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Far off, in a hidden plateau of the Andes, three explorers uncovered a verdant and peaceful land populated and ruled by a lost race of white women.

The year before, two inventors drilled into the Earth’s crust and discovered a primeval world in its hollow core. This was a brutal land baked by a permanent noon-day sun and populated by savage humans and wrathful prehistoric beasts and ruled by an advanced race of female reptiles.

The white women of Herland, the utopia described by Charlotte Perkins Gilman in her 1915 novel of the same name, and the reptiles of Pellucidar, the dystopia of Edgar Rice Burroughs’ 1914 At the Earth’s Core, had evolved to breed without men. Herland’s children were born through parthenogenesis. Pellucidar’s reptiles had discovered a secret formula to fertilize their own eggs. Through accidents of evolution, they had come to rule over women’s lands.1

Gilman, by the time she wrote Herland, had already forged a reputation as a lecturer and short-story author. She was sympathetic to socialism and feminism, though she remained aloof from their organizations. Even as she became one of the nation’s best-known feminist voices, her activism was primarily independent. Her novel fictionalizes (in didactic prose) the theories of economics and evolution of her non-fiction writing. Herland appeared in serial form in Gilman’s self written, published, and distributed magazine Forerunner, which reached, by her own estimate, a few thousand readers each month. It was later published in book...
form. Burroughs, at the same moment, was riding a wave of popularity following the 1912 publication of his novel Tarzan.  

Writing women’s lands was a literary conceit. The setting naturally created conflict between female rulers and the manly explorers who narrate both books. In Herland, explorers’ dreams of imperial rule of a temperate land are thwarted by an industrial gynaecocracy (rule by women, as Gilman termed it). At the Earth’s Core ends, by contrast, with the narrator/explorer returning to the surface to bring back industrial technology to defeat the reptiles and conquer the tropical underworld. Their depictions of women’s lands—for Gilman, as temperate utopia and for, Burroughs, as primitive tropics—embody a larger Progressive-era American debate about the origins of industry and the sexual division of labor.

Gilman and Burroughs constructed their novels around the anthropological consensus that modern industry had its origins in primitive women’s earliest labor. In an era when women’s work provoked fears about the breakdown of families, declining morality, and racial degeneracy, this conception of labor history was potent enough to become the grist of popular fiction. This surprising recognition suggests the need to examine the place of gender in how Progressive-era American observers conceptualized labor history as “industrial evolution.” Contemporary labor historians have come to understand industry as process in which gender was constitutive, that is, it shaped the experience of both female and male workers and it provided the crux around which workplace regulations were first organized. They note that support for protective legislation did not necessarily translate into enthusiasm for women’s wage work. Even organizations and individual leaders supportive of women’s right to organize in unions evinced deep ambivalence about women’s wage work. These paradoxes are understood by historians primarily as inherent contradictions rather than as reflective of an articulation of labor history that described the emergence of a sexual division of labor and men’s seizure of economic primacy as racial progress from savagery to civilization. This labor history engaged anthropologists, sociologists, social reformers, socialists, and their literary interlocutors as they encountered, evaluated, and compared tropical, colonized peoples and women workers, often immigrants, in metropolitan factories.

While there is a rich historiography about women’s turn-of-the-twentieth-century experience with industrial labor, their labor organizing, and workplace reform, the intellectual history of the sexual division of labor has lagged. The dominant paradigm has been set by historians of labor who have examined the sexual division of labor as lived experience, not as the subject of an intellectual debate with dramatic political implications. This investigation of the gendered origins of industry linked and subsumed questions that historians and American studies scholars have too often secluded in domestic and imperial frames. The differing roles of men and women in modern industry was certainly examined in courtrooms, trade union halls, and settlement houses, but to focus exclusively on these spaces obscures the way the Progressive-era concern about women’s work in factories and sweatshops was seamlessly connected to evaluations of
colonized peoples as races incapable of withstanding the rigors of industry. The campaign for protective legislation as the predominant reformist and even socialist response to the reality of women’s industrial work occurred in immediate dialogue with fantasies of strenuous masculinity realized in imperial adventure and with enthusiasm for imperial conquest as economic opportunity and racial revitalization.

The intersection of conversations about gender and industry with those about race and empire hindered ideas about the origins of industry in women’s labor from translating into sympathy for working-class women in metropolitan factories or sweatshops. Rather, it marked colonized races and immigrant groups, both of whom demonstrated abundant women’s productive work, as racially inferior. Louise Newman has appropriately encouraged a consideration of the imperial context for debates about the regulation of women’s industrial work. She posits that the “protection” of women domestically recalled paternalist justifications for empire. More broadly, the campaign for protective legislation encouraged reformers, socialists, and feminists to evaluate the working conditions of contemporary women alongside their study of prehistory and savage lands. The juxtaposition of Gilman’s *Herland* and Burroughs’ *At the Earth’s Core* integrates labor history more closely with the intellectual history of race, gender, and empire and reveals the awkward relationship of celebrants of white manhood, like Burroughs, and of feminists, even socialists like Gilman, to women wage workers.

