

Women in Utopia

Author(s): Lyman Tower Sargent

Source: *Comparative Literature Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 4, Special Issue on Utopian Social Thought in Literature and the Social Sciences (Dec., 1973), pp. 302-316

Published by: [Penn State University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40468021>

Accessed: 16/01/2015 21:27

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Penn State University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Comparative Literature Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Women in Utopia

LYMAN TOWER SARGENT

ABSTRACT

The positive utopia, or eutopia, and the communitarian movement are views of desirable futures and better societies, including the correct role and status of women. Classical eutopians either abolish the family and make women fairly equal (Plato and Campanella) or maintain the family and make women definitely inferior (More and Bacon and most utopias since 1850). In the Shaker and Oneida communities women were generally equal, but in most other communes they were clearly subservient. The negative utopia, or dystopia, often shows women as equal, thereby indicating that this equality need not bring about the good society. (LTS)

Studying past images of desirable futures, utopias if you wish, is almost always instructive because of what it tells us about how people have felt the life of their time could be improved; it is particularly interesting to take a question that is exercising us today, such as the role and status of women, and see how others would have changed that position. While we cannot look at all such utopias, the overwhelming majority ignored the question completely and we can examine some of those that did make suggestions.

In these works we are given the (usually male) authors' views of the best or significantly better society, and along with these, their views of what roles and status women should have in a good society. Hence we are often given very direct descriptions of the best role and status for women. I have taken a representative selection of these views and have described them without extensive interpretation, since their meanings are usually obvious. It would take a lengthy monograph to do a complete job of relating the attitudes of the utopias that deal with this question to the time in which the utopias themselves were written or of comparing the utopias to each other, and that is simply not possible here.

In addition to the positive utopia, or eutopia, I have examined, much more briefly, two other forms of utopianism, the

communitarian experiment and the dystopia, or “bad place,”¹ for the attitudes they express toward women. In the case of the communities, I have limited my survey to those established in the United States. This was done primarily because these data are more readily available than those for anywhere else but also because there were more communitarian experiments in the United States than anywhere else.

In each example I have presented only those aspects of the work or community that deal directly with the position of women. I have not attempted to present a picture of the entire society except where it seemed essential to give an understanding of the status of women in that society. Within each category, I have proceeded chronologically.

Eutopias

Leaving aside for the present the question of whether or not Plato's *Republic* should be classified as a utopia, it provides a good place to start. Plato argues that women should be treated as fully equal, “except that we treat them as not quite so strong.”² And he carries out this contention fairly consistently by discussing them in the same terms as he does men. Women should be equal partners with men in all branches of life and should be treated in exactly the same way. His famous abolition of the family and his proposal of controlled sexual relations for the Guardians are part of his means of ensuring equality, even though the primary purpose of these provisions may be to rid men and women of self-interest and allow them to be concerned with the total society.

Skiping many centuries because there is no obvious utopia available, we can turn to the originator of the term, Sir Thomas More, and his *Utopia* of 1516. Here we find a totally different concept of the role and status of women—no equality here. In this I directly contradict Elisabeth Mann Borgese, who argues that all collectivist utopias, including More's, provide equality for women. In defending her thesis about his *Utopia*, she concludes, “Thus we feel tempted to ascribe these traces of patriarchy in Utopia, which can be detected in a few broad generic assertions rather than in detailed descriptions of the circumstances, to some distortion in the eye of the narrator-author, reared and conditioned as he was in a strictly patriarchal environment, rather than to the inner logic of the communist-collective structure of the State, which implies the emancipation of women and their equalization with men.”³ Since it is clearly impossible to argue with a writer who contends

that an author got his own book wrong, I shall simply note my differences with her interpretation.

In More's utopia women work outside the home and thus might be thought to be equal, yet the practices of this society preclude any equality. First, the social structure is strictly hierarchical: "wives are subject to their husbands, children to their parents, and the younger to their elders."⁴ Second, "on each last holiday, before going to the temple, wives fall on their knees before their husbands, children before their parents. They confess every misdeed or failure, and ask forgiveness for their offenses. Thus any cloud of domestic discord is removed" (p. 77). No comment seems necessary. Third, there is a premarital rite in which the couple are shown nude to each other; all the reasons given for this practice deal with the possible deformity of the woman (p. 58). Fourth, "women are not excluded from the priesthood, but are chosen less often, and only if they are elderly widows. The *wives* of the priests are the chief women in the whole country, except for the women priests" (pp. 75-76; italics mine).

