

# Feminist Thought and Science Fiction: From Deconstruction to Affirmation

Elektra Paschali

Albert Ludwig University, Freiburg  
Germany

Abstract:

Reading feminist Science Fiction from the 60s until nowadays, we can trace the development of feminist theories towards a deconstruction of the categories that constitute the notion of 'woman', such as 'gender' or 'body'. SF, adopting feminist theoretical ideas goes beyond mere deconstruction to affirmative reconstruction of a world freed from bias and set social categories, while offering a space for inspiration and experimentation with new ideas. The article presents some central feminist theoretical ideas around the notion of 'woman', 'gender' and 'body' and the concept of 'gender/militarization' through a parallel reading of important feminist SF novels and points out spaces where feminist theory expands ideas developed in SF narratives.

Keywords: feminism, science fiction, women, gender, body, militarization, Ursula K. Le Guin

## Feminist reading-writing

*"Flying is woman's gesture- flying in language and making it fly. We have all learned the art of flying and its numerous techniques; ...They (women) go by, fly the coop, take pleasure in jumbling the order of space, in disorienting it...turning propriety upside down." Helene Cixous, "The laugh of the Medusa"*

The making of the history (or several histories) of Women can be traced in feminist theory, writing and cultural production. Language and text becomes a political tool and a mode of expression. Being sensible towards words, women create their own meanings in their texts, literature and political speech by using symbolic, imaginative language and they find space of expression in the most hidden and unknown places. One of the most creative attempts of literary expression is the genre of feminist Science Fiction. It is there, in the heart of male dominion of space-crafts, nasty aliens, colonial universal empires and easy riders of the galaxy (sic), where women have tried to find a space to speak, to invent their own future and demand the right to participate in other possible worlds. The fight for a literary space for women within Science Fiction resembles the fight of women for emancipation and equal access to political and social space. Women writers are not satisfied with a minor participation in a male's space. They demand and create a new space, a genre from women, to women, for women about women. [1]

Reading through feminist Science Fiction from the 70s until nowadays, we are able to track the changes of issues and discourses that the feminist movement has focused on and those which the novelists have reflected upon in their works. After all, there is a special link between feminist theoretical thought and feminist literature, because: “Feminism is as much a way of reading as it is a way of writing” (Staskowski, 2004: 17). In a way, the genre of Science Fiction expresses a culture’s political unconscious and therefore seems useful as a tool of “moving-beyond-conventions” in order to understand deep rooted social ideas, imaginative utopias, future hopes, social aims of a certain historical time and parallel to move beyond these by creating new possibilities of social life. Science Fiction is a “thought experiment” (LeGuin, 1979) similar to a scientific experiment and as Ursula LeGuin points out: “Einstein shoots a light ray through a moving elevator; Schroedinger puts a cat in a box. There is no elevator, no cat, no box. The experiment is performed, the question is asked, in the mind.” (LeGuin, 1978:136). [2]

### **Thinking-Out-Of-The-Box**

*“I can’t imagine a two-sexed egalitarian society and I don’t believe anyone else can, either... Well, here you have the whole thing about SF. Where else could one even try out such visions!” Joanna Russ, “Reflections on Science Fiction”*

Feminist utopias are places of union, reinvention and empowerment. They nurture and embrace the Other rather than fear and fight against it. They put the Other, the Woman or the Alien in its centre and try to erase isolation, racism and discrimination. They are a space of freedom, a freedom from boundaries parallel to what claimed by science, a freedom from time and geography. The feminist utopian novel is a place where theories of power can be addressed through the construction of narratives that test and stretch the boundaries of authority and oppression, drawing from feminist theories and discourses. The symbolic use of the “Other” aims to explore the experiences of hegemonic traditional ‘others’ (Hollinger, 2003), such as women, subalterns, deviants. Through imagination, feminist narratives not only picture a new possible world, but introduce powerful critical views on the status quo, the late-capitalist society, the patriarchal systems and the bourgeoisie, offering imaginative alternatives based on radical inspiration (Csisery-Ronay Jr., 2003; Hollinger, 2003). Science fiction is a manifestation of the archetype in myth, legend, dogma, art. It is a literature with the potential to face the open universe, ironically, innovatively and honestly, because it does not aim to predict, explain or guide, it only wishes to challenge the limits of our cognitive skills. Science fiction uses the mythmaking faculty to comprehend the world in which we live, a world profoundly shaped and changed by science and technology. Its originality is that it uses the mythmaking faculty on new material. As LeGuin argues: “All fiction is metaphor. Science fiction is metaphor. What sets it apart from older forms of fiction seems to be its use of new metaphors, drawn from certain great dominants of our contemporary life- science, all the sciences, and technology, and the relativistic and the historical outlook, among them. . Space travel is one of these metaphors; so is an alternative society, an alternative biology; the future is another. The future in fiction is a metaphor” (LeGuin, 1969: preface) [3]