The reading of these two novels demonstrates how American observers used conceptions of labor history to link women’s industrial labor with the fate of supposed savages in tropical lands. Both novels fictionalize elements of the popular travel narrative, descriptions for sedentary domestic readers of the adventures of metropolitan explorers in tropical and colonized lands. They also reference the never-before-identified genre of primitive fiction—writing (and, occasionally, films) about an imagined prehistoric time or location. Burroughs and Gilman produced books that are at once imperial travel narratives and primitive fiction when they described an imperial world-scape divided along binaries of industrial and primitive, temperate and tropical, manhood and womanhood. These two novels identify a particular historical and anthropological view that recognized in primitive races the industrial past of the civilized. The settings of these novels understood tropical or temperate landscapes as reflections of the evolutionary status of their inhabitants. This recognition engages with a recent history of empire that examines the perceived differences between tropical colonies and the temperate metropole. Popular narratives of colonial exploration and pulp novels about prehistoric romance and adventure engaged with the evidence produced by imperial anthropologists in order to argue that certain races had advanced towards industry, partly because of natural pressures that encouraged adaptation, innovation, and, ultimately, evolution. In temperate lands—like the hilltop Herland—nature was unforgiving with alternating seasons of warmth and cold. The women of Herland faced the choice of evolution or extinction. Gary Okihiro, Warwick Anderson, and I (in other publication) have all noted the
American engagement with racial theories of climate that described the tropics as inducing indolence while temperate zones were cast as encouraging innovation and evolution. Gender, however, is frequently missing from this study of an imperial science that identified the basis for industrial progress. In fact, there are significant links with studies of imperial manhood that have focused on the belief that industrial society had led to dangerous over-civilization. While Gail Bederman and Kristin Hoganson correctly note that Americans sought to emulate the virile traits of the savage, the allure of tropical and imperial adventure lay not simply in the attributes of the savage but more precisely with the recapitulation of moments of gender conflict that, alongside climactic factors, shaped modern industry.

Anne McClintock has described the intertwining of “the project of imperialism, the cult of domesticity, and the invention of industrial progress.” For American observers like Gilman and Burroughs the intersection of primitive fiction and travel narratives defined tropical lands as preindustrial spaces in which the prehistoric origins of temperate industry could be observed. Burroughs looked to the tropics in order to revisit the moment of gender conquest of primitive men over their female mates. He linked the primitive emergence of male superiority as the precursor to modern industry and modern colonization. Gilman saw within tropical spaces evidence that both contemporary domesticity and the industrial system had emerged from mishaps of evolution that had led to male primacy. The marriage of primitive fiction with the travel narrative permitted the simultaneous imagining of evolution corrected and evolutionary history revisited. For both, industry was the gift of temperate races, the product of primitive women’s labors, the realm of contemporary manhood, and the object of cultural anxiety. Their imperial frame provided a frightening historical context even as it claimed industry as the racial mark of the civilized and assigned women a pioneering place in the industrial progress.

**Writing Women’s Lands: Primitive Fiction, Savage Women**

Gilman and Burroughs have been key figures in American studies and gender history. Their re-reading here provides familiarity. It also captures the contours of a far-reaching debate. Burroughs provides a key to understanding the strenuous masculine ideals that accompanied the American quest for empire. He believed that empire would resurrect manhood that was degenerating in industrial civilization. Gilman advocated a feminism shaped by evolutionary theory. Her classic *Women and Economics*, in particular, insisted upon a principal role for women in industrial evolution. Gilman was no less concerned than Burroughs about the fate of civilization in an age of industry, yet she worried, principally, about an aggressive manhood—“androcracy,” she called it—that was stunting female evolution. Androcracy appeared with the emergence of savagery, a distinct stage of racial development characterized by tribal organization and promiscu-
ous family structure. Savages, she insisted, bore particular guilt for a failure in
which civilization had been fostered by men’s industry primarily. Therefore, in
*Herland*, Gilman described a women-centered evolution in a temperate plateau
isolated from the savages who dwell in tropical lowlands.

Burroughs began writing popular fiction at thirty-six, as historian John Kas-
son observes, to replace the drudgery of his white-collar, married Chicago life
with manly adventure in imagined tropical landscapes. Without white and male
leadership, these lands remain mired in prehistory and savagery. His serialized
story *The Cave Boy* typically juxtaposed an industrial society in crisis and pre-
historic tropics. The story is set on a tropical island whose inhabitants have not
advanced past cave-dwelling. Their evolution begins only when a white man,
Waldo Emerson Smith-Jones, is stranded. As the graduate of bookish Harvard,
Waldo has lost the energy to innovate. Like so many of Burroughs’ characters,
he is a victim of what Bederman describes as over-civilization. When the effete
Waldo is plunged into the jungle, however, he recapitulates not only the long
process of industrial evolution but also the shorter history of imperialism. He
becomes the white ruler of the local savage tribe and produces essential industrial
tools. The story is a paen to the revivifying effects of colonialism upon white
men. It is, as well, a claim to male supremacy in evolution. A white woman,
also stranded, merely became part of the local tribe. Her racial status is realized
only when she is won by Waldo in a mortal mating battle. Burroughs’ racism is
obvious, but his vision of savages is complex. While he adjudged savages’ racial
inferiority, he celebrated the stage of savagery as the moment when the male
forcibly claimed power. When his white male explorers mark their masculinity
through the seizure of women, they recalled the moment when savage men first
claimed dominance. Yet, as *At the Earth’s Core* demonstrated, Burroughs believed
that only white races could translate androcracy into industry. He embeds his
main explorer narrative within another. His initial explorer of the African desert
describes meeting a stranded explorer. They are immediately united by shared
whiteness, as the marooned man calls out: “I have been watching you for hours,
hoping against hope that this time there would be a white man” (PAGES). The
second explorer, David Innes, then describes his visit with Perry, an inventor, to
the centre of the Earth.