Most of the rest of the classic utopias present societies that are close to either Plato or More, with the family abolished and women fairly equal, as in Campanella's *The City of the Sun* (1623), or with the family maintained and women definitely inferior, as in Bacon's *New Atlantis* (1621). Cabet in *Voyage en Icarie* (1840) tries to have it both ways, with the family the basis of the system and women equal, although his concern for equality is solely political and economic. In the community he established in Nauvoo, Illinois, women could not vote.

The writers usually classed as utopian socialists (none of whom wrote a utopia), Fourier, Owen, and Saint-Simon, argue for extensive equality. The very recent first publication of his *Le Nouveau Monde amoureux*, in 1967, establishes Fourier as the advocate of *sexual* equality par excellence. In this work he advocates a free-love community in which all sexual desires are fulfilled and sexual activity seems to be the major recreation. The emphasis is on the equal sexual paradise, but Fourier also establishes equality economically and politically. In 1864 an American, Calvin Blanchard, advocated a similar system in his novel *The Art of Real Pleasure*, although it must be said that Blanchard did not allow for the variety of sexual tastes that Fourier did.

Most utopianists since 1850 argue for a clearly inferior role

for women. One of the most extreme was Benjamin Lumley in *Another World* (1873), where the tendency of the woman's education is to be "to qualify her for the position which nature intended her to hold as the companion and helpmate of man. However, she is instructed, though not to as great a degree, in many branches of art and science, cultivated by the stronger sex, the design being to enable her to appreciate the efforts of man and to encourage and comfort him in his progress, but not to take his place. With us women are happy and contented, and words of complaint rarely fall from their lips."⁵

Or there is Z. S. Hendow who says that "women will be excused from work altogether, for they have their homes to attend to, their husbands to look after, and their children to bring up."⁶ In the anonymous *In the Future* (1875), women are placed in two castes: outdwellers, who are free, and indwellers, who are tied to the home and must be veiled. Men prefer the latter, but some women prefer to be free.

Other utopianists are more subtle than this. In *Pyrna* (1875), for example, although complete sexual equality is asserted, it is also noted that women do not choose to put themselves forward for election.⁷ Yet other utopianists are not too subtle: "we look upon woman too highly to wish to contaminate her by thrusting her into the field of our rivalry."⁸

But some utopias do present another side. For example, in *Sub-Coelum* (1893), the author suggests that as women become disenchanted with domestic labor, men become more interested in it. A truly fortunate balancing of changes. Therefore, men do all domestic work except that connected with "the nursery."⁹ In an earlier example, *The Empire of the Nairs* (1811), the author describes a matriarchal society in which the women are free to choose and change their lovers and raise their children without any male interference. The children never know who their fathers are.¹⁰ Another matriarchal society is presented in *Among the Tetchas of Central Asia* (1886) but here it is bad rather than good as in Nair.

And there is Devinne's *Day of Prosperity* (1902), which, beginning in apparent ambivalence, seems to come down in favor of something close to formal equality.¹¹ The ambivalence is in the fact that women are not required to work; rather, they "find their *entertainment* in the education of the children, the care of the sick, the superintendence of housekeeping, in the study and teaching of arts and sciences, and many other pursuits" (p. 77, *italics mine*). In fact, some positions in these fields, primarily in

housekeeping and its superintendence, are set aside for women.

In Devinne's utopia, everyone lives in a hotel, each family having four rooms: anteroom, drawing room, bedroom (children older than ten sleep in special dormitories), and nursery, plus a balcony. Each woman is expected to care for these rooms and clean them daily (p. 128). Each hotel's inhabitants elect a manager, who is to be a woman. Also, there is a board of supervisors, to oversee all the hotels in a city, elected by the managers for a one-year term (100 managers = one supervisor), and these supervisors are also to be women (p. 130).

