

**The Trajectory of Biological Reproduction from Feminist Utopia to Dystopia:
Reading *Mizora* and *Red Clocks* Through the Feminist Imaginaries of
Motherhood**

Aishwarya Basu

Ph.D Research Scholar (English), St. Xavier's University, Kolkata

Article Received: 09/08/2026

Article Accepted: 11/09/2026

Published Online: 12/09/2026

DOI: 10.47311/IJOES.2026.8.09.66

Abstract:

Biological reproduction has never been purely biological in the same sense. It is deeply social and political in nature. Motherhood has been a site of feminist contestation. The central issue is based on reproductive autonomy and the question of who exactly controls women's reproductive choices. This paper focuses on a comparative study of Mary E. Bradley Lane's *Mizora: A Prophecy* (1890) and Leni Zumas's *Red Clocks* (2018). The two novels have a nearly 140-year literary trajectory between them, and the paper discusses how feminist utopia has travelled to reproductive dystopia through this time period. *Mizora* is a nineteenth-century utopian reconstruction within an all-female society where motherhood is separated from patriarchal marriage and there is female social and intellectual independence. But even then, eugenics inherently contradicts utopian freedom. *Red Clocks* is a twenty-first-century reversal where reproductive technologies are already available, but legal access to those are withdrawn from women and the State is the reproductive authority. While *Mizora* shows science overcoming biological limitation, *Red Clocks* upholds laws restricting scientific possibility. This paper discusses this historical transformation of feminist anxiety. Genuine reproductive freedom comes from self-determination and bodily autonomy, not obligation.

Keywords: Feminist Utopia; Reproductive Autonomy; Motherhood; Reproductive Dystopia; Bodily Sovereignty

Introduction:

It is essential, firstly, to see biological reproduction as one of the most enduring points where the "natural" or biological aspects intersect with the social and political aspects, like, pregnancy, childbirth, infertility, maternity, abortion, assisted reproduction and everything in between. These may all seem like only bodily processes, but are rarely only so. The politics surrounding these aspects are profoundly dynamic and intense. Various questions inevitably extend beyond women's biological capacity and ask, controversially,

who may be allowed to reproduce, who must be made to reproduce, who may refuse to reproduce and if they even have the right to refuse, under what legal or moral circumstances motherhood becomes socially legitimate, and most importantly, who possesses the authority to determine the answers to these questions. Rayna Rapp insists that transformations in “child-making” cannot be properly understood merely through medical intervention into women’s bodies, since the process of reproduction is entangled with gender relations, generations, kinship, religion and governmental regulation (696). Thus, reproductive autonomy is considerably broader than the single, and often most debated, question of abortion. It talks about the freedom to avoid pregnancy, the freedom to continue pregnancy, the freedom to actively seek motherhood, the freedom to use reproductive technologies, the freedom to form a family outside of a socially acceptable and conventional heterosexual marital structure and the overall freedom to redefine motherhood, free from what society may call a “proper” mother.

Motherhood itself requires to be separated into at least two related yet non-identical categories, which are, biological reproduction and the socio-cultural institution of motherhood. It needs to be acknowledged and discussed that a woman may possess reproductive capacity, yet may not desire motherhood. Likewise, a woman who may not possess reproductive capacity may still desire motherhood without following the traditional biological/marital route. Naturally, feminist politics have become concerned not just with whether women can or should be mothers, but with the conditions under which motherhood is freely chosen, regulated, experienced and socially recognised.

Feminist speculative writing has become an exceptionally productive literary field for examining and clarifying certain questions. The first question under consideration is how to remove the so-called “natural” institutions from their familiar contexts, so that the definition of motherhood is allowed to expand without constraints. Then comes the question of how to reconstruct the concept of marriage, sex, motherhood, family, domestic labour and reproduction itself. Hence, it becomes clear that utopia is not merely a vision of fantasy of perfection, but rather, is a mechanism or route to expose the historical contingency of existing arrangements. Catherine R. Stimpson formulates feminism as being simultaneously resistant and imaginative, where feminist advocates embody both “resistance to injustice” and belief in “the possibility of change.” She says “feminism is at once oppositional and creative” and follows immediately with “It both rejects elements of the present and proposes a radical future” (2). She further connects feminism directly with utopian/speculative traditions and describes feminism as a major influence upon utopian thinking and speculative fictions (2).

