suffrage or legal equality.” While contributing to the feminist movement, however, this alliance also led to the exclusion of minorities and the suppression of civil liberties in many of the utopian worlds designed by women.

Mizora, the all-female world imagined by Mary E. Bradley Lane, provides an excellent demonstration of the complications associated with late-19<sup>th</sup>-century female authors’ use of evolutionary science to

create feminist utopias. The novel, of the same name, is narrated by the Russian political fugitive Vera Zarovitch who discovers a mysterious land below the sea occupied by strong, beautiful, blue-eyed women who have found a way to reproduce without men. Lane, as Lake astutely notes, employs an “instrumentalist view of nature,” which allows her Mizoran women to control natural processes—like reproduction—through science. Furthermore, in an interesting complication of gender associations, Lake points out the way Lane assigns feminine characteristics to *both* nature and science:

Science and scientific work are normally seen as masculine domains, but in *Mizora* science is personified more frequently than nature, and often given female attributes. ... The terms science and nature also seem to be used interchangeably. Nature is God, but Science is Goddess.

Science is not always used for benevolent purposes. When the narrator Zarovitch asks what happened to the people with brown eyes and dark hair, she is provided with an answer that, Lake writes, “sounds suspiciously like ethnic cleansing.” Similar to men and criminals, the darker people were removed because the “Mizorans believed that ‘the highest excellence of moral and mental character is alone attainable by a fair race.’”

While published nearly 35 years after *Mizora*, Charlotte Perkins Gilman's *Herland* (1915) shares many of the same features of Lane's novel and those of other late-19<sup>th</sup>-century utopian works.<sup>3</sup> As Elinor Bowers outlines in her article in this issue, these features include a commitment to the women's rights movement coupled with the confidence in evolutionary science to create a more perfect world where (white) women enjoy freedom, health, and equality. The alliance between feminism and evolutionary science is further complicated in Gilman's *Herland* for the ways that it challenges some of the more oppressive characteristics assigned to women, while at the same time reinforcing others. Coupled with its undertones of racism and elitism, Bowers places *Herland* outside the feminist literary genre. In doing so, however, she applies the standards of feminism in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, not the norms of early 20<sup>th</sup>-century feminism.

*Herland* is narrated by a male sociology student named Vandyck Jennings, who launches an expedition with two friends to find and explore a world rumored to consist solely of women. Jennings is both thrilled and puzzled by the society he discovers after being held captive for several months by the women of Herland. Reflective of the Progressive reforms Gilman herself championed, the women of Herland place a high value on education as an instrument of social progress and on public health and hygiene. Herlandian women epitomize good health and are never sick. The women, as Bowers points out, also “conform to the essentialist view that women’s identities are defined by their biological differences to men.” As a result, they cherish above all others their role as mothers.

The feminist shortcomings of Gilman’s *Herland* are especially troublesome to Bowers given the significant contribution to the feminist literary genre of the author’s earlier work, *The Yellow Wallpaper* (1892). In this short story, Gilman skillfully challenges the gendered medical practices of the time, which, to the detriment of women’s mental health, dismissed postpartum depression and other hormonal maladies as an outgrowth of women’s natural tendency for hysteria. Although the female narrator embodies many of the negative qualities associated with women, including fragility, helplessness, and hyper-anxiety, Gilman suggests these qualities are not innate in women, but thrust upon them by men’s refusal to recognize women’s needs for independence and intellectual stimulus. This sense, however, that Gilman possessed a more enlightened or progressive view of femininity is dulled by the author’s depiction of Herlandian women. As Bowers points out, although the women in Herland are athletic, intelligent, and powerful—everything the narrator of *The Yellow Wallpaper* is not—they also are inherently maternal, asexual, and rather one-dimensional. “Thus,” Bowers writes, “Gilman confines women to the role of ‘Makers of People,’ rather than individuals capable of pursuing a life beyond motherhood.”