Politically, there are three hierarchies, two chosen through work and one popularly elected. In the former, twenty workers elect their foreman, twenty foremen elect a chief foreman and so forth, up to the director-general of all the factories in a state. The same system is used for election to parliament: members are chosen by organizations, trades, and so forth (pp. 220-21). There is also a popular election in each city for a mayor and a mayoress, with men voting for the mayor and women voting for the mayoress (p. 223). These city officials in turn elect a governor and governess, who elect a regional governor-general and governess-general, who in turn elect a president and presidentess—all voting only for the same sex (p. 225). "There are also two male and two female judges in each case" (p. 243).

Most utopianists simply assume that sex roles, the status of women and the attitudes toward them, will remain the same in the future good society as they are in the present bad society. There are often various inventions to make woman's lot easier, but it remains essentially the same, excepting perhaps improved educational opportunities and the vote. And in many of the utopias concerned directly with changing that lot, a significant number of authors propose more rigidly defined sex roles and a lower, though seen as higher, status for women.

Other writers have used the utopian form to present good societies in which women dominate. Gerhart Hauptmann in *The Island of the Great Mother* (1925) deals with a variety of myths, but in doing so, he also presents a society made up solely of women (and one small boy) and shows that women can play all roles. But after establishing this point, he seems to change his mind. The longer the society exists, the more he emphasizes the women's difficulties and failures. He then comes to argue that men are needed as a balance or corrective to the women.¹²

In *New Amazonia*, Mrs. George Corbett presents the results of a

group of progressive women having come to control in Ireland. In the far future, their descendants, seven feet tall, now rule the land.¹³ No one holding an important post—and these are reserved for women—can ever have been married, and any slip from celibacy is unthinkable. In the few cases where people do slip, any off-spring are killed (pp. 81-82). The rest of the utopia does not seem to be directly related to the role and status of women; it consists largely of a rather odd mixture of reforms, but reforms that the author thought women would institute. Marriage and divorce are easy; no one may have more than four children; children, until they are twenty, are educated and maintained by the state; they must study a trade for four years, and from the time that they are twenty until they are twenty-five years old, their earnings are returned to the state in partial payment for their previous maintenance. In addition to vocational training, physical education is stressed (p. 45). Along this same line, all malformed children are killed at birth (p. 46), and voluntary euthanasia is practiced to avoid the physical degeneration of old age (p. 76). But the inhabitants are still young at 120, due to a vegetarian diet and the prohibition of tobacco and alcohol. Economically, the country is comprised of small shops and businesses. No one can participate in more than one type of business, and no branches are allowed. This prevents the development of monopolies and the possibility of political and economic control they engender (p. 43).

There have also been two utopias written specifically from a woman's point of view. Although neither quite fits any strict definition of utopia, they are both explicitly called utopias by their authors.

The first, *A Woman's Utopia* (1931) by A Daughter of Eve, is a series of essays on many topics; it argues that women would make better reformers than men, since after all it was Eve who saw the advantage of eating the apple, of knowledge, and she freely shared this boon with Adam.¹⁴ The author explicitly rejects the egalitarian utopia that she believes most men want. "The man utopian is a leveller; and *he always levels down*" (p. 19, italics in original). Her utopia will have class differences, based largely on intelligence. Education will be a major focus of the society. From five to twelve years of age, everyone will be educated together. From then on, a division will be made into vocational training and academic training. The graduate of the vocational system will be guaranteed a "decently paid job" (p. 46). But the author's concern is with improving the academic system, and she provides for schools of art

and literature, which take the truly talented and whose graduates are guaranteed jobs fitting their talent, and a "school for exceptions," where the exceptionally talented in any field may go and live. The school for exceptions is on an island and children are brought to observe the people at work.

One of the few reforms proposed that relates explicitly to the position of women is the reform of Parliament. *A Daughter of Eve* suggests that instead of the House of Commons and the House of Lords, there be a house of men and a house of women. At this point, she comes back to some very traditional views about men and women, since all bills concerning foreign affairs and finance originate in the men's house and all bills regarding home and family originate in the women's house (p. 43). The new parliament is elected under a system of severely limited franchise. Only householders, those who pay rates and taxes, have the vote, with married householders getting one each. The sole addition to this is those who demonstrate wisdom or intelligence, who are also allowed to vote (pp. 56, 58).