The nineteenth-century American context serves as a particularly fertile ground for utopian imaginaries. It was a time when feminist aspirations were emerging within a society that was still structured by profound inequalities in women’s domestic, political and economic positions. Thus, the utopias became imagined, alternative spaces where

transformations, which were otherwise not possible in ordinary life, could be conceptualised. Iva Balic describes nineteenth-century utopian fiction as possessing “imaginative power”, expressing “discontent, hope and desire” and thus becoming “a logical outlet for those committed to radical changes in society” (2). Mary E. Bradley Lane’s *Mizora: A Prophecy* emerges precisely within this time’s tradition. It was first serialised in the *Cincinnati Commercial* in 1880-81 and was later published in book form in 1890. Balic has identified it as an early portrayal of an all-female utopian society (22). *Mizora* is quite a radical experiment in reproductive imaginary. It is an all-female society with a complete removal of male necessity from social organisation. Reproduction has been scientifically reorganised and heterosexual reproduction is no longer a prerequisite for the continuation of society. Here, the conventional patriarchal marriage system has been rendered unnecessary. Women are shown to be occupying scientific, educational and civic spheres. Hence, biological difference is no longer accepted as an automatic justification of female dependency. This scientific vision has allowed Lane to ask what kind of a utopian imaginary a female society would become if women’s bodies no longer needed men for reproduction. Lane’s vision further emphasises female potential that is suppressed by existing “spatial and social constraints placed upon women” (Balic 24). But an important nuance to be noticed is that Lane never describes or portrays *Mizora* as an unbiased and uncomplicated female paradise. The very reproductive freedom that is being glorified here, also raises questions regarding who the society thinks is fit to be a mother and which qualities can be seen as acceptable to be carried forward into the genome of the society. Thus, freedom from patriarchal male authority is not necessarily equivalent to having complete reproductive autonomy.

Moving across approximately 140 years, there is a striking reversal in feminist speculative anxiety. A nineteenth-century feminist writer can be seen imagining a world beyond their contemporary reproductive constraints. But a twenty-first-century feminist writer can be seen imagining the removal of reproductive options already made possible by modern medicine. Leni Zumas’s *Red Clocks* (2018) imagines a near-future United States where abortion is illegal, IVF is prohibited, and a Personhood Amendment grants legal rights to embryos. Women are navigating motherhood, unwanted pregnancy, infertility, family and reproductive desire under the newly restrictive law. The crucial distinction of this novel from *Mizora* is that the problem is no longer primarily whether science can transform reproductive possibility, since science is already capable of doing so, but rather whether women will legally be permitted to access those possibilities. Reproductive technology is therefore not automatically synonymous with reproductive emancipation, which is discussed by Rapp, as she points out that technological reproduction is always entangled with governmental regulation and existing social relations (696). Stimpson provides a theoretical bridge between utopic and dystopic possibilities as she points out how feminist speculative imagination is capable of envisioning technology operating for emancipatory ends, while also imagining “a vicious alliance along high technology, science, and a police state” (4).

Thus, the trajectory from *Mizora* to *Red Clocks* is not simply a path that traces utopia becoming dystopia, but rather a transformation of the feminist reproductive question from “Can biology be reconstructed and redefined?” to “Who controls the reproductive possibilities that modernity has made available?”

Historical and Literary Context

During the late nineteenth century, America witnessed a sharply gendered social organisation. Womanhood became strongly associated with the aspects of domesticity, marriage, caregiving, maternity and the overall private sphere. On the other hand, male identity became associated with the public sphere and participation in employment, politics and civic authority. Domestic and public separation did not remain merely spatial. It also became economic, political and intellectual. The question of female movement grew stronger during this time. It extended beyond domesticity and it became a major concern of the first-wave feminist agitation. The first-wave women’s movements sought women’s “right to vote and be represented in the public space” (Ottoh-Agede and Essien-Eyo 16). Hence, the early feminist aspiration was to move away from being exclusively domestic toward freedoms already available to men (Ottoh-Agede and Essien-Eyo 16). But suffrage was only one component of a much broader sense of female dissatisfaction. Late nineteenth-century women’s concerns also involved the complexities of home life, gendered social spaces, motherhood, marriage, work, independence and economic self-sufficiency (Balic ii). Motherhood was already deemed inseparable from wider structures of female dependency. The conventional structure of the American home became a potential site of material dependence, unpaid labour, child-rearing obligation and social isolation. Women’s reproductive identity got inherently embedded within the structured institution of domesticity. A woman was not merely a biological mother, but rather, she was socially expected to inhabit a particular maternal and domestic role, meticulously engineered to keep her position tied down.