Gilman was no less an ‘escape artist’. She left an unhappy marriage in
1888, supporting herself through writing and lecturing. Her lecture topics, while
sharing a common feminist theme, ranged widely, from practical clothing and
childrearing to motherhood. Her expansive writings included political poetry,
short stories, novels, and social scientific texts. Her *Forerunner* united fiction,
political observations, and social scientific argument. For Gilman, fiction about
imperial adventure provided the frame for an examination of masculinity, not as
something to be redeemed, but as something artificial. *Herland* features three
explorers, who each represent an element of the manly ideal. Terry O. Nicholson
was the consummate wealthy, courageous explorer. Jeff Margrave “was full of
chivalry and sentiment and all that” (PAGES). Vandyck Jennings is a sociologist. He alone narrates their adventures.

When they replicated travel narratives, Gilman and Burroughs provided the pretext of truth and transformed fiction into imperial anthropology. Adventurers produced popular reading and collected the raw material for social science. Mary Louise Pratt and David Spurr both suggest that travel literature changed with the rise of Euro-American empires and the popularization of evolutionary theory. Writing focused increasingly on racial classification through direct comparisons between home and abroad, metropole and empire, and civilized and savage. These narratives represented a form of evolutionary time travel. As Adam Kuper notes, anthropologists argued that the races of imperial hinterlands approximated the prehistoric lives of civilized explorers’ ancestors. The ancient past of civilized races could be discovered through the examination of contemporary savage races. The ever-popular Theodore Roosevelt captured this idea in his classic African Game Trails. Roosevelt introduced his account of his post-presidential African safari by describing his journey on a railroad, the recognizable symbol of both industrial progress and the penetration of the imperial state. For Roosevelt, this was a journey back into the “Pleistocene.” Burroughs’ description in At the Earth’s Core of his hero’s confrontation with primitive races of ape-men or dinosaurs, however fantastic, reflected the notion that to explore the tropical world was to step backwards in racialized evolutionary time.

Though they have received significant attention from cultural historians and literary critics, imperial adventure travelogues were not alone in offering popular accounts of racial time travel. Americans were equally enthralled with primitive fiction. The dozens of primitive fiction novels, stories, and silent films produced around the same time as Herland and At the Earth’s Core turned the mundane processes of invention and everyday food provision into gripping struggles against violent creatures and wrathful proto-humans. The primitive fiction novel’s typical narrative of invention and innovation was set within a story about male characters’ seizure of women for mates.

Primitive stories fictionalized travel narratives when they placed the evidence collected by explorers and adventurers into primeval settings. The prehistoric tribes of primitive fiction deliberately recalled living primitives. Primitive fiction even offered an outlet for anthropological theory when evidence was lacking. The anthropologist Adolph Bandelier in his The Delight-Makers turned to fiction to explain his theories about pre-Columbian life in Southwestern Pueblos because the archeological evidence was spotty. Novelist Ashton Hilliers, likewise, built his narrative of the The Master-Girl around an Oxford don’s archeological discovery. He fictionalized scientists’ desire for “one hour’s genuine confab, séance, communication” (PAGES) with their prehistoric subjects. What science could not provide, fiction could. Given the paucity of anthropological and archeological evidence, primitive fiction was often as admittedly fanciful as academic scholarship and, thus, the line between the social sciences and primitive fiction was blurred. Primitive fiction appeared in the usual outlets for romance and fantasy,
including adventure story magazines and dime novels. They also filled the pages of scientific magazines and political journals, such as the *International Socialist Review*. Even the Columbia University sociologist Franklin Giddings produced primitive fiction.\textsuperscript{17} Paradoxically, as Nan Enstad notes, dime novels were eagerly read by working women and acted as tools to develop a politicized identity as working women, troubled by their condition and dreaming of something richer. Ironically, the same general genre of adventure literature helped critics articulate negative connections between these same women workers and the savage subjects of literature.\textsuperscript{18}

Travel narratives, based in the present, but located in primitive space, reflected the genre of primitive fiction in their focus on human innovation. The narrative structure of primitive fiction depended on the anthropological conclusion that gender revealed evolutionary racial status. As McClintock and Newman have argued, in an age of empire and industry, gender difference marked racial evolutionary chronology. The status of women became a measure of racial status, as observers labeled the sexual division of labor a measure of civilization. This logic helped feminists like Gilman describe working women—domestic servants, for example—as closer to non-white men encountered in colonies than to elite white males in the metropole. The University of Chicago’s W.I. Thomas insisted that sexual differences were more pronounced among the “higher races.”\textsuperscript{19} For Thomas and others, women of the highest races should be compared physically and mentally to men of the lower races.\textsuperscript{20} Among the lower races, differences between men and women were muted. Women were almost as large as men and equal in bravery. As one observer noted: “The pre-eminence of the men of the higher races grows at a rate corresponding with the progress of evolution.”\textsuperscript{21} Hilliers was convinced. Asking women to “thump me not” (PAGES), he proclaimed that women were “nearer to the savage.”\textsuperscript{22}

Primitive fiction turned anthropological debate about family structure, the sexual division of labor, and processes of invention and innovation into dramas of romance and adventure. Hilliers, for example, used fiction to imagine an evolution in which women were hunters and men were versed in the domestic arts. His plot revolved around the erotics and violence of gender reversal. His “wife-hunter” Pûl Yûn had broken his ankle. He is discovered by Dêh-Yân, the master-girl. Though “well grounded in the domestic arts then practised [sic] by woman” (PAGES), she prefers hunting and fighting. She alone decided that she would marry Pûl Yûn. Hilliers inserted his own narrative voice to highlight how the fateful meeting of the courageous Dêh-Yân and the injured Pûl Yûn revealed an alternative “domestic relations” that, as in Herland, did not include the forcible seizure of women for mates. Pûl Yûn now assumes the “conservative” feminine role and women’s tasks like making needles whereas Dêh-Yân stands alone in primitive fiction novels as a female inventor of the bow.