The late-19<sup>th</sup>-century utopian worlds provide better models of feminism than those of the early-19<sup>th</sup> century for the ways that they embrace leadership roles for women and promote women’s independence from men. The women of these worlds, however, similarly embody the traditional characteristics of femininity found in the women

of early 19<sup>th</sup>-century utopias—they are innately beautiful, peaceful, and maternal. Thus, while late-19<sup>th</sup>-century female writers took the bold step of imagining separatist worlds where women flourished without men, they continued to limit the feminist potential of these utopias by working within the confines of prevailing definitions of femininity and, by extension, of masculinity. Based on the works surveyed in this issue, it would take another 50 years before the feminist utopian genre successfully pushed against this vestige of patriarchy.

### **20<sup>th</sup>-Century Feminist Utopianism**

The interwar years of the 20<sup>th</sup> century produced very few utopian works, by men or women. Among the many casualties of WWI, explains English professor Michael Robertson (2018: 224), “was the sort of utopian idealism exemplified in the lives and works of Edward Bellamy, Edward Carpenter, and Charlotte Perkins Gilman.” The progress championed by late-19<sup>th</sup>-century utopian writers—that of industry, technology, and science—also produced the weapons that transformed modern warfare. As Robertson (2018: 224) writes:

Progress had led to the machine gun, barbed wire, poison gas, armored tanks, and aerial warfare, to a mode of total war that obliterated distinctions between soldiers and civilians—some seven million of the war dead were noncombatants.

The destructive effects of “progress” and the unwavering faith in the human ability to wield science and technology to create better worlds continued to surface long after the war’s end, particularly in the Soviet Union and Germany. The totalitarian projects of Soviet Communism and German Nazism, Robertson notes, “embodied a ruthless version of utopianism” that was not a huge leap from the imagined worlds of Gilman and others. Thus, while the decades following WWI produced very few utopias, they gave rise to what Robertson (2018: 225) calls “the triumph of the literary dystopia” as seen through the publication of such classics as Aldous Huxley’s *Brave New World* (1932), George Orwell’s *1984* (1949), and William Golding’s *Lord of the Flies* (1954).

Interest in utopianism—demonstrated through literature and social theory—experienced a revival in the decades following WWII. The

postwar economic boom, coupled with growing anxiety as the United States and the Soviet Union became mired in a Cold War, inspired a new wave of social dreaming. Women played a key role in the resurgence of utopian literature at this time. According to Susan Magarey (2014: 124), the total number of feminist utopias published in the United States “leaped” from about 8 percent in 1960 to 32 percent of all utopias published by 1970. Similar to the feminist utopias created by women in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, these works interacted in important ways with second-wave feminism of the 1960s and 1970s.

Although there are many continuities between 19<sup>th</sup>- and 20<sup>th</sup>-century feminist utopian literature, as the authors in this issue highlight, there also were new developments. Many of the feminist utopian works of the mid- to late-20<sup>th</sup> century tended to fall into the category of what Sargent (1994: 9) has labeled “critical utopias.” Critical utopian societies often appear more enlightened and perfect than the worlds to which they are juxtaposed, but they actually contain inherent flaws and a host of problems uncovered as the story unfolds. Critical utopian works, which also sometimes fall into the dystopian genre, function to warn readers of the dangers of certain trends in contemporary “utopian thinking.”

Katherine Cross’s analysis of Ursula Le Guin’s *The Dispossessed* (1974) demonstrates the monitory power of such critical utopias. Cross argues in her article in this issue that, despite its flaws, *The Dispossessed* “brilliantly analyzes where emancipatory politics can go wrong.” Through “insights that were new even to scientists in the early 1970s,” Cross writes, Le Guin warns “about the dangers of *informal* power, and how revolutionary dogma can rhetorically mask it.”