Looking back at that time period, the female body can be taken as an argument against female advancement. Nineteenth-century restrictions were seen as frequently justified through various claims about biological sex. Female physiology was treated as evidence of their limited intellectual capacity. Education was sometimes believed to be potentially dangerous to women’s reproductive functioning. Some contemporary assumptions also pointed that women’s “unique physiology” supposedly limited educational ability and excessive education was also feared as threatening reproductive capability (Balic 38). Reproduction was not just seen a female capacity during that time, but it was consciously used as a justification for limiting female possibility. A woman’s body became an argument for keeping her within largely male-prescribed social functions. Hence, feminist challenge involved much more than political rights and targeted the idea that biology was a woman’s social destiny. *Mizora*, later, radicalised this challenge precisely, arguing that if reproductive biology supposedly necessitates dependence, then it is necessary to alter reproductive biology itself.

Utopian fiction can be seen gradually becoming a feminist counter-space. It started representing something that women could not access in real life. Existing society offered women limited possibilities. Utopian fiction became an imaginative space outside those restrictions. It gave authors the ability to construct societies where familiar institutions and structures no longer remained inescapable. Marriage and the patriarchal household became removable, gendered labour was reorganizable and conventional reproduction was technologically alterable. Thus, feminist utopia did not simply serve as a fantasy of a happier place, but it also became a tool for critiquing actual social organisation. Women writers recognised both the popularity and the “subversive potential” of utopian fiction (Balic 4).

Mary E. Bradley Lane’s *Mizora* was first serialised in the *Cincinnati Commercial* in winter 1880-81 and it was published as a book in 1890. Historically, that time was significant in several ways. Women’s suffrage remained unresolved, domestic dependency of women was still profoundly present, female intellectual capacity was constantly questioned and conventional marriage and family structure remained the focus of women’s lives. Lane, against this background, imagined a female government, female scientists, female educators, their economic independence, technologically transformed domestic labour and reproduction without men. Thus, the novel did not just imagine women to be equal to men, but it imagined women and their lives without the presence of patriarchal structures at all. *Mizora*, today, is recognised as a product of strong faith in science, rationality, education, technological development and social improvement. Lane’s own language seems to be quite revealing as she says “patient Science and practice” is capable of evolving “the ideal life of exalted knowledge” (pt.1, ch.1). But there is also the darker side of scientific progress. It is necessary to acknowledge the complications before idealising nineteenth-century scientific optimism. The scientific management of humanity can be seen potentially merging with eugenic logic. *Mizora* itself demonstrates this contradiction where reproductive science was supposed to give freedom from male biological necessity, yet it also became a mechanism for determining desirable future citizens, thus essentially labelling some women as having inferior genes and not suitable for being included in the continuation of a society. Female emancipation, therefore, does not automatically become equivalent to universal emancipation (Balic 23-24).

After *Mizora*, during the twentieth century, there was a major historical shift. Reproductive possibility increasingly transformed materially rather than just imaginatively. Scientific developments like contraception, safe abortion procedures, fertility medicine, artificial insemination, IVF, gamete donation and assisted reproductive technologies, among others, changed the reproductive scenario. As a consequence, there was an increasing separation between sex and reproduction, marriage and reproduction, genetic maternity and gestational maternity. Rapp identifies one major consequence of assisted reproductive technology as the “separation of sexual relations from reproduction” (696). Thus, this time period is seen as having enormous significance for feminist reproductive politics, as

biological reproduction no longer remained tied to heterosexual intercourse, husband and the conventional family structure. But then, the focus shifted to questioning who controls the technologies through which reproduction can now be altered. In many cases, despite the scientific developments, women were denied authority over reproduction and the State, therefore, became the central actor in modern reproductive politics. So now, women's movements linked reproductive freedom with the struggle for women to become subjects rather than objects of the state (Cook and Dickens 45).

