

Women's Roles in Utopian Literature

A Study of Edward Bellamy's

Looking Backward: 2000–1887

and other works in the genre

Linda Donan

Sigmund Freud¹⁾ once suggested that man's dreams can be classified into two categories: those which are wish fulfilling and those which are related to fear or anxiety. If one can extrapolate from dream to literary creation, we can see the pastoral tradition like the dream-wish and the horror story as the dream of fear. Also the futurist writers follow these two paths. Utopia is a dream or wish they entertain of a better world and dystopia is the fear of a future worse than the present.

Some classic utopian works written by men prescribe a role for women in their future paradise that many women today would find dystopian. Time and values in male – female interpersonal communication has changed radically since the days when every cave girl looked forward to being dragged away by her hair to nubial bliss.

Let's scan history briefly for utopian values. In the dark ages of pestilence and hunger, Canterbury pilgrims told tales²⁾ of comic relief with underthemes of happy endings for the pious and hell's retribution for the evil. We see Bunyan³⁾ sending a pilgrim into a future "heaven" and Dante seeing the ultimate future as Inferno, Purgatory, and Paradise.⁴⁾ Since these writers lived and wrote in what William Conboy⁵⁾ suggests was a time of changelessness, their future scenarios were set in a future religious realm rather than on earth; and because their life was much affected by the forces of nature (where flood, fire, disease, and wild animals were believed to be the wrathful hand of God) we see these things at work in their nightmares. Artist Bosch⁶⁾ depicts a vision of this type of dystopia.

Plato had even earlier called his vision of utopia on earth *The Republic*⁷⁾ but the logic and antique grace of his time, like his utopian dream, crumbled into ruin with the conquering of Greece and the later fall of Rome. The utopia mouthed by wise Socrates and the dystopia oracled by the Delphi witch were both to be forgotten like fallen temples with only ancient roofless columns left standing as a symbol of hope in hopeless ruin.

The Renaissance brought man a vision that he might change this earthly life itself for better or worse rather than wait for heavenly respite, and you see futurists like Davinci⁸⁾ giving man wings, not made of meltable wax like the dystopian fable⁹⁾ but wings of mathematically calculated balance and construction.

When man began to feel that he could "make" his own future, we find a burst of utopian hope in Western literature. But the industrial revolution with some of its grimmer realities brought a counter wave of dystopian anguish. Heartwringing poems yearn for the pastoral

past's simplicity as the squallor, alcoholism, and man-run-by-machine reality gave literary drive to such men as Thomas More¹⁰), Sinclair Lewis¹¹), Karl Marx¹²), and Edward Bellamy¹³) to dream utopian dreams of a world where man is more than a machine extension. Bosch's hell has given way to the nightmare of Miro¹⁴) and hell has become the factory sweatshop.

The next generations have hope renewed as technological advances and labor union successes raise the life standard of the working man. This hope is then dashed by the new horror—man himself—as Germany flexes her nationalism in two World Wars and Fascism raises its Medusa head in Italy. Utopian literature now begs for a land of peace and individual freedom and dystopias omen war in all its nuclear horror, ie. Frank¹⁵) and big brother (Orwell¹⁶) looking over every man's shoulder denying and eradicating any kind of dissent.

But as wars ended, hope phoenixed again and scientific advances multiplied, Robots became man's helpmates in utopia (Asimov¹⁷) and his enemy in dystopias (see for example Kubrick¹⁸) Planets and stars and spaceship villages became the modern future "heaven" or "hell" and other—world beings like Michael Valentine Smith¹⁹) became the modern "christs" or "antichrists" The hero traveler is no longer a pilgrim but a space pilot or a time traveler. And it is with three of these utopian time travelers that this paper wishes to examine the female situation in literature. and how what might seem radical liberation and utopian to male writers, could by today's standards be seen as dystopic Hells for women.

Dreams of the future, whether fancy or nightmare, become more than mere trend extrapolations or projected imaginative scenarios when writers carry a being from the past into their contrived futures. They are whisked into the future either in time machines such as Welles²⁰) or are revived from some state of suspended animation. The future shock suffered by these sci-fi pilgrims delineates starkly the social changes and technological advances the Utopian writer wishes for or Dystopian writer fears.