Burroughs and Gilman similarly reverse evolution and employ the novel to intercede in social scientific debates about the origins of industry. Gilman’s description of ancient Herland initially reads as a primitive fiction novel. The
ancestors of Herland were polygamous and slave-holding. When earthquakes and volcanoes isolated the community, slaves revolted and, in a familiar narrative of inter-tribal warfare, slaughtered the men and male children “intending to take possession of the country with the remaining young women and girls” (PAGES). The women, however, resisted and killed their “brutal conquerors.” Without men, Herland never passed through the stage of savage man’s seizure of power. The miracle of parthenogenesis saved the women from extinction. Gynaeocracy survived and through selective breeding—“eugenics”—Herland was perfected. Burroughs, meanwhile, casts women’s rule as degeneracy by placing reptiles as the dominant race. Like Frederick Costello’s Sure-Dart, Burroughs describes a primitive world in which humans live alongside bloodthirsty dinosaurs. However, where Costello offers a happy conclusion with the slaughter of dinosaurs and of hostile tribes by the male hero, Burroughs laments triumphant lizards. His female reptiles are highly evolved, having discovered the secret of self-fertilization; humans are enslaved.

When Gilman and Burroughs offer contrasting portraits of evolution without savage man’s seizure of power, they necessarily revisit the notion of a primitive matriarchy. As Cynthia Eller argues, Anglo and American observers regularly highlighted an ancient history of women’s superiority. Gilman, typically, examined lower races and animals in order to understand the evolution of women’s supremacy. Among insects, males were merely fertilizers and often did not survive mating. “When the centuries of slavery and dishonor, of torture and death, of biting injustice and slow, suffocating repression, seem long to women” (PAGES), Gilman noted, “let them remember the geologic ages, the millions and millions of years when puny, pygmy, parasitic males struggled for existence, and were used . . . like a half-tried patent medicine.” Existing savage races illustrated the evolutionary moment when the male discovered, as Gilman noted, that it was “cheaper and easier to fight a little female” (PAGES) than to fight another male for her attentions. “So he instituted the custom of enslaving the female.” In Herland and Pellucidar, women’s rule persisted. For Gilman, this had lead to perfection. For Burroughs, the male seizure of power was key to progress. Women’s rule was stagnation and a justification for imperial subjugation.

Gilman and Burroughs could agree that the real-world industrial civilization had evolved from the female’s surrender of primacy. Yet Burroughs, like other celebrants of virile imperial manhood, worried that industrial civilization was too removed from that moment of gender reversal. The act of imperial conquest and, it seemed, the very economic viability of tropical colonies, demanded the recapitulation of the moment of male sexual victory. Such a view of empire led Gilman to worry, not about the fate of colonized peoples, but that the artificiality of male superiority had come to threaten future racial progress of white women. She drew especially from the self-trained biologist and sociologist Lester Frank Ward’s challenge to what he termed the “androcentric theory” (PAGES), the belief in male natural superiority. Androcentric theory, according to Ward, was grounded in superficial physical evidence. Male birds, for example, could sing
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In fact, the large male and the colorful bird were, for Ward, evidence of women’s power to select mates. The male was just a fertilizer who had evolved into the expendable warrior and had developed traits to attract female attention. Ward concluded: “The whole phenomenon of so-called male superiority bears a certain stamp of spuriousness and sham. . . . I call it male efflorescence.”

Nevertheless, men, augmented in physical strength through the force of female sexual selection, eventually made claims to supremacy. They birthed what Ward called the “androcracy”—a mistake of evolution. But, women did not cede power easily. Living savage tribes—the Khasi in Assam or the Dyaks of Borneo—demonstrated the persistence of “amazonism,” or some degree of female rule and supremacy. Other living savages tribes illustrated the recent rise of androcracy.

Gilman dedicated her 1911 The Man-Made World to Ward and praised his gynaecocentric theory as the most important contribution since the “Theory of Evolution.” Ward, in return, would write to Gilman that “no one is doing as much as you to propagate the truth about the sexes, as I have tried to set it forth.”

For Gilman, women, sheltered by their male enslavers, were protected from climate and environment, thereby stunting their evolution: “She now met the influence of natural selection acting indirectly through the male, and developing, of course, the faculties required to secure and obtain a hold on him” (PAGES). She developed a female “efflorescence”: more feminine, beautiful, and ornamented in dress. In a poignant irony, women adorned themselves with the feathers of male birds, to the great surprise of the women of Herland. They wondered if men also wore feathers. Jeff consciously connected women’s fate with primitivism: “‘Only Indians,’ Jeff explained. ‘Savages, you know.’”

Dependent on the power of “sex-attraction,” the female had become a stunted member of the race, with little role in the world of “science, commerce, education,” and, above all, the modern factory.