By the twenty-first century, the reproductive scenario looked radically different from Lane's. Women now possess substantially greater public participation, educational and professional access, reproductive technologies and legal recognition. Yet, reproductive autonomy remains politically contingent. Hence, dystopian imagination does not necessarily require the invention of impossible reproductive technologies. Instead, dystopia is now achievable through withdrawal of access to technologies and rights already available. Hence, in *Red Clocks*, reproductive freedom is threatened through law rather than technological limitation. The Personhood Amendment transforms fetal status into a legal instrument. Law here is capable of retaining control over the female body "despite the potentially liberating effects of technology" (D'Adamo and Baruch 77). To put it concisely, nineteenth-century feminist utopia asked how reproduction might be transformed to liberate women, while contemporary reproductive dystopia asks what happens when the State determines whether women are allowed to use those transformations.

Mizora: Reproduction as Feminist-Utopian Reconstruction

In this novel, Mizora as a society has not always been feminist in nature. As such, there is a forgotten patriarchal past, where women were politically subordinate and thought to be intellectually inferior. Female existence was almost fully under male governance. Women were termed "a beast of burden" (Lane, pt.2, ch.2). Patriarchy gave rise not just to social inequality, but also to women's reproductive dependency. Male extinction from Mizora gave way to a radical narrative rupture. Here, there is no reform of heterosexual patriarchy. Instead, it is completely removed. Balic interprets Lane as imagining female progress without any sort of negative male influence and terming patriarchy an obstacle to human progress (Balic 48-49).

Here, asexual reproduction acts as a breaking point of biological dependency. The central utopian transformation happens when reproduction becomes possible without men. Male absence is initially shown as a mystery. All children are female and fatherlessness is completely normalised. Wauna, in the novel, says "I have but one mother, one adorable mother" (Lane, pt.1, ch.4). Mother is presented as reproductively sufficient and biological dependence is technologically dismantled. Lane's strongest reproductive declaration in the novel is "the MOTHER is the only important part of all life" (Lane, pt.2, ch.3). Reproduction is detached from heterosexual intercourse and thus, motherhood is automatically detached from the very concept of wifehood. There is no patriarch-centred family structure. D'Adamo

and Baruch argue that feminist reproductive thought sometimes imagines reproduction outside the womb as liberation from biological determinism (72).

Lane shows science as a force against the patriarchal idea of “biological destiny.” Science, in the society of Mizora, is the central authority and biology is not accepted as fixed. It is seen as a controllable process. The Mizorans think “we can control Nature’s processes of development as we will” (Lane, pt.2, ch.3). Science is the main reason behind female reproductive agency here and female biology is not used as a justification for dependency. When seen from the lens of a model theoretical parallel, reproductive technologies are capable of “liberating women from the constraints imposed by biology” (D’Adamo and Baruch 74). Mizora is a fictional vision of such liberation, yet it is far more radical since it romanticises the elimination of male reproductive necessity itself.

Mizora has reconstructed motherhood. An important distinction to be noted is that the novel does not abolish motherhood, but structurally reconstructs it. Motherhood is highly valued and maternal care is of public importance. Lane has described how Mizorans consider the care of mother and child as “a sacred duty” (pt.1, ch.5). Motherhood is separated from patriarchal marriage and from economic dependence. Child-rearing has been linked with social advancement and the State itself is maternalised: “The State was the beneficent mother” (Lane, pt.1, ch.4). The contemporary nuclear family concept is done away with and it is expanded beyond the nuclear household, where community is treated as “one immense family of sisters” (Lane, pt.1, ch.4). Motherhood is not treated as just a biological function; rather, through it the social institution is reconstructed.

Lane has shown that reproductive emancipation is insufficient alone, given the condition of women during her time. So a utopian vision required more than just that. Material emancipation was equally necessary and this novel visualizes exactly that. Mizora, as a society, promotes universal education, female scientists, female intellectual authority and occupations are matters of personal choice, instead of what the State forces. There is no degradation of the servant class. Lane focuses on showing occupations selected according to individual abilities (pt.1, ch.8). Here, unlike the real society of that time, motherhood and intellectual life are not oppositions to each other.