The other specifically woman's utopia, an essay entitled "My Own Utopia" by Elisabeth Mann Borgese, also seems to me to include some fairly traditional views about men and women.¹⁵ In Borgese's society, women will be freed of child-rearing, all children being developed in laboratories (p. 218). At the age of two the children go to family groups where they are raised in a setting close to that of an extended family in which individuals of different ages and occupations live together. All children are raised the same, and "between the ages of eighteen and twenty, when their primary education is completed, they will *all* grow up to be women" (p. 219). A radically changed society. However, each of these women continues then until about forty-five, at which point she "has had a full life, has raised her children, has learned from the man she loves, whose disciple she was, what she was able to learn. If now she is herself 'capable of communicating wisdom and virtue,' she will naturally feel attracted toward a young person 'seeking to acquire them.' She will grow into the position of a man; she will become a man" (p. 221). It should be noted that those who don't change "will be considered failures in life" (p. 223).

The contemporary utopia is found almost exclusively in science fiction, but the ambivalent picture that has emerged in the utopias we have looked at would not be changed much by surveying science fiction.¹⁶ Traditionally an intensely prudish genre, science fiction

has only recently begun to overcome its early male-dominated but asexual beginnings. Therefore, women are still largely stereotyped, although according to one author, science fiction does provide a means of developing fully human women characters.¹⁷

Dystopias

The dystopia, also today largely found in science fiction, provides another interesting way of looking at the role and status of women in society. The dystopia challenges some of the assumptions that are often made about how to free women, because in many dystopias women *are* equal, the family *has* been abolished, and society is still a bad place.

I shall use only a few examples, since most illustrate the same point. The first two make the point that women's place in a bad society could conceivably be even worse than at present.

The Master Beast; Being A True Account of the Ruthless Tyranny Inflicted on the British People by Socialism A.D. 1888-2020 (1907) is, as its subtitle explains, an antisocialist dystopia.¹⁸ In this case socialism has come to England in 1970, sixty years after Germany had defeated England in war. The government is a bureaucratic tyranny by governmental officials who wear red rosettes in their buttonholes so that they can be readily identified, both to help in policing and to be treated better.

The goal is an equality of the lowest common denominator; a doctor is dismissed to a labor gang for being too competent (p. 66). Everything is owned and run by the state: all houses and clothes are standardized, occupations are chosen by the state, and there is complete censorship. In this society, the status of women is very low. They cannot vote. There is no longer any lifetime marriage, and single women are not allowed to associate with men during the day because the women's morals are so lax that they are a disturbing influence (p. 83).

John Bull: Socialist (1909) is another standard antisocialist dystopia. In this one, the state, which operates by majority rule, is so poor that its pensioners are just barely kept alive, and as it fails, it becomes even more ruthless. The freedom of women has been curtailed because men outnumbered them and voted to restrict them. There are no permanent marriages. Children are raised by the state—a change potentially liberating for women is not. Men are free to choose their occupations if there is room, which there rarely is. Hence the state chooses occupations and most men must do many different jobs. The state is finally overthrown by

the workers in cooperation with the surrounding capitalist countries.

In some of the major dystopias, a different point is made. In *We* (1924) and *Brave New World* (1932), women are equal to men, the family has been abolished, child rearing is a profession, and everyone is equally oppressed. This provides a corrective to those who see these reforms as a panacea. Societies are sufficiently complex that equality between men and women tells us very little about the society as a whole.

There is another type of dystopia that should be noted: the sex-role reversal novels.¹⁹ Since they all say the same thing with very minor variations, there is no reason for analyzing them separately. In these novels, normally set in the future, but with some set in a contemporary Amazonia, women are dominant and masculine, and men are subservient and effeminate. All important work is undertaken by women, and men are usually kept as pets, or mainly for breeding. In the more recent works, lesbianism is the general rule, with men having no sexual role other than breeding, and this is often done by artificial insemination. In other, more conservative ones, men care for the home and children and leave the real work of the world to women. But for all the seeming differences, these are mere variations on the set theme of dominant women and subservient men; and it is clearly indicated that this is a reversal of the natural order. Usually this is pointed out by having a truly masculine man from the past woo and win the most important female, who discovers the pleasures of subservience to a truly strong man.