**Love, Landscape, and Rape**

For Gilman, the assertion of masculinity stranded women in savagery. Burroughs’ expression of masculinity revisits the overthrow of female rule, the seizure of mates by force, and the application of industrial technology in the interest of imperial rule. Masculinity and women’s evolution appear in both texts in inherent conflict. To stunt one was to express the other. For Burroughs, his reptiles recall ancient Amazons or those living savage tribes ruled by women. The defeat of their gynaecocracy, accented by rape, naturally leads to industry and empire. Burroughs follows a familiar primitive fiction plot in which the male hero Innes proves his manhood when tested by monstrous beasts and is rewarded with a beautiful mate. Innes is stripped by the “gorilla-like” slavemasters of the reptile rulers to reveal his “young muscles.” Innes and Perry join a chained caravan of enslaved humans, a “noble-appearing race with well-formed heads and perfect
physiques. The manly chivalry of the narrating explorer Innes clashes with the primitive behavior of the other slaves as they struggle for the attentions of Dian the Beautiful, a white woman. Innes thwarts Hooja the Sly One’s forcible seizure of Dian. He does not realize, however, that his actions have won him the female prize. Because Innes neither renounces, nor accepts her as his wife, Dian becomes his slave—a slave of a slave.

Immediately upon arrival in Phutra, the reptiles’ underground city, Innes plots his escape and his comrade learns the secret of the reptiles’ asexual reproduction. The two explorers, in a fete of misogyny, disembowel the reptiles and use their skin as disguise. Innes is, then, reunited with his own beautiful slave, whom he has come to love. Unwittingly, he learns the primitive ritual of courtship when, frustrated by her inattention, he grabs Dian in a cave: “I imagine that I had suddenly turned brute, that I had gone back a thousand million years, and was again a veritable cave man taking my mate by force. . . .” Innes’ rape of Dian—what anthropologists termed marriage by capture—contrasts with the actions of Hilliers’ master-girl who emasculates Pŭl Yūn by defeating wild beasts while he looked on helplessly. She also scalped other suitors/rapists who sought her capture. Dēh-Yān tried to restore the dynamic of savage marriage by begging him to beat her. However, even Hilliers could not contemplate primitive marriage without rape; the two seemed more comrades then lovers. She bore no children and supplied him with other wives, so he could pass on his heritage. At his death, moreover, the gendered order of the primitive family was reestablished when she immolated herself on his pyre, an act of sati familiar to an imperial audience.

Just as anthropologists described marriage by capture as key to the emergence of the primitive andocentric family, rape was central to the larger genre of primitive fiction, a predominant theme in texts as diverse as Sure-Dart, Stanley Waterloo’s The Story of Ab, or P.B. McCord’s Wolf, The Memoirs of a Cave-Dweller. Primitive fiction in its language and images ranged to the erotic, but its anthropological pretensions as the representation of marriage by capture eclipsed the pornographic. The decline of McCord’s Wolf from a tribal leader to forgotten old man coincided with the rape by another male of his wife (who he had long ago stolen from his own brother). Primitive fiction encouraged readers to engage in erotic fantasies that encapsulated imperialism’s cult of domesticity and its thirst for strenuous manhood. The rape of Wolf’s wife, like Innes’ protection and then assault of Dian, recalled both the chivalric rescue of the white woman outraged and the assertion of manly power. McCord even offered a drawing of Wolf’s wife, the prototypical white delicate, beautiful, and naked woman, born off by a “man-beast” (See figure 1). This eroticized rape serves, at once, as a rejection of the over-civilized dynamics of modern courtship that seemed to be leading only to race suicide and as a familiar image of interracial rape. By contrast, Innes’ rape of Dian, whose pearly white skin is carefully described, represents the first step in revitalization, transforming Innes from a white explorer into a triumphant colonizer. If the authors of travel narratives were mere observers of
Figure 1: Frontispiece: P. B. McCord, *Wolf, The Memoirs of a Cave-Dweller*. The white skinned, feminine body of Wolf’s wife stands in contrast to the dark skin of the savage rapist. The intimate gaze allowed the reader to engage in fantasies of interracial rape.
life in colonized regions, Innes became an active colonizer at the moment that he recapitulated the savage male’s seizure of power. His supremacy over Dian confirmed, he is driven to begin the final conquest and eventual development of the tropical land.\textsuperscript{42}

Herland also confronted the imperial rape. Terry anticipates the assertion of androcracy, “his pet conviction that a woman loves to be mastered, and by sheer brute force, in all the pride and passion of his intense masculinity” (PAGES). He imagines himself as the natural new leader of Herland. Rebuffed, he retreats in time to the prehistoric moment when men asserted androcracy through rape. Terry turns to the doggerel of empire. His explorations—both geographic and sexual—among uncivilized races would help him conquer Alima, the Herlander who has caught his fancy. He recites: “I’ve taken my fun where I found it./ I’ve rogued and I’ve ranged in my time,/ and/ The things that I learned from the yellow and black,/They ‘ave helped me a ‘eap with the white” (PAGES). Gilman’s opposition to imperial manhood focused only on the savage impulse towards domination. Gilman offered a limited resistance to empire, blaming the savage male for the sexual impulse of the colonizer. When Terry’s attempted rape of Alima is thwarted, he is banished from Herland, symbolically returned to the savage, tropical lowlands.\textsuperscript{43}

Gilman, in describing the landscape of Herland, denied that colonies held the potential of racial revitalization through strenuous manhood. Yet, as Newman has noted, Gilman did not oppose the political project of American imperialism. Her insistence on the whiteness of the Herlanders, combined with their temperate environment, confirms Gilman’s belief in white supremacy. Herland is a petted, carefully groomed temperate oasis. Its buildings, trees, and climate are tamed and temperate. Terry admits to the civilization of Herland when he sees the “peacherino” white women walking in tended forests of familiar trees: “‘Talk of civilization,’ he cried softly in restrained enthusiasm. ‘I never saw a forest so petted, even in Germany.’”\textsuperscript{44} The temperate luxury of Herland stands in stark contrast not only to the tropical wildness of Pellucidar but also to the tropical lowlands inhabited by savages.