Male-female communications are one of the many institutions changed by the time factor in many utopian and distopian novels and science fiction thrillers. Currently the writers are overcoming the tendency in the past to make science fiction a male literature with little mention of females except for a lovely android robot or two, or some half-clad damsel to be rescued from otherworldly dragons. Females are numerous in so many works that for the parameters of this study, the writer will limit herself to discussing in depth only three "utopian" works:

1) *Looking Backward: 2000–1887* by Edward Bellamy, 2) *Looking Backward from the Year 2000* by Mack Reynolds and 3) *Love Me Tomorrow* by Robert H. Rimmer in which these words from the dedication show it to be in the same tradition as the two former volumes, it reads: "This book is dedicated to the UNITED PEOPLE OF AMERICA who in the year 2000 will be LOOKING BACKWARD and wondering why they waited so long to make the inevitable transition."²¹)

First, for a short review of our three chosen pieces of literature. Bellamy's *Looking Backward* is a classical novel read in the 1880's as something of a political tract. Reynolds' *Looking Backward* is an early 1970's minor science fiction novel no longer even published. Rimmer's *Love Me Tomorrow* is such a recent publication that its effects are as yet unknown, but it is marketed in some bookstores, not under science fiction nor futurism, but in the pornography section because of its alluring jacket and "lurid" subtitle "A Novel of Future Shock Sex". Such as they may be, all three utopias contain important elements of the novel, the sci-fi thriller, and the economic-political tract; and all three work within their time frame toward the point of this paper.

Bellamy's *Looking Backward* tells the story of, and in the words of, the persona Julian West. He is a successful late 19th century businessman betrothed to socialite Edith Bartlett and he is troubled by only two things: the construction worker's strike that is holding up the completion of his future marital home and his own extreme malady of insomnia. He circumvents the latter by sleeping in a soundproof, secret, sub-basement to his house. His hard-won sleep is induced only every third night through the machinations of a hypnotist, Dr. Pillsbury. Fate twists when the vacation of Pillsbury, "Professor of Animal Magnetism" out of town vacation coincides with a fire which kills West's only servant and burns down his house while he is deeply asleep. The fire-hidden chamber is dug up and his spell is finally broken 200 years later by a Dr. Leete who patiently tutors him in the present day economic realities of "for the common good"-based Utopia. Bellamy's long sleeping Julian West falls in love with Dr. Leete's daughter Edith, who as fate would have it, is a great granddaughter of his first fiancée. His letters to her ancestor had always been material for romantic day-dreams to the second Edith; and when the awakened time traveler asks for her hand in marriage, she readily assents and we are left to assume they will live happily ever after in the utopian world.

In the later book by Reynold, the Julian West character is an unhealthy, high-powered business executive of the 1960's who sidesteps his doctor's warning that his smoking and drinking are going to lead to imminent heart failure and death. He has himself cryonically frozen by another Dr. Pillsbury in the hopes of being revived a few years later when science has developed the techniques for heart transplants. He awakes instead in the year 2000 when technology has transformed the world into a utopia. Jule, the hero, is tutored by the Leete family in the present economic reality. As he becomes more and more aware of what an icon he himself is, however; that reality becomes a personal dystopia for him. In the tragic scene at the end, Edith Leete, unlike Bellamy's young heroine, refuses his offer of marriage and makes him aware that her only interest in him has been that which one of her enlightened age might give sympathetically to a freak. He complains, (then why) "did you ever awaken me?" and she replies, "It wasn't my decision to make, Jule. I was against it."²²)

In the Rimmer version the time sleeper protagonist is a woman, Christina North, who dates Warren Newton, an economic utopian philosopher who claims to be the reincarnation of Edward Bellamy. Christina becomes an actress in an x-rated movie as part of her constant battle to liberate herself from the prurient mores of society around her. She marries Karl Klausner, a super-rich and powerful, but conservative businessman. She tries to escape from her dissatisfied life by suicide and wakes to find herself hypnotised and becoming an experimental guinea pig in a cryonics experiment of the government. It is twenty years later and she finds boyfriend Morrow running for the presidency on a Utopian communebased platform. She makes love to the doctor who awakens her and to most of the members of his commune, both male and female, two of the candidates for the election, her own son who has been aging while she slept, and many of the females and all of the males mentioned in the story. In the last scene she switches her amatory intentions from Morrow, assassinated in the post-inauguration parade, to the vice president and heir apparent.