These reversal novels seem to make two points. First, as already noted, that there is a "natural" sexual order. Second, that sexual relations, natural or reversed, require dominance and subservience. Hence the conclusion implied is that sexual equality is simply impossible.

Communes

Women have also played an important role in the history of communitarian experiments. For the purposes of this analysis, communes can be divided into three categories: celibate, standard marriage, and modified sexual relations. I shall look briefly at examples of each.

Most *celibate* communes come early in the history of communitarianism, although there are a few among the current upsurge of commune building. Some of the communes did not insist on celibacy but considered it the preferred state. Jemima Wilkinson's

Jerusalem (founded 1788) is an example of this type. Founded and led for its entire existence by the Publick Universal Friend, as she styled herself, it had both celibate and married members. This was a fairly common pattern.

The two most interesting celibate communes were Ephrata (founded 1732) and the Shakers (founded 1776, communized 1787, and still in existence). Ephrata had a series of groups within it. At the center was a small, secret Rosicrucian *brotherhood* that seems to have been unknown by other members. Then there were two celibate orders, men and women, that were completely separate. Third, there was a group of married, but ideally celibate, householders living in the neighborhood.

On the whole, the Ephrata commune did keep the sexes separate and functioning as two separate communes. At times, the women did cook for the entire commune, mend the men's clothing, and so forth; but at other times, these functions were also kept separate. On the other hand, the commune was predominantly controlled by men. The founder and leader of Ephrata, Johan Conrad Beissel, and all the other communal leaders were men. The only leadership in the female line in the community was in the leader, called the Mother Superior, of the women's convent.

Ephrata was a Seventh-Day Baptist church coming out of the Pietist tradition.²⁰ It emphasized a simple life, the mortification of the flesh, and as complete separation from the world as possible. The daily life of the community was based on hard labor, prayer, and the inner life. Each individual slept in a small, two-person cell in which the only bed was a narrow piece of wood and the only pillow a small block of wood. They ate an extremely limited amount and range of food, and commentators always noted that they were thin almost to emaciation. They wore a habit, designed within the community, that covered the body completely, revealing no secondary sexual characteristics.

It seems, from the limited evidence that we have, that celibacy in Ephrata was not a complete success. There are always people who talk about the sexual activities of the supposedly celibate members of all the celibate communes. Ephrata is the only case I have found in which some of the comments were probably true. It is clear that the supposedly celibate married householders were not always celibate, since quite a number of children were born to them. It is generally considered that there were at least some incidents within the celibate brotherhood and sisterhood too. But it is also fair to say that these were exceptions.

The Shakers are an entirely different case.²¹ There is no evidence that at any time in their extraordinarily long life was there a single birth in any of the communities, nor is there any other evidence of any sexual activity. The Shakers also were much more egalitarian in their internal structure and in the functioning of the communal system. Founded by a woman, Mother Ann Lee, the Shakers were established on a dual order in which all offices were held equally by men and women. Each commune had deacons and deaconesses to oversee the day-to-day operation of the economy of the commune.

The only way in which it is possible to see any nonegalitarian elements within the Shaker lifestyle is to look at the domestic arrangements, by which the women did the cooking and each man in the commune was assigned a female member to care for his clothes. Also, the women did the indoor domestic work almost exclusively. The men, and some of the women, worked in the fields and workshops, but they did not work together. That the women did the work in the household was not considered a "natural" separation due to sexual differences, however, but a division of labor based on differences in skills and differences in knowledge. From the perspective of 1973 this division of labor seems to belie the egalitarian character of the Shaker community, but in the context of the time in which the institutions were developed, the entire Shaker system was extraordinarily radical in its attitude toward the role and status of women.

The leading theologians of the United Society of Believers in Christ's Second Coming, the official name of the Shakers, were mostly men, but women contributed largely to the ongoing religious life of the community in complete equality to the men. And for most of the members, the writings of the theologians were probably less important than the daily round of work, prayer, and the unusual Shaker religious services that centered on dancing. In all of these activities, there was equality; there was no institutionalized sexual inequality.