Pellucidar was a tropical land at the moment of colonization whereas Herland reflected an improved metropolitan landscape in which potential colonizers exhibited the impulses of savage males. Gilman’s assumption that a civilized utopia must be temperate engaged with an imperial science about the relationship of racial progress to climate. First articulated in Europe in the 1880s, this climactic science addressed the difficulties faced by soldiers and bureaucrats living in the heat of the tropics. Such science worried that life in the tropics would lead to degeneration—not the racial revitalization promised by Burroughs. Scientists suggested that torrid zones featured too abundant a nature. Free from the pressing need to build shelter or cultivate food, tropical zones induced indolence. Temperate zones’ alternating seasons of abundance and privation acted as powerful stimuli for racial progress, industry, and innovation.\textsuperscript{45}
This science of race and environment was reflected in primitive fiction. Such novels were often set in landscapes that were simultaneously tropical and temperate. Snowstorms might bury tropical vegetation. Cold conditions played key roles in plots by stimulating adaptation and progress whereas tropical settings reinforced parallels to living primitives. Mary Marcy’s *Stories of Cave People*, for example, connected innovation to the struggle of the cave people tribe to withstand snow and frost. During the short period of summer abundance, the tribe degenerated: “These were not the days of progress or discovery, and the minds of the Cave People grew torpid and they forgot many things they had learned in times of hunger and activity.”

Equally, the humanoids in Austin Bierbower’s *From Monkey to Man* began developing tools, shelter, clothing, and weapons only after the sudden onset of an ice age.

Gilman’s exploration narrative reverses the time travel of Roosevelt’s *African Game Trails* when she substitutes an airplane for a railroad to carry her explorers up and out of the primitive, tropical landscape into a civilized and temperate utopia. The natural forces that acted on white races in temperate zones, without the savage males’ seizure of power, had led to the perfect evolution of the Herlanders. Gilman separates race from gender and locates the problems of contemporary industrial society only in gender evolution, thereby excluding non-white, colonized, and tropical peoples from her utopian vision. In her novel, racial evolution had followed its real-world course. Her fiction only corrects gendered evolution. However, in its geography as a temperate oasis of civilization elevated above savage tropics, Herland was far from fictional. Rather, it mirrored the imperial hill station. Scientists and doctors urged the construction of sanitariums and summer capitals in the hills of colonies to protect colonial officials and soldiers from the degenerative effects of tropical life. These hill stations could simulate the hale climates of the temperate metropole. Hill stations were on the American mind at the moment that Gilman was writing. In fact, one of the first American expeditions in the newly conquered Philippines sought a location for a hill summer capital. Like the real-life explorers of the Philippine highlands, the three explorers of Herland immediately comment on finding familiar vegetation. In the Philippines, raspberries provoked excitement; in Herland, delight centered around familiar nut and fruit trees. Such trees confirm Herland as an ordered, and temperate landscape and recalled to the explorers an idealized version of the imperial hill station or, even, the World’s Fair’s glorious cities. “‘This is no savage country’,” warned Terry. “‘It’s like an exposition.’”

If fairs placed industrial evolution on display as racial progress, contrasted with the savagery of colonized peoples, hill stations emerged from the same comparative impulse. Isolated from tropical primitives, hill stations provided a temperate haven to protect evolutionary status and guarantee the racial progress of empire. As a hill station, Herland isolates the utopia in temperate surroundings removed where gynaecocentric race progress can be achieved.
Women’s Place in Industry

Empowered by his rape of Dian, Innes immediately returns to the Earth’s surface—the colonial metropole—in search of the industrial equipment to cement his rule. He aims to return with gunpowder to eradicate the reptiles and telegraph wire to link the Earth’s core to its surface. His choice of technologies is noteworthy. Gunpowder and the telegraph serve simultaneously to defend the modernizing potential of empire and to deny the industrial capabilities of both women and colonized races. In inaugurating the colonial development of Pellucidar with gunpowder, he describes a labor history that began with hunting and warfare. The inventions born from warfare—gunpowder and rifles—would “advance the cause of civilization within Pellucidar thousands of years at a single stroke” (PAGES). Primitive fiction, like travel narratives, generally privileged male innovations, especially the bow, sword, or the club. D.W. Griffith’s primitive fiction film Man Genesis: A Psychological Comedy Founded on Darwin’s Theory of the Genesis of Man (1912), for example, turned this story of male innovation into violence and romance. The deformed Weakhands competes with Brute force for the attention of Lillywhite. He invents a club, by attaching a rock to a stick, vanquishes his rival, and wins his bride.

By contrast, Gilman echoed the conclusions of numerous anthropologists to argue that modern industry had its origins in women’s domestic labors. Production—originally, the creation of goods for the protection of children—was the result of female invention. “[T]he natural origins of . . . industries,” Gilman declared, “is in maternal energy.” She found inspiration in Thorstein Veblen who insisted that fighting—often for the attention of women—became primitive men’s work. Productive labor was women’s work. As Thomas similarly recognized, in the “unadvanced stages of society” women, engaged with the reproductive work of raising children, were also left with productive work. Women “developed the beginnings of many industries” (PAGES). The gendered nature of savage industry connected the lower classes and primitive tribes. In both, “woman still retains a relation to industrial activities.” In West Africa, young men in search of wives sought widows, well-versed in techniques of production. Similarly, the American lower classes preferred the “heavy, strong, patient, often dominant type” capable of hard labor.