Even though *Mizora* serves as a reproductive utopian vision, this utopia becomes unstable under scrutiny and the eugenic contradiction becomes quite heavy. Here also, there is reproductive control and it does not give pure individual freedom. The very science that has given reproduction a new form and freedom from patriarchal control, has become a tool of population management. The questionable concept of desired offspring is seen where children are deliberately cultivated. While mothers are protected, they are also treated as instruments of generational improvement. Lane has written “the child of a Mizora mother is always an improvement upon herself” (pt.2, ch.3). Criminality is treated as hereditary which

somehow diminishes the importance of social mothering, since one would naturally think that a criminal's child, through positive social mothering, would be positively influenced and upbrought. Diseases are treated as a reason to prohibit women from reproducing and dark complexions are explicitly "eliminated" while whiteness is constructed as biological superiority (Lane, pt.2, ch.1). D'Adamo and Baruch argue that reproductive engineering of this sort raises questions of "positive eugenics and control of human evolution", warning that greater danger arrives when individual choice is intertwined with State intervention (76). Hence, female control in a society is not automatically equal to true reproductive freedom.

Another important issue that arises while minutely studying this envisioned utopia is the question of whether Mizora gives maternal liberation or a new maternal discipline. Motherhood is honoured, but with that honour comes certain expectations. Maternal devotion is socially compulsory and any form of maternal dissatisfaction is unacceptable, where "any dereliction of duty would be severely rebuked" and can even lead to banishment (Lane, pt. 1, ch.5). Therefore, even though patriarchal motherhood is dismantled, yet a so-called ideal motherhood is still regulated, which ultimately does not grant freedom from reproductive norms

Mizora is an extraordinary and revolutionary feminist reproductive rupture where men and marriage are unnecessary. Science gives way to biological transformation, motherhood is socially reconstructed and female public life is normalised. Yet, reproductive authority fails to be truly personal and remains centralized. Utopia here is simultaneously emancipatory as well as questionable and coercive. Bulent Somay warns that an all-female society is not automatically liberatory and it can become oppressive in other ways (29).

Red Clocks: Reproduction as Dystopian Governance

In this novel, reproductive freedom is reversed. The plot is set in near-future America. There is reproductive regression, Roe is overturned and a Personhood Amendment Act is established. Abortion is illegal, IVF is banned, and the State acts as the reproductive authority. Women, despite having all sorts of reproductive technologies available to them, cannot access them freely. Ro, one of the women in the novel, experiences a public outburst in a classroom due to extreme anxiety and frustration, saying "Two years ago... abortion was legal in this country" followed by describing how women now "resort to throwing ourselves down the stairs" (Zumas 50). Thus, the novel clearly shows that dystopia here is not technological backwardness, but rather the legal removal of available choices from women. Cook and Dickens describe these restrictive laws as tools for forcing continuation of pregnancies and point out how unsafe interventions can lead to bodily harm (5).

The novel focuses heavily on the anxiety around compulsory pregnancy. Mattie, one of the women, gets pregnant and her pregnancy is completely unwanted. Her future plan is to be a part of the Math Academy. For her, career is her focal point and she does not want motherhood at all. She is socially accused of being selfish for her views. Mattie's answer is

“But she has a self. Why not use it?” (Zumas 225). The central feminist conflict in this novel is surrounding the fact that the fetus is legally prioritised and the pregnant subject and her personal choice are politically diminished. Markowitz argues that “anti-abortion laws require sacrifice not of everyone, but only of women” (7). Pregnancy is not just an abstract moral issue, but it is also a gendered burden. Mattie’s education, future, body and decision are all minimised because of her pregnancy. And this is something she is facing because of her gender.

Red Clocks has portrayed the horrors of unsafe abortion and how it is solely a politically created danger. Despite the criminalisation of abortions, the demand remains. Safe care is unavailable and there are underground “termination houses.” These illegal and secret abortion houses have poor regulation, risky equipment, secrecy and the constant fear of being caught. Another woman, Yasmine, carries out a self-induced abortion, leading to bodily mutation. Thus, political prohibition directly leads to medical danger. World Health Organisation describes these legal restrictions as reasons why women seek services elsewhere through unskilled or unhygienic providers, with increased risk of disability or even death (23). But even then, the very act of rebellion by these women works as a hint of utopia in the dystopian setting. It surely is a very disturbing and twisted sense of utopia when it is achieved through extreme measures like carrying out abortions in unsafe ways with unpredictable results.