But most of the communes that developed during the nineteenth century were based on traditional, *standard marriage*, with all of the traditional roles. Some of the communities did raise children communally, and some of them gave women the vote in community affairs, but women held relatively few leadership roles and their lifestyles were not changed as much by membership in the communes as were the lifestyles of the men. Thus it is fair to conclude that in most communes it was believed that significant sex-role

changes were not needed to bring about the good society.

In the nineteenth century there was one community, the Oneida community, that did have a system of *modified marriage*, which they called "complex marriage."²² This system was one in which everyone was considered to be married to everyone else and could have sexual relations with anyone in the community, subject to the approval of both involved. An individual who desired to have sexual relations with another individual within the community would ask through another individual, in order to avoid the emotional problems of rejection by the desired partner. The system seems to have worked very well.

In most other areas of life within the Oneida commune, there was also a fairly high degree of sexual equality. At the same time, though, Oneida was founded by a man, John Humphrey Noyes, who led it throughout its entire existence, and most of the politically important positions in the community were held by men. And in general, work was divided along traditional lines. But this was not always true; at times men and women worked together at jobs usually assigned to one or the other. The problem with Oneida on this point is partially a problem of material, as it is with quite a number of other communes. People who have written about the commune simply have not been sensitized to sex-role problems to the extent that we are today. Therefore, we simply do not know to what extent there was a true equality. It does seem that politically there probably was not, but at the same time the position of women in the commune was considered important and they were very free.

As examples of the degree to which the women themselves felt free in Oneida, there is the fact that the women developed a modified dress so that they would not be hampered in their work by the long dresses of the time. They also adopted a short haircut so that they would not have to spend a great deal of time with their hair, time they saw as detracting from their ability to participate in the life of the commune. Thus it seems that the women saw themselves at least potentially as full participants in communal life and attempted to overcome some of the fashions that helped to keep most women in an inferior position.

Today's communes also divide along the lines already mentioned, with the exception of the celibate communes, of which there seem to be few today. Again today, it seems that most communes do follow a system of standard marriage. The communes that have

attempted a system of modified marriage follow a less formalized "complex marriage" than Oneida did, but one that is not significantly different from the Oneida system. Thus it seems that today's experiments are not significantly different from the earlier traditions. The differences come in the number of communes in existence and the number of people involved in the movement. Part of this is simply that there are more people around today, but also there seems to be a greater concern with the communal life than there has ever been in the past. Perhaps more significantly for the role of women is the fact that there are many communes experimenting with modified marriage in a conscious attempt to achieve a greater equality. It also seems that in at least some of the standard-marriage communes women are considered to be more full participants than in the older standard-marriage communes. At the same time, there is considerable evidence that women are in a clearly inferior role in many of the contemporary communes.

There is very little to be said by way of conclusion. Even the utopians seem to have concluded that, as far as women are concerned, we live in the best of all possible worlds already, or that women should be *more* subservient. Of course there are exceptions, and we have the dystopias as correctives to naive hopes, but the message is predominantly negative. Still we have the Shakers and Oneida demonstrating that something different is possible. We can change.

LYMAN TOWER SARGENT · *University of Missouri—Saint Louis*

NOTES

1. For the definitions used in this paper, see my "Utopia: The Problems of Definition," *Extrapolation* (forthcoming).

2. Plato, *Republic*, 452. (Cornford translation.)

3. Elizabeth Mann Borgese, *Ascent of Woman* (New York, 1963), p. 127.

4. Thomas More, *Utopia*, ed. H. V. S. Ogden (New York, 1949), p. 38.

Hereafter cited parenthetically in the text.

5. Benjamin Lumley [Hermes], *Another World; or, Fragments from the Star City of Montalluyah*, 3d ed. (London, 1873), p. 94.

6. Z. S. Hendow, *The Future Power; or, The Great Revolution of 19--* (Westminster, 1897), p. 11. Others stressing the inferiority of women are Percy Greg, *Across the Zodiac: The Story of a Wrecked Record* (1880); Leonard Arthur Magnus, *A Japanese Utopia* (1905); and C. Regnas, *The Land of Nison* (1906).

7. *Pyrna: A Commune; or, Under the Ice* (London, 1875), pp. 58, 64.

8. Charles Wicksteed Armstrong [Charles Strongi'th'arm], *The Yorl of the Northmen; or, The Fate of the English Race: Being the Romance of a Monarchical Utopia* (London, 1892), p. 74.