What is so interesting for theory in the re-reading of feminist SF stories is that it enables to follow an on-going dialogue around major feminist concerns and makes possible to trace a development, reconsideration, setting of new questions within

feminist SF addressed to feminist theory. On the other hand, feminist theory can often recognize and analyse women's concerns expressed in SF stories. The relation between feminist thought and feminist Science Fiction is two sided. Not only does feminist SF express ideas discussed within feminist theoretical circles, but often feminist theory finds inspiration in feminist SF. Contemporary feminist thought shares the concerns of contemporary Science Fiction and provides the best means for interpretation. Science Fiction in the best of cases makes the patriarchal structures which constrain women obvious and perceptible and it operates as a powerful educational tool which uses exaggeration to make women's lack of power visible and discussable. The texts are popular and accessible- and certainly not revered by traditional scholars (Barr, 1987: xx). [4]

Feminist SF narratives deal with issues that are central in feminist theoretical discourses, such as sex, gender, sexuality, power, language, nature and technology. Feminist theory has often found in SF, a place for fruitful "thinking out of the box" and has set under analysis issues and ideas found within SF narratives. For the last forty years, feminist SF has mirrored contemporary feminist theoretical debate and activism, sometimes even being ahead of it. The visionary character of feminist SF's narratives has been generating a knowledge production that has been later expanded into the theoretical field of feminist thought. [5]

## **Linking feminist theory to SF literature**

### **Common ideas, different grounds**

There are multiple and shifting sites of feminist identities expressed within and formed by feminist thought- theory and activism. Theory has always served the important task of resourcing and inspiring feminist movements. Feminism changes and re-invents itself according to the socio-historical conditions of a time. The meaning of feminism changes therefore as the different feminist theories change over time. Given that women live in so many different social, economic, cultural and political circumstances, there can be no single theory of women's subordination. What theories try to explain and give answers to are questions such as: what defines women as a social group with shared interests? How are women subordinated as "women»? How specific events might be part of social oppression based on sex, rather than unique individual misfortunes? How can women resist subordination? (Mc Cann & Kim, 2004: 1). [6]

To answer these questions, a structured organization of knowledge is necessary. Theory offers ontological (theories of being and reality), epistemological (theories of knowledge production) and political (relations and practices of power) aspects that aim to constitute a basis for effective politics. Feminism does not constitute a unified vision. This is perhaps one of the reasons why many feminist writers are attracted to science fiction, for its fluidity of form allows a variety of approach. Although Science Fiction stories have a unique literary value, it is mostly political visions that fuel the narrative drive and create visions of emancipatory politics of the future. Feminist Science Fiction gives answers through literary production to the same questions that feminist theories try to analyse within discourses. And as feminist theory is of value only when it makes sense of women's situation, accounts for women's experiences and points to effective strategies for change (Mc Cann & Kim, 2004: 3), feminist Science Fiction makes sense only where related to the reality of women in given

social, political and cultural contexts. As Lefanu has explained in her “Feminism and Science Fiction”: “Feminism questions a given order in political terms, while science fiction questions it in imaginative terms. If science fiction demands our acceptance of a relativistic universe, then feminism demands, no less, our acceptance of a relativistic social order. Nothing, in these terms, is natural, least of all the cultural notions of ‘woman’ and ‘man’” (Lefanu, 1989: 100). [7]

Much of the re-visioning of constructed ideas, at least in the last forty years of Science Fiction, has been inspired by feminist principles. It seems that the goal was always to subvert ever-present social constructions, creating metaphors for the future “where any assumption can be tested and any rule can be rewritten” (LeGuin, 1978: intro). The re-construction includes the rules of who is on top, and what gender means, and who gets to be free. *The Left Hand of Darkness*, which came out in 1967, was an early experiment in deconstructing gender. Questions like, “What is it to be a man? What is it to be a woman?” were answered in *The Left Hand of Darkness* by eliminating gender to find out what would be left. As LeGuin admitted: “Science fiction is a wonderful opportunity to play this kind of game.” (LeGuin, 1978: intro). In almost all her novels, in “Dispossessed” (1976) or “The Telling” (2000), she comes again to set new and old questions, experiment with thoughts that have been central in the feminist theoretical debates the last 40 years. [8]

### **The question of “woman”**

*“Harth, I can’t tell you how women are like. I never thought about it much in the abstract, you know, and –God! - by now I’ve practically forgotten...In a sense, women are more alien to me than you are.” (The Left Hand of the Darkness, Chapter 16)*