Rimmer's story obviously has big structural differences from the other two stories of *Looking Backward*; nevertheless in the end this writer finds herself in some agreement with Rimmer's own statement that his book is in the tradition of the first; although Edward Bellamy is no doubt flip-flopping in his grave at such an alliance.

The scope of female roles being so broad, this paper will limit itself to four particular concerns that many modern women (ie. Friedan²³) might enunciate as follows:

1. A woman does not have to be beautiful for a man.
2. A woman is not necessarily weak nor dumb and needs neither a man's protection, nor his control.
3. A woman's province is no longer limited to the home.
4. A woman's relationship with a man or men does not have to be within the traditional institution of marriage.

These four tenants may represent an ideal that is limited to certain segments of this author's American culture and any one or all may not be considered Utopian ideals by other women or by any particular individual woman; however, sufficient are they to the parameters of this paper, for discussing the male-female communication in Utopian literature.

I. FEMALE AS A BEAUTY

Addressing first the question of the necessity of female beauty, let us step back to the 1887 as reported by Edward Bellamy. His character, West, takes for granted that women are ideally beautiful and describes his fiancée:

In that age, when money alone commanded all that was agreeable and refined in life, it was enough for a woman to be rich to have suitors;

but Edith Bartlett was beautiful and graceful also.

In Bellamy's 2000 he dismisses Mrs. Leete's looks with a brief: "Mrs. Leete was an exceptionally fine looking and well preserved woman of about her husband's age." (p. 31), but describes young Edith at length:

..... the daughter, who was in the first blush of womanhood was the most beautiful girl I had ever seen. Her face was as bewitching as deep blue eyes, delicately tinted complexion, and perfect features could make it, but even had her countenance lacked special charms, the faultless luxuriances of her figure would have given her place as a beauty among the women of the nineteenth century. Feminine softness and delicacy were in this lovely creature deliciously combined with an appearance of health and abounding physical vitality too often lacking in the maidens with whom alone I could compare her. (p. 31)

West admits that his interest in her that later culminated in marriage was a direct affect of her beauty.

Edith Leete took little part in the conversation, but when several times the magnetism of her beauty drew my glance to her face, I found her eyes fixed on me I had excited her interest to an extraordinary degree Though I supposed curiosity was the chief motive of her interest, it could but affect me as it would not have done had she been less beautiful. (p. 33)

Dr. Leete, Bellamy's character representing the utopian year 2000 has nonetheless similar attitudes. He also regards women's beauty as necessary. He says, "The men of this day so well appreciate that they owe to the beauty and grace of women the chief zest of their lives and their main incentive to effort" (p. 210) and considers it a utopian ideal: "Women are a very happy race nowadays, as compared with what they were before in the world's history, and their power of *giving happiness to men* has been of course increased in proportion." (p. 212, emphasis mine)

Taking a time leap forward to Reynold's novel, we see a quite different standard of beauty, but a *beautiful* fiancée nonetheless:

..... for him she was the most beautiful woman he had ever known. Perhaps not for the judges of the Miss America or Miss Universe contests. Perhaps not for those of Hollywood who had the job of selecting the sex symbols for films and television. But for Julian West. His taste ran to brunettes, to greenish eyes in short, to Edith Bartlett. (pp. 14-15)

Reynolds' Year 2000 character; however starkly contrasts with the values of the earlier time, in the forceful words of the second Edith:

In your day, a girl did her utmost to marry a man of wealth. His other attributes were secondary. Today she is highly impressed by his achievements. It works both ways of course. Today, a girl's face and figure are not nearly so important to a man as her *abilities*. She is no longer a status symbol for him to display, if she is merely beautiful. (p. 162, emphasis

mine)

The “abilities” of women alluded to here are perhaps Edith’s own skill at agriculture. She farms a good proportion of the U.S. midwest by robot tractors.

Finally stepping forward in time again to the third novel, the reader finds Christina, a startlingly beautiful woman, pursued by men and women before and after her hibernation. In the year 2000 a Unilove church service’s play’s words insist that the beautiful woman is no longer the man’s ideal desire:

Slowly my voyager is beginning to understand that the absolute openness of our minds and hearts to one another makes our happiness far more dependent on the moral and mental qualities of our companions than their physical. A woman of mind and heart has no need of beauty to win love ” (p. 294)

If a woman need not be beautiful to catch a man, then the expenses of fashion, makeup, and hairstyle are removed. In Reynolds’ Utopia, Edith shuns earlier ideas of female attire, saying:

Why in the world should I wear high heels and totter around so that my figure can supposedly be more alluring to a man? He doesn’t wear high heels, cosmetics, girdles or other uncomfortable affectations to attract me. (p. 130)

In Reynolds the fashion is unisex, emphasizing comfort and practicality but in the later Rimmer novel, the utopian people wear clothing so sexually suggestive and see-through that there is no question of unisex confusion.