The novel also explores the polar opposite of unwanted pregnancy, focusing on the question of the right to become a mother. Ro wants motherhood. She is a single woman whose infertility requires her to reach for assisted reproduction. IVF, though technologically possible, is legally prohibited. Adoption is increasingly restricted, with the public law stating “Every Child Needs Two”, thus excluding unmarried applicants (Zumas 35). Reproductive autonomy is, therefore, double-sided. The human-rights handbook states that assisted reproduction raises rights questions for those who are unable to become parents unassisted, including single persons (*Reproductive Rights Are Human Rights* 115). Ro and Mattie have opposite desires, and yet they feel the same loss of authority and bodily agency. So, at the end, no matter what the condition of a woman is, the common factor is still State control over her.

State does not merely control pregnancy. It also defines a socially and legally accepted form of a legitimate family. A major law states “Every Child Needs Two”, pushing the two-parent ideal (Zumas 35). Marriage is a legal prerequisite and single motherhood is delegitimised. Ro’s concept of desired family is politically unacceptable because of her choice to not include a man in her life. Susan, another woman, is in a conventional family, yet suffers from domestic dissatisfaction. It once again shows that marriage and children do not automatically make a woman feel fulfilled, despite how deeply patriarchy has tried to sell that idea over centuries.

The novel also shows women with reproductive knowledge as criminals. Gin, another female character, is a healer and has alternative reproductive knowledge. She participates in female reproductive assistance, which leads to State suspicion and, subsequently, her criminal prosecution. Her so-called crime is “Conspiracy to Commit Murder” (Zumas 226-27). So, reproductive control is seen to be extending beyond pregnant women and targeting and policing helpers of women, even policing what reproductive knowledge can be allowed to be possessed.

Red Clocks shows a woman's body as not personal property but as State territory. Pregnancy is no longer a private condition and the State legally intervenes in reproductive decisions. The embryo becomes a political subject, and the woman, as the embryo's holder, becomes a regulated body. Thomson discusses an important distinction, stating that fetal personhood alone is insufficient and personhood does not automatically establish any right to another person's body (57). Markowitz also argues that abortion is inherently political and is based on gendered power relations (11).

Dystopia, as seen through this novel, is through restriction, not invention. No futuristic reproductive procedure is needed, since it is already available. Dystopia is created through the act of prohibition. The very feeling of a woman being restricted from using a technology or medicine just because her gender is expected to stick to certain norms is dystopian in itself. Suppressing individual freedom despite the availability of reproductive technology makes the womb an instrument of the State (D'Adamo and Baruch 79). Hence, while in *Mizora*, science was once imagined as liberation, modern law in *Red Clocks* is capable of blocking science itself, bringing a utopian vision to a dystopian downfall.

Reproductive Futures Between Emancipation and Control

Returning to the historical trajectory, this paper discusses two radically different historical moments. The first is nineteenth-century feminist imagination and the second is twenty-first-century reproductive anxiety. *Mizora* imagines a utopian vision of liberation while *Red Clocks* imagines a dystopian sense of dispossession. Both works have the same central concern regarding women, reproduction, motherhood and authority. Reproduction is never merely biological. Rather, it is heavily social and political. Lane has dismantled biological dependency in her work, where every structured institution constructed by the patriarchy has been removed. Yet the troubling contradiction in this utopia comes from its scientifically engineered motherhood, eugenic selection and compulsory maternal ideals. So, even though the women have been liberated from patriarchal control, their choices and opinions are still heavily regulated.

Zumas has inverted historical movement and put choice under siege. Reproductive technology is already available and female independence has been achieved. But there is a political rollback and the women in her novel face the consequences of that in different ways. These women have different reproductive desires with the same underlying demands of

agency and self-determination. Markowitz has argued that reproductive practices are inseparable from women's liberation or oppression (15).