The links between the modern female wage-worker and the savage led Gilman and other observers to measure the racial distance that separated them from working women. They dwelt at different evolutionary moments. Historians have often noted that the study of women’s work obsessed both reformist and socialist critics. Their concern led most industrialized states to construct mechanisms for factory inspection in the last decades of the nineteenth century. Their published reports paid particular attention to the sites and conditions of women’s labor especially where industrial production had penetrated the tenement home as sweatshops. Eileen Boris has noted that “homework” became the prime example of industrial evil, dependent on immigrant women. Activists,
notably those grouped around the Women’s Trade Union League (WTUL), described a double burden of wage earning and reproductive care. In seeming paradox, they simultaneously argued that modern industry had emerged from the primitive double burden. The Socialist Party organizer Luella Krehbiel, typically, noted that among Australian aborigines, women claimed every productive task. Men, she argued, only competed for women’s attention, hunted, fished, and lounged. For Gilman, such evidence demonstrated that industry was once domestic, but had slowly moved out of the home. Bread was now made in the bakery and shirts in a factory. “Vintner, brewer, baker, spinner, weaver, dyer, tallow-chandler, soapmaker, and all their congenerers were socially evolved from the practicers [sic] of inchoate domestic industries” (PAGES). Historians have primarily examined Gilman’s evolutionary feminism for her condemnation of women’s unproductive consumption and its envisioning of collective mothering work. More immediately, the logic that Gilman shared with reformist and socialist critics understood women’s industrial labor as devolution to a primitive state that raised uncomfortable comparisons between working women and savages.

The notion of women as the originators of industrial production actually augmented many critics’ concerns about women’s factory wage labor. Women had become foreigners, akin to savages or recent immigrants, in contemporary industrial civilization. For Anna Spencer, a reformer whose work focused principally on child labor and women’s suffrage, the efforts of “primitive woman” were “the first steps on that dark path which led toward the higher industrial organization of later societies” (PAGES). The original impulse for industry was feminine, but the modern factory, with its bitter competition, was the product of androcracy. Primitive woman was driven to industry by the demands of family and child-rearing. She was “pressed to her special tasks by the biologic push itself . . .” (PAGES). Later, men had been pulled into industrial labor through the violence of slavery and, then, through their claims to family lordship. By the dawn of the machine age, men claimed primacy in industrial work. This vision of labor history understood working women as primitive anachronisms in modern industry, unfortunately defined by androcracy. Metropolitan working women, therefore, became the subjects of paternalist and maternalist politics and legislation that, Newman notes, evoked, even for its proponents, the manners of empire.

The labor history that defined the primitive origins of industry as female and the modern factory as androcentric placed virtually insurmountable boundaries of not only class but also race between working women and reformers. While men were carried along by modern industry in the main currents of evolution, women were restricted to its primitive and parasitic backwaters. They took their place alongside the lower races. Gilman would have agreed with Alice Kessler-Harris, perhaps the leading historian of gender and labor in the United States, when she recently declared that “the language of ‘work’ and ‘workers’ still conjures up male images.” Almost a century before, Gilman noted that “When we say, men, man, manly, manhood, we have in the background of our
minds a huge vague crowded picture of the world and all its activities... full of marching columns of men, of changing lines of men, of long processions of men; of men steering their ships into new seas... ploughing and sowing and reaping, toiling at the forge and furnace" (PAGES). But "women," evoked only sex. If for Kessler-Harris, gender relations helped constitute "the organization of production," for Gilman—the evolutionary economist—the triumphant factory system had emerged from the mistakes of evolution. She, therefore, had as little sympathy for the wage-earning woman as for the colonized savage.

Even as this labor historical outlook created intersections between reform and imperialism, it must also have influenced the perspective of working women. The accessibility of material on savage races, cavewomen, and their domestic labors in popular travel narratives and primitive fiction helped configure the relationship of domestic workers to colonized people. Colonized peoples became, not subjects for solidarity, but the subject of exotic entertainment often aimed at working-class and female audiences—even as evolutionary feminist theory defined similarities. Equally, the popular literary genres used for debates about race, gender, and labor history complicated conversations between reformers and their domestic subjects. Enstad considers the problems faced by alliances between working women, socialists, and reformers that characterized women’s trade union organizing. Like most historians of Progressive-era women’s labor, she accepts that these tensions emerged from class divides. Yet these class divides were intellectually grounded in racialized historical and anthropological understandings of domesticity in relation to industrial progress. Like many of her contemporaries, when Gilman argued that women were primitive pioneers, but modern interlopers, she drew on evidence gathered in the imperial context.