Questions of weakness and domination or protectiveness are of big concern in women’s liberation ideas and our three utopias reflect the author’s period’s values.

Women in Bellamy’s novel were delicate creatures that must be dealt with politely and when he is the least bit direct in his speech, “The expression or the words or both together caused her now to drop her eyes with a charming blush.” (p. 140) In startling counterpoint, the Edith of Reynolds novel is sharp and direct of speech and it is the male time traveler that feels he must be protected from her tongue. In Rimmer, Christina is frank to the point of viciousness. Her older husband gets some kind of twisted pleasure from her outspoken crudeness and sees her temper as having a positive affect on his world view:

She’s tempted to whisper in Warren’s ear that she’s sick of fucking with aging knights and decaying kings; in the future she’s going to bed with a dragon. But alas, that’s just the kind of thinking that makes Warren excited by her. Her unpredictability. No one can guess what Christa may say next. She’s delightful. She chops up the weeds growing in his stodgy brain. (p. 14)

II. FEMALE AS DUMB AND WEAK

Authors sometimes suggest a weakness in their women attributed to an inferiority of intellect that the modern educated woman would certainly find dystopian. Even in Bellamy's Utopian 2000 women do not take part in men's discussions, but politely leave the table when the men remain "discussing our wine and cigars with a multitude of other matters." (p. 183) The exclusion of women in business discussions is similarly highlighted in the much more recent 1981 novel in which an American bank executive woman is sent by force from the business table in a Hong Kong gathering (Clavell²⁴) In Reynolds, West is confronted with his male chauvinism, "..... would you have married a woman you knew was smarter than you? That set him back." (p. 133) and the Utopian Edith of the 1970's writer continues like a true women's libber of that period, trying almost for female superiority:

..... our I.Q. and aptitude quotients are just as high. The only difference between us are physiological ones Men on the average are bigger and stronger than women, which is partly countered by the fact that on the average women are more deft, which is, if anything more important in modern society. Faster more slender fingers are often of premium value.
(p. 134)

In Rimmer some of the women were but one superficial step beyond the "dumb blond" model.

Of course, their plastic, sexless wives have the proper educational credentials—a comfortable bachelor's degree from a substantial woman's college.
(p. 10)

but this is counterpointed by Christina who is highly educated with a Ph.D. in clinical psychology. Where other businessmen's wives spend time chatting about clothes and parties, Christina is fame and achievement oriented, much to her husband's dismay.

I know that Karl is finally reaching the breaking point with me. My obsession with my current painting and my conviction that if I can complete it, it will be the masterpiece of my, as yet nonexistent career as an artist, is depressing But Karl doesn't understand. Somehow I must make this painting hobby "work." I must accomplish something worthwhile in the world. I must not live in the shadow of Karl's or any man's success. (p. 20)

In her wake-up Utopia of 2000, she is delighted to find that intelligent discussions include women equally.

The weak intelligence of women (attributed by two of the three male Utopian writers in this study) seems to cause a cyclic reaction in their male characters who then assume roles of dominance.

In Bellamy a classical coy reversal of roles is portrayed where the woman seems to dominate the man:

I was a confirmed sufferer from insomnia Edith knew this and insisted

on sending me home by nine o'clock, with *strict orders* to go to bed at once. (p. 14, emphasis mine)

Not only did the woman seem to henpeck, but as Bellamy would have it, she dominated from a seat of power that was other than logic and should be circumvented by deceit if necessary.