The most crucial historical irony is that *Mizora* represents science defeating biological limitation, while *Red Clocks* represents law defeating scientific possibility. In both cases, the warning remains the same, stating that the question of control is the decisive issue. Neither motherhood nor the rejection of it can lead to liberation. Rather, what is important is reproductive autonomy and the capacity to choose without coercive social or political authority. Feminist reproductive imaginary has historically transformed based on contemporary social conditions. It has traced its way from overcoming biological destiny to the current need to protect bodily sovereignty. *Mizora* and *Red Clocks* are separated by more than a century, yet joined by one overarching question of who possesses authority over women's bodies and reproduction. Feminist utopia, therefore, cannot be seen as one single prescribed reproductive future, but rather as a plurality of possible futures. Motherhood has to be seen as a choice rather than destiny and reproduction has to be a possibility and not an obligation based on authorial social structures. Ultimately, bodily autonomy is the true foundation of genuine reproductive freedom.

Works Cited

- Balic, Iva. Always Painting the Future: Utopian Desire and the Women's Movement in Selected Works by United States Female Writers at the Turn of the Twentieth Century. University of North Texas, 2009. PhD dissertation.
- Colker, Ruth. "Feminism, Theology, and Abortion: Toward Love, Compassion, and Wisdom." *California Law Review*, vol. 77, no. 5, Oct. 1989, pp. 1011–75. JSTOR, stable 3480642.
- Cook, Rebecca J., and Bernard M. Dickens. "Human Rights Dynamics of Abortion Law Reform." *Human Rights Quarterly*, vol. 25, 2003, pp. 1–59. Johns Hopkins UP.
- D'Adamo, Amadeo F., Jr., and Elaine Hoffman Baruch. "Whither the Womb? Myths, Machines, and Mothers." *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, vol. 9, no. 1, 1986, pp. 72–79. University of Nebraska Press. JSTOR, stable 3346135.
- Lane, Mary E. Bradley. *Mizora: A Prophecy*. G. W. Dillingham, 1890. Project Gutenberg, 4 Mar. 2008.
- Markowitz, Sally. "Abortion and Feminism." *Social Theory and Practice*, vol. 16, no. 1, spring 1990, pp. 1–17. JSTOR, stable 23557071.
- Moylan, Tom. "Beyond Negation: The Critical Utopias of Ursula K. Le Guin and Samuel R. Delany." *Extrapolation*, vol. 21, no. 3, 1980, pp. 236–53. Kent State UP.

-
- Nilson, Maria. "Resisting Motherhood: Reproduction in Young Adult Dystopian Fiction." *Populating the Future: Families and Reproduction in Speculative Fiction*, edited by Britt Johanne Farstad, Kriterium, 2023, pp. 111–31. JSTOR, stable [jj.5125350.8](#).
- Ortiz Millán, Gustavo. "Anti-Abortion Laws and the Ethics of Abortion." *Controversies in Latin-American Bioethics*, edited by Eduardo Rivera López and Martín Hevia, Springer, 2019.
- Ottoh-Agede, Blossom Shimayam, and Ako Essien-Eyo. "Gender Semiotics and the 21st Century Feminist Utopia: Implications on National Security and Socio-Cultural Development." *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, vol. 4, no. 1, Jan. 2014, pp. 15–23.
- Rapp, Rayna. "Reproductive Entanglements: Body, State, and Culture in the Dys/Regulation of Child-Bearing." *Social Research*, vol. 78, no. 3, fall 2011, pp. 693–718. JSTOR, stable [23347011](#).
- Reproductive Rights Are Human Rights: A Handbook for National Human Rights Institutions. United Nations Population Fund, Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, and Danish Institute for Human Rights, 2014.
- Somay, Bülent. "Towards an Open-Ended Utopia." *Science Fiction Studies*, vol. 11, no. 1, Mar. 1984, pp. 25–38. JSTOR, stable [4239585](#).
- Stimpson, Catharine R. "Feminisms and Utopia." *Utopian Studies*, no. 3, 1991, pp. 1–6. Penn State UP. JSTOR, stable [20718919](#).
- Thomson, Judith Jarvis. "A Defense of Abortion." *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, vol. 1, no. 1, autumn 1971, pp. 47–66. Blackwell Publishing. JSTOR, stable [2265091](#).
- Wells, Haley. "Anti-Abortion Activism and Advances: A Historiography." *Vulcan Historical Review*, vol. 26, 2022, article 13.
- World Health Organization. *Safe Abortion: Technical and Policy Guidance for Health Systems*. 2nd ed., World Health Organization, 2012.
- Zumas, Leni. *Red Clocks*. Little, Brown and Company, 2018.