Alone in their hill station, Herlanders enjoyed an evolution of domestic industry, unencumbered by the assertion of androcracy. They produced verdant fields and palatial buildings, not dank factories and sweatshops. The “seven or eight million” women of the “poorer sort” who labored for wages in ‘Ourland’ serve merely as evidence of the shallowness of Terry’s ideal of men as workers and women as “idolized [and] kept in the home to care for the children” (PAGES). The productive assembly line, therefore, was as absent in Herland as fathers. Similarly, when Josephine Kaneko, the editor the Socialist Woman imagined socialist equality, she described only the “perfect mother” who produced “the highest race of people.” Gilman described wage work, not as a reclaiming of preeminent status, but as evidence of women’s stunted place alongside savages and poor immigrant laborers. Even the tireless advocate for protective legislation, Florence Kelley lamented that the wage work of young women rendered them “unfit...for life in the home” (PAGES). Turning to questions of reproductive health, the protective legislation activist Josephine Goldmark worried that industrial labor hampered the ability of women to bear children—let alone to raise them effectively. Still, each looked back to a primitive past of female industrial superiority.
Gilman insisted that women’s wage labor had no potential to restore the biological norm because it represented only a corrupted evolution. Instead, she retreated to musing on utopia, like socialist feminists who sought a co-operative commonwealth free from the “dangers of exclusive masculinism.” Herland is an evolutionary rumination that focuses its political ire on present and prehistoric savages when it represented industrial evolution absent of savage man’s seizure of power. Gilman’s cult of domesticity described the evolution from primitive modes of production to the socialization and specialization of mothering work in an idealized temperate zone. The different tasks of reproductive work, from bearing to rearing children, were in the hands of those most capable and most fit for such labor. The rearing of children was a “stimulus to industry” foreign to the male explorers of Herland. For Jeff, “Mothers . . . would of course work for their children in the home; but the world’s work was different—that had to be done by men, and required the competitive element” (PAGES). The “daring social inventiveness” (PAGES) and “mechanical and scientific development” (PAGES) of Herland contradicted the novel’s male explorers’ androcentric notion of industrial evolution arising out of “struggle—combat” (PAGES). In a telling statement, Gilman’s narrator raged about the collectivization of motherhood by comparing these utopian women to insects. He unconsciously echoed evidence about female superiority gathered from insects: “It was beyond me. To hear a lot of women talk about ‘our children’! But I suppose that is the way ants and bees would talk—do talk maybe.”

Jeff—like Burroughs—would have disagreed with Gilman about how advanced races progressed from savagery to modern industry. Yet both Gilman and Burroughs offered portraits of muscular characters to demonstrate racial character and industrial superiority. The physical descriptions of male colonizers and utopian women combined to confirm the modern female worker as an unfit type in industrial civilization. They were “unfit for wifehood or motherhood” (PAGES), as May Wood Simons warned. Images of emaciated wage workers laboring within a squalid landscape of tenements physically testified to evolution gone array and contrasted with muscular Herlanders. Little wonder, then, that not only wage work but also working-women’s efforts to restore a semblance of domesticity within marriage were met with scorn, not sympathy. The loss of industrial superiority forced women to depend on “sex attraction” for survival. In her 1912 University of Wisconsin PhD dissertation, Theresa McMahon argued that in the “struggle for authority between the sexes” (PAGES), women lost power as “industry departed from the hearth.” Her survival in industrial civilization depended on her beauty. Alone in the animal kingdom, the civilized woman sought to charm the male. Woman, superior in “prehistoric days,” now spent her “energy upon acquiring qualities that would be pleasing to her new master.”

Because industry had become antithetical to reproductive labor, women’s wage work, alone, would not reverse the long history of industrial evolution. Their labor, more than the conditions of their work, represented the cause of racial
decline. When the industrial expert Helen Sumner offered to testify as part of a nineteen-volume study on the wage-work of women and children, she declared that women’s wage work in the machine age “is a story, moreover, of underbidding, of strike breaking, of the lowering of standards for men breadwinners.” Where Gilman dreamed of a Herland utopia and Burroughs fantasized about imperial conquest and manly innovation, Sumner proposed protective legislation. It was the inevitable “Ourland” response to androcentric industrial evolution. The natural twin of utopian dreams was the practical reality of protective legislation. Utopia eliminated the effects of modern industry on women; legislation recognized the androcentric nature of the factory. Legislation recognized the idea that when women entered the factory they seemed akin to primitive marauders. When journalists Rheta Dorr and William Hard lamented the substitution of male workers by women, they resorted to the militarized language of armies and invasion. Women workers were part of an invading army, but they were not professional soldiers. Rather, the woman worker was “a guerrilla, a bushwhacker, entering the fight without training” (PAGES). Most dramatically, Dorr and Hard described the working woman as “the white Chinaman of the industrial world. She wears a coiled-up queue, and wherever she goes she cheapens the worth of human labor.”

Gilman and Burroughs would have agreed with Dorr and Hard. The imperial gaze that they both adopted worked to blind them to the complexity of working-class women’s shopfloor politics, paradoxically forcing an unabashed advocate of virile manhood and a socialist feminist into common conversation. For Burroughs, the savage male’s rape of a wife—the defeat of primitive matriarchy—represented the key first step towards industry defined by the gun and telegraph. Empire represented an opportunity for men, grown soft in civilization, to relive this moment; the colonization of Pellucidar begins with rape and the overthrow of women’s rule, not with the capture of land. Even if Gilman rejected this vision of empire as the defeat of matriarchy, she still engaged with a logic of labor history embedded in popular literary genres and science of empire. Her commitment to ideas about industrial evolution and to theories of racial progress induced or stilted by environment led Gilman—like so many of her contemporaries—to consider metropolitan working women alongside colonized peoples. Both were subjects to be examined for what they revealed about the process and perils of racial development but not as possible allies in common cause. For working women, colonized peoples may have dwelt silently in the pages of pulp fiction or in the flittering image of the film. According to Gilman, like so many other observers of their labor, these women joined savages as voiceless and passive subjects fit for the impulses for civilization. The drive to restrict and regulate women’s metropolitan labors joined a pantheon of gestures, from anthropological study to the construction of hill stations, associated with empire, that aimed to advance civilization in the face of savagery.
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