*The Dispossessed* features two worlds, which appear diametrically opposed. Anarres is an egalitarian society settled by anarchist separatists from Urras who worship practicality above all else. Urras is a post-revolutionary world comprised of multiple nation-states, including the money-worshipping industrial state of Io and the totalitarian socialist regime of Thu. The story follows the experiences of Shevek, a theoretical physicist from Anarres who temporarily relocates to Urras for a professional opportunity. Through flashbacks, readers discover far more similarities between Anarres and Urras than the vastly different social structures of these worlds would indicate. Cross highlights

two particularly troublesome continuities rooted in differentials of power: rape and misogyny. By the end of the book, readers are left wondering which of the two worlds is truly more ideal. The lesson, according to Cross, is that “[h]ierarchy endures, power remains salient even if it is not titled, and coercion takes many forms beyond the obvious.” Although, in many ways, *The Dispossessed* highlights the dangers of failed utopian revolutions, Cross does not believe Le Guin meant to warn against utopian dreaming:

Utopia is not possible, [Le Guin's] worlds acknowledge, but it remains a desirable goal to work towards. It is a subtle distinction, but it makes all the difference ... Le Guin conceived of utopia, not as a destination, but a cynosure that kept one on course. Or, in words spoken by Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, a politician Le Guin might well sympathize with, “We need to name our star so we can chart a course.”

Essentially, Le Guin understood the power of the exercise of social dreaming to effect positive change.

However worthwhile, the “exercise” of utopian imagining is fraught with a type of intellectual risk inherently linked to feminist perspectives. In her essay in this issue on risk and feminist utopia, Jeanne Cortiel explores the works of three feminist authors. Despite writing at very different times, these three authors envision future worlds shaped by the intimately gendered notion of risk: whereas men are valorized for taking risks, women are rewarded for steering clear of danger. When women do take risks, Cortiel notes, it is usually associated with self-expression or autonomy of some kind. “Risk-taking affords control over the self,” she writes. In looking at how risk show-cases in Margaret Fuller’s *Woman in the Nineteenth Century* (1845), Joanna Russ’s, *The Female Man* (1975), and Mary Daly’s *Quintessence: Realizing the Archaic Future* (1998), Cortiel argues that “feminist interventions into utopian discourse show risk enabled feminist social dreaming.”

Fuller’s use of risk in *Woman in the Nineteenth Century* most clearly comes through the fictional, yet clearly autobiographical, character of Miranda. Like Fuller, Miranda is educated and self-reliant, but unlike the character from Shakespeare’s *Tempest*, on whom she is based,

Fuller “lets Miranda speak in her own voice and allows her to reflect upon the courage required to rewrite a text in which a male authority conceptualizes women and their relationship to the future.” In rewriting and reimagining the stories of prominent characters of myth, philosophy, and history, Fuller engages in intellectual risk-taking.

Risk manifests slightly differently in Russ’s *The Female Man*, and in a way, writes Cortiel, that is distinctly utopian. Although Janet, one of the main protagonists in Russ’s story, is at her core a “risk-taker,” the all-female world in which she resides, Whileaway, is “supremely safe” for women. Similarly, the new world created by radical feminists in the wake of Earth’s destruction by patriarchy in Daly’s *Quintessence* embodies a utopian-level of safety for the remaining women (and men) who inhabit it. The takeaway here, according to Cortiel, is that in all three texts of feminist utopian writing, “the notion of risk affords both a vision of safety and an idea of attaining self-possession” for women.

By the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, feminist thought had become increasingly saturated by pessimism about the possibility of overcoming patriarchal institutions and patterns of behavior. As Kirsten Imani Kasai argues in her article in this issue, the result was a growing trend toward dystopian writing by feminist authors. In contemporary thought, utopia has become equated with the arrival at an endpoint, and Kasai regards that as inherently boring or totalitarian. She asserts that dystopia, “rife with conflict,” has more dramatic appeal. Cortiel addresses this problem in her article as well, but she concludes that feminist utopian fiction avoids this problem by being process oriented rather than results oriented.

But dystopias, as Kasai notes, are more cautionary tales about the past than roadmaps for a better future. They are full of “imperialist and colonial subjugation ... spawned by the ruling majority’s revulsion of being controlled, marginalized, and disempowered.” In dystopia, the white men who have dominated for centuries become victims of the systems they have created. By projecting that fantasy, feminists are able to engage in subversion of existing hierarchies.