Of course when Edith became my wife I should have to tell her my secrets [his use of hypnosis which he needed for sleep] Repeated *experiments had fully convinced me* that the risk was next to nothing if reasonable precautions were exercised, and of this *I hoped, though doubtingly, to convince Edith.* (p. 16, emphasis mine)

In Reynolds, Edith Leete argues that men dominated women because they economically supported them:

Julian protested, "Are you suggesting that in my day, women were slaves to men." "Exactly The end was already in sight, in your time [1970's], the struggle for freedom was already well under way. But so long as a person is dependent upon someone else for food, clothing, shelter and the other needs of life, that person is not free."

and emphasises her point with the admission of West's dislike for women in authority roles:

"How would you have reacted to having a woman as as your immediate boss?" "I don't think so well" "Of course not. It would be a blow to your masculine pride." (p. 133)

In Rimmer, Karl Klausner is shown to be a particularly dominant male. "He patronized everybody, including his wife and children." (p. 7) Christina likes to oppose him but she is afraid of his ultimate power of domination, rape. The conjugal act in the best of their marital period had been domineering and even sadistic:

Even then I sensed that he only achieved a good orgasm with me with an underlying feeling of wanting to hurt me. He took his sadistic business world to bed with him. Often, my behind and breasts and stomach had black and blue marks where he sank his fingers into me, more in anger than in love. (p. 297)

In her 2000 Utopia that sadism is examined both by men,

Jag's theory is that some of this response was due to the built in repression of a patriarchally conditioned society. The male was still trying desperately to prove his power and infallibility (p. 191)

and by women

Ruth giggled. "I remember in the late 1970's that men were so insecure sexually, so frightened of the new, liberated females, that sadistic pictures of women shown bound, gagged, whipped, chained, or even as victims of murder or gang rape, began to appear on record-album covers and in magazine layouts, and in department store windows. Women were shown in magazines like Playboy, Penthouse, Hustler, and others with their

legs splayed. The defenseless but uppity woman was put in her place as a sex object. Of course the whole thing was a pathetic cover-up. The female no longer believed in the image of the male superman. (p. 193)

A more acceptable response to female weakness might be protectiveness and yet even this is rejected as unhealthy by modern American women as depicted in the widely read *Cinderella Complex*²⁵). In Bellamy, Edith Leete insists that she is delicate; “this long sleep of yours to fancy myself in your place makes my head swim. I know that I could not have borne it.” (p. 140), but in Reynolds she won’t even let West hold her chair for her: “I don’t hold your chair for you, why should you hold mine for me? When I am old and fragile, then you can hold my chair for me, Jule.” (p. 209) and in Rimmer we have female presidential candidates.

Reynolds ‘West argues chivalrously that he wants to protect the gentler sex, but his Edith retorts angrily:

[West:] “In my day, women were considered the gentler sex. A gentleman protected —” “Well forget about it.” She said tartly, “We’re not. That was a cultural trait, and had nothing to do with reality. Women are no more gentle or delicate than men.” (p. 134)

and she wises him up to the women of strength in the year 2000:

For the first time we have true equality between the sexes. We no longer have to be cute, or pretend to be silly and helpless, or to look up to men. We no longer are taught that it’s ladylike to squeal at a mouse and to be unable to total up an account accurately. (p. 134)

III. FEMALE AS A HOMEMAKER

In Bellamy’s time housewifery was drudgery and his West says “In my day, even wealth and unlimited servants did not enfranchise their possessors from household cares, while the women of merely well-to-do and poorer classes lived and died martyrs to them [houses].” (p. 95) He saw the housewife’s life as one of great isolation:

..... their ennuied, undeveloped lives, stunted at marriage, their narrow horizon, bounded so often, physically, by the four walls of home, and morally by a petty circle of personal interests. (p. 212)

and sorrow:

From the great sorrows, as well as the petty frets of life, they had no refuge in the breezy outdoor world of human affairs, nor any interests save those of the family. (p.212)

which his 2000 Utopia cures by allowing women careers,

We believe that the magnificent health which distinguishes our women from those of your day is owing largely to the fact that all alike are furnished with healthful and inspiring occupation. [Dr. Leete] (p. 210)

and they have ambitions

No woman is heard nowadays wishing she were a man, nor parents desiring boy rather than girl children. Our girls are as full of ambitions for their careers as our boys. (p. 212)

but their work force is kept strictly segregated from men's, "They are under an entirely different discipline and constitute rather an allied force than an integral part of the army of men. (p. 210) and like the present Japanese labor system, Bellamy still wants them pampered like weaklings:

The heavier sorts of work are everywhere reserved for men, the lighter occupations for women. Under no circumstances *is a woman permitted* to follow any employment not perfectly adapted, both as to kind and degree of labor, to her sex. Moreover the hours of *women's work* are considerably shorter than those of men's, more frequent vacations are granted, and the most careful provision is made for rest when needed. (emphasis mine) (p. 210)