9. A. P. Russell, *Sub-Coelum: A Sky-Built Human World* (Boston, 1893), p. 245. Others stressing equality are James Cowan, *Daybreak: A Romance of an Old World* (1896); and Sir Julius Vogel, *Anno Domini 2000; or, Woman's Destiny* (1889).

10. James Lawrence, *The Empire of the Nairs; or, The Rights of Women: A Utopian Romance*, 4 vols. in 2 (London, 1811), 1, i-ii.

11. Paul Devinne, *The Day of Prosperity* (London, 1902). Hereafter cited parenthetically in the text.

12. Gerhart Hauptmann, *The Island of the Great Mother; or, The Miracle of the Ile des Dames: A Story from the Utopian Archipelago*, trans. Willa Muir and Edwin Muir (New York, 1925), p. 120.

13. Mrs. George Corbett, *New Amazonia: A Foretaste of the Future* (London, [1889]). Hereafter cited parenthetically in the text.

14. A Daughter of Eve [Mrs. Ellen Warner (Olney) Kirk?], *A Woman's Utopia* (London, 1931). Hereafter cited parenthetically in the text.

15. Elisabeth Mann Borgese, "My Own Utopia," in her *Ascent of Woman* (see note 3 above). Hereafter cited parenthetically in the text.

16. Besides, it has been done twice only recently. See Joanna Russ, "The Image of Women in Science Fiction," in *Images of Women in Fiction: Feminist Perspectives*, ed. Susan Koppelman Cornillon (Bowling Green, Ohio, 1972), pp. 79-94; and Beverly Friend, "Virgin Territory: Women and Sex in Science Fiction," *Extrapolation*, 14 (December 1972), 49-58.

17. Joanna Russ, "What Can a Heroine Do? or, Why Women Can't Write," in *Images of Women in Fiction* (see note 16 above), pp. 18-19.

18. Horace W. C. Newte, *The Master Beast; Being a True Account of the Ruthless Tyranny Inflicted on the British People by Socialism A.D. 1888-2020* (London, 1907). Hereafter cited parenthetically in the text.

19. I have compiled a partial list of such works: Sir Walter Besant, *The Revolt of Man*, rev. ed. (London, 1896; copyright, 1882); Robert Bloch, *Ladies Day* (New York, 1958); Allan Reeth, *Legions of the Dawn* (London, 1908); August Anson, *When Woman Reigns* (Oxford, [1938]); Vivian Cory [Victoria Cross] *Martha Brown, M.P.: The Coming of the Amazons: A Satiric Speculation on the Scientific Future of Civilization* (New York, 1931); Thomas Pinkerton, *No Rates and Taxes: A Romance of Five Worlds* (Bristol, 1902); Timothy Savage (pseud.), *The Amazonia Republic Recently Discovered in the Interior of Peru* (New York, 1842); and Jesse Wilson, *When the Women Reign, 1930* (London, 1930).

20. The literature in English on the Ephrata is generally of poor quality. The best of a bad lot are: Julius Friedrich Sachse, *The German Sectarians of Pennsylvania, 1708-1800: A Critical and Legendary History of the Ephrata Cloister and the Dunkers*, 3 vols. (Philadelphia, 1899-1900); Lamech and Agrippa (pseud.), *Chronicon Ephratense: A History of the Community of Seventh-Day Baptists at Ephrata, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania*, trans. J. Max Hark (Lancaster, Pa., 1889); Felix Reichmann and Eugene E. Doll, eds., *Ephrata as Seen by Contemporaries*, 17th yearbook of the Pennsylvania German Folklore Society (Allentown, Pa., 1953); James E. Ernst, *Ephrata: A History*, ed. John Joseph Stoudt, 25th yearbook of the Pennsylvania German Folklore Society (Allentown, Pa., 1963).

21. The literature on the Shakers is vast and of high quality. The best single work is Edward Deming Andrews, *The People Called Shakers: A Search for the Perfect Society*, new enl. ed. (New York, 1963).

22. The literature on the Oneida community is extensive and of generally high quality. The most valuable work is the latest: Constance Noyes Robertson, ed., *Oneida Community*, 2 vols. (Syracuse, N.Y., 1970, 1972).