Kasai protests the narrow roles to which female characters are assigned in male dystopian fantasies. Women, in these stories and movies, remain little more than instruments of war or sex, employed by men, having little agency of their own. Dystopian stories have

developed a feminist orientation only within the genre of young adult fiction, such as the *Divergent* series or *The Hunger Game* series. In those stories, young women become the leaders of rebellion against totalitarian rule. However, according to some feminists, the mere empowerment of women falls short of perfection. They regard a world without men to be the ideal for women. If patriarchal dystopias are permeated with violence against women, the simplest solution is to find a way to remove men entirely.

Kasai, however, suggests that utopia should aim for balance, not perfection. The best feminist utopias imagine a world in which power is shared by men and women with the aim of reducing poverty, violence, and other forms of suffering. Totalitarian rules and androicide are not required to achieve those aims, and when women write utopian novels that propose draconian measures to achieve progress, they should not be classified as feminist. Feminist utopian thinking should, instead, guide society toward achievable goals, even if they are currently out of reach. Utopian fiction can sustain the conviction that progress for women is truly possible. Moreover, as Kasai concludes, writing a better ending can help create a better world. She observes changes already occurring in the world that foreshadow the positive attributes of a balanced utopian vision.

### Conclusion

The feminist utopian literary genre, as the articles in this issue make clear, has served as a powerful medium for women authors over the past two centuries to express their fears, frustrations, and hopes. The exercise of imagining new worlds where women are capable of becoming more fully human is an act of intellectual risk-taking that not only exposes deep flaws within the current society, but also is an act that enables women authors to process and give voice to their own experiences with patriarchy. Feminist utopian literature is not without limits or weaknesses; the worlds proposed by feminist authors have often reflected the racial and sexual prejudices of various eras, even as they have simultaneously promoted and foreshadowed important social improvements that have benefited women and other subaltern groups. In these ways, the feminist utopian literary genre provides a

useful lens through which to study, evaluate, and even inspire movements for progressive change.

### Notes

1. In 1869, British women won the right to vote in local elections, and Wyoming became the first U.S. state to extend suffrage to women.

2. Sargent (1976: 275) uses these dates to bookend his analysis of utopian literature due to the impact of Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* (1516), which established the utopian genre, and H. G. Wells's *Time Machine* (1895), which "modified the genre to a great, but as yet undetermined, extent."

3. Historians often refer to the "long nineteenth century," arguing that the ideas and developments characteristically associated with the 19<sup>th</sup> century originated with the French Revolution in 1789 and lasted through WWI. See, for example, Eric Hobsbawm's *The Age of Revolution: Europe, 1789–1848* (1962), *The Age of Capital, 1848–1875* (1975), and *The Age of Empire, 1875–1914* (1987).

### References

- Kessler, Carol Farley. (1985). "Fables Toward the Future: Two Studies in Women's Utopian Fiction." *Journal of General Education* 37(3): 189–202.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1995). *Daring to Dream: Utopia Fiction by United States Women Before 1950*. 2nd ed. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Magarey, Susan. (2014). *Dangerous Ideas: Women's Liberation, Women's Studies Around the World*. Adelaide, Australia: University of Adelaide Press.
- Piercy, Marge (2003). "Utopian Feminist Visions: Transcription of a Video by O. Ressler, Recorded at Cape Code, Massachusetts." [https://www.republicart.net/disc/aeas/piercy01\\_en.htm](https://www.republicart.net/disc/aeas/piercy01_en.htm).
- Robertson, Michael. (2018). *The Last Utopians: Four Late Nineteenth Century Visionaries and Their Legacies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sargent, Lyman Towner. (1976). "Themes in Utopian Fiction in English Before Wells." *Science Fiction Studies* 3(3): 275–282.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1994). "Three Faces of Utopianism Revisited." *Utopian Studies* 5(1): 1–37.