In Reynold's Utopia, Edith complains about earlier unequal rights in the working place,

Women were second-rate citizens. In the lesser jobs they were not paid as much as a man holding down the same position. In the better jobs, very few made it to the real top, no matter what their ability. (p. 133)

and the male-female job-division,

Back in the old days, you made quite a to-do about men's jobs and women's jobs. When Americans would take trips to the communist countries they were invariably horrified to see women digging ditches or sweeping the streets. (p. 135)

and she is satisfied in her own work in 2000,

I'm a farmer The farm I work is out in the middle West I suppose Nebraska and Kansas I supervise twenty tractors. That is, I do for my six-hour shift The tractors are automated. I simply supervise them. (p. 102)

In Rimmer, Christina feels so frustrated and insignificant without achievement that she considers suicide. "The splutter I would make when I landed [from jumping off a famous building] obviously wouldn't compare with King Kong's. Anyway most of the time I felt so insignificant that I was sure that I would evaporate on the way down. (p. 212)

In the Utopian 2000 she is joyfully powerful as the consort to the president and at his assassination to his vice-president now president. She literally lifts him off the streets in the shooting and commands him to take up his duty with her help.

IV. FEMALE AS WIFE

Bellamy reported that the romanticism of his own day was greatly warped by economic considerations. He said that story writers, aware of social conditions would find it difficult

if not impossible to write novels without the contrasts of rich and poor. He couldn't imagine "a romance in which there should indeed be love galore, but love unfettered by artificial barriers created by differences of station or possession, owning no other law but that of the heart." (p. 138) as he found in the Utopian libraries of the year 2000. Before, the economics of the relationship had disallowed women to be the aggressor or even to express their feelings openly:

Nothing was therefore considered more shocking to the proprieties than that a woman should betray a fondness for a man before he had indicated a desire to marry her. Why, we actually have in our libraries books written for no other purpose than to discuss the question whether under any conceivable circumstances, a woman might, without discredit to her sex, reveal an unsolicited love When for a woman to proffer her love to a man was in effect to invite him to assume the burden of her support, it is easy to see that pride and delicacy might well have checked the promptings of the heart. (p. 217)

In the enlightened 2000 Julian is happy to find that girls can speak their minds on the subject of love and matrimony and do so without deceit or circumlocution.

..... the girls of the twentieth century tell their love There is no more pretense of a concealment of feeling on their part than on the part of their lovers. Coquetry would be as despised in a girl as in a man. Affected coldness, which in your day rarely deceived a lover, would deceive him wholly now, for no one thinks of practicing it. (p. 127)

Equal opportunity in employment and the end of flirtatiousness is a utopian ideal, this writer can certainly hope, as Bellamy did, to see arrive by 2000.

In Reynolds, Edith Leete questions if love could have really even existed between marital partners in the past.

A true love could only be maintained between peers, between equals. As long as woman had been the under-sex, dependent upon a man for her living and that of her children, real romance was largely a farce. Love cannot reach its heights between inferiors and superiors. (p. 137)

and she firmly believes in the superiority of her own state of affairs although Reynolds utopia is not romantic and marriages are formed on very pragmatic principles.

Love we don't have any more, Jule. The relationship between man and woman has *evolved*. I said I had a crush on you But I seem to have given a wrong impression. Don't you see how impractical any relationship between us would be? (emphasis mine) (p. 203)

This was a rather abrupt reply to his marriage proposal! Bellamy had disliked marriage in his past because it had been ensconced in a social deceit,

..... the fact that women were dependent for support on men made the woman in reality the one chiefly benefitted by marriage. The fact appears to have been coarsely enough recognized among the lower classes, while among the more polished it was glossed over by a system of elab-

orate conventionalities which aimed to carry the precisely opposite meaning, namely that the man was the party chiefly benefited. To keep up this convention it was essential that he should always seem the suitor. (p. 216)

but unlike luckless Reynolds' Jule, Bellamy's Julian does bond himself to monogamy with Edith even though legal marriages no longer exist.

In Bellamy's time we see women waiting to be proposed to without a hint of their carefully hidden yearning but in Reynolds when Edith Leete hears that West's days are numbered (before his cryonics trip), *she* immediately proposes to *him*, in what one supposed was true and noble spirit of love and not merely a consideration of inheritance, but Jule loses her self-sacrificing love to enter the future where he is rejected by the future Edith who spurns the whole idea of marriage,

Look at the Greeks. Even during the so-called Golden Age, they considered women little more than animals they resorted to homosexuality for their real romances, figuring that there couldn't be true love except between equals And the Christians weren't any better. Remember in Ephesians? Wives submit yourselves unto your husbands, as unto the Lord." (p. 133)

In Rimmer we have Christina dissatisfied in the suburban housewife role with her rich husband and pleasantly shocked to find a variety of non-monogamous relationships as options in the year 2000. People live in "love groups" communally, homosexuality groups, or have pair bonding which differs from marriage in that fidelity in sex wasn't necessarily part of the bond. Prostitution was legalized and supervised with companions trained as therapists for the unbalanced. Sexual performances are so revered that they are not only available for viewing day and night on the holographic televisions but are also a part of the church services. Obviously the problem of divorce is unheard of.

In conclusion, we can find that Utopia can be anything from a heaven-bound beanstalk to climb, or a trip to-other worlds, or-others' beds. Whatever it is now or shall be in the future, it is the making of dreams. The utopian dreams of male writers change with the change of society are reflected by these three writers which seem dystopian failures compared to the hopes of today's females. Most women living today may live to see the year 2000 and one hopes to find it more enlightened and delightful than any of the *Looking Backward* novelists in the pasts has yet dared to dream.

Notes and References

- 1) Freud, Sigmund *The Interpretation of Dreams* translated by A.A. Brill (New York: Modern Library, 1950)
- 2) Chaucer, Geoffrey, *The Canterbury Tales* translated into modern English by Neville Coghill (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1952)
- 3) Bunyan, John *The Pilgrim's Progress: from this world to that which is to come*, ed. by James B. Wharey (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960)
- 4) Dante, Alighieri *The Inferno* translated in verse by John Ciardi (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1954) and *Purgatorio* (New York: New American Library, 1961)
- 5) Conboy, William A. *The Challenge of the Future, Visions and Versions* (Lawrence, Kansas: The University of Kansas, 1979)
- 6) Bosch, Hieronymous "Hell" from the "Gardens of Delights" tryptich pictured in Horst Woldemar Janson *History of Art* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1969)
- 7) Plato *The Republic* reprinted in *The Dialogues of Plato* translated by B. Jowett (New York: Random House, 1937)
- 8) DaVinci, Leonardo excerpts from the journals in Horst Woldemar Janson *op cit*
- 9) anonymous "Icarus" in Sir James George *Golden Bough* (New York: The Mac Millan Company 1935)
- 10) More, Thomas *Utopia* from the *Complete Works* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963)
- 11) Lewis, Sinclair *Babbitt* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1933)
- 12) Marx, Karl *Capital: The Communist Manifesto and other Writings* (New York: The Modern Library, 1932)
- 13) Bellamy, Edward *Looking Backward* (New Jersey: Harvard University Press, 1967) all quotes from this source
- 14) Miro "untitled" pictured in Horst Woldemar Janson *op cit*
- 15) Frank, Pat *Alas Babylon* (New York: Bantam, 1976)
- 16) Orwell, George *1984* (Middlesex England: Penguin Books, Ltd. 1949)
- 17) Asimov, Isaac *The Caves of Steel* (London, Granada Publishing Co., 1977)
- 18) Kubrick, Stanley *2001: A Space Odyssey* (movie 1969)
- 19) Heinlein, Robert A. *Stranger in a Strange Land*, (London, Putnam, 1961)
- 20) Welles, Herbert George, *Time Machine* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977)
- 21) Rimmer, Robert, *Love Me Tomorrow* (San Francisco, Grove Press, 1981) all quotations are from this volume
- 22) Reyonolds, Mack *Looking Backward from the Year 2000* (Dorchester: Dorchester Printing Press, 1976) all quotations are from this volume
- 23) Friedan, Betty *Female Mystique* (New York, Dell, 1977)
- 24) Clavell, James *Noble House: A novel of Contemporary Hong Kong* (New York: Dell Publishing, 1982)
- 25) Dowling, Colette *Cinderella Complex: A Woman's Hidden Fear of Independence* (New York: Summit Books, 1981)