Adopting the technique of “thought experimentation”, LeGuin attempts to analyse the idea of “woman” by questioning what that actually is, what constitutes the “woman”. By refusing to distinguish between man and woman in her story, she involves herself and the reader in an ontological exploration of the elements that define the female. As Julia Kristeva has critically argued, “Woman can never be defined” (Butler, 1990: 1). Feminist theorists have tried to give a better understanding of women’s histories and situations over the years. Through debates, counter-arguments and differentiations from each other, they have reached one core idea through consensus, that the “woman” is definitely a category under scrutiny. From Beauvoir, who claimed that “one is not born a woman, but rather becomes one”, to Kristeva, who claimed “Strictly speaking, ‘women’ cannot be said to exist” to Luce Irigaray “Woman does not have a sex”, the idea of womanhood remains as vague as it has been before the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> wave of feminist thought. The difficulty of defining “woman” does not necessarily trouble feminist theorising; in many cases it gives the freedom for a subjected interpretation and personal politicization of the issue. The main question that theory points to, and that feminist science fiction adopts, is that if woman is such a difficult term to define, then what is that which constitutes the notion of woman and why is woman seen as a “subject”? As Butler argues, drawing from Foucault, who claims that juridical systems of power produce the subjects they subsequently come to represent through limitation, prohibition, regulation and control, woman is represented linguistically and politically as a “subject” (Butler, 1990: 2). The political construction of the female subject proceeds with certain legitimating and exclusionary aims through political operations that are naturalized and concealed.

Butler finds problematic a general category of “woman”, because it imposes a fake coherence among the individuals that constitute a category. [9]

The notion of “woman” is constituted differently in different historical contexts, intersecting with race, class, and ethnicity, sexual and regional modalities of discursively constituted identities. Similarly, the notion of woman is constituted by different patriarchal systems that differ again according to the same modalities mentioned before. The different female subjects that are constructed according these conditions cannot be positioned under a unique category of “woman”. Being aware of the political, linguistic and social constructions of “woman”, feminist theory tries to destabilize the category of woman by destabilizing the notions that create the feminine subject, meaning sex, gender and body. [10]

### **Deconstructing Categories: The politics of the body**

*“The king was pregnant.” (The left hand of darkness, Chapter 3)*

LeGuin in her *Left Hand* fantastically alters the human body to explore the relationship between female biology and female destiny. Her provocative description of powerful men “caught” in a female body irritates her male hero, Genly Ai and the reader. The main character Genly Ai describes the alien Estraven with a bewildered confusion: *“fat buttocks that wagged as he walked and a soft fat face, and a prying, spying ignoble, kindly nature...He was so feminine...There was in his attitude something feminine, a refusal of the abstract, the ideal, a submissiveness to the given which displeased me”.* (*The left hand of darkness, Chapter 1*)

The mistrust that Genly Ai expresses towards Estraven is mostly caused by the fact that the character incorporates antithetical images that do not follow the prescriptions of known social conventions. The creation of androgynous characters that combine contradictory male and female characteristics is an ironic way for LeGuin to protest against social norms that capture the body into set gendered categories and social situations. [11]

The exploitation of the female body and the emancipatory demands of self-determination over reproductive functions of female bodies, have been thoroughly presented in feminist Science Fiction. In texts where women’s biology literally becomes women’s destiny, basic reproductive freedoms- contraception and abortion, for example- become feminist utopian dreams. The powerlessness of women to have self-control over their bodies is also presented through dystopian pictures. In “The Dispossessed” (1974), Le Guin gives us a mother figure who is cold, hard, rejecting and narrow minded. The depiction of such a model of mother offers an insight to the problematic of forced or unsupported motherhood, roles forced upon women by society, and an absence of self-determination and control over bodily functions.

In her later novel “The Telling” (2000), LeGuin goes deeper into the issue of self-control over the body by thematicizing the issue of homosexuality and its connection to reproduction. Suttu, the main character of the book, critically presents the constructed taboo of homosexuality, as socially unacceptable, as it becomes contradictory to the reproductive role of the woman within certain social frames.

*“And I saw a woman dancing. And I fell in love with her.” ....*

*“I know you think that’s wrong.” she said.*

*After a hesitation, he said, “Because no children can be born of such union, the Committee on Moral Hygiene declared-“*

*‘Yes, I know. The Unist Fathers declared the same thing. Because God created women to be vessels for men’s semen.’ (The Telling, Chapter 8) [12]*

The question of homosexuality is, within feminist discourse, invariably associated with forms of cultural unintelligibility and, in the case of lesbianism, with the desexualization of the female body and its theorization as a reproductive machine. For Wittig, the binary restriction on sex serves the reproductive aims of a system of compulsory heterosexuality; she claims that the overthrow of compulsory heterosexuality will inaugurate a true humanism of the person freed from the shackles of sex. The lesbian emerges as a third gender that promises to transcend the binary restriction on sex imposed by the system of compulsory heterosexuality (Butler, 1990: 19). [13]

Feminist theoretical thought has tried to analyse the construction of “body”, its images, representations and roles, employing ontological and epistemological methods, in order to answer first questions such as what constitutes a body, what is the body used for according different social roles. Western theorization has seen the body as basic constitution of gender identity, as well as marker of gender division, through an amazingly complicated system of cultural symbols, references and perception. The feminist theorization of the body has followed a line of detaching the concept body from the gender binary and its materialization. From Beauvoir that has argued that the body is an active process of embodying certain cultural and historical possibilities to the post-modern feminists that view body as a project of open and continuous reformation through clothing, plastic surgery etc. (Featherstone, 2000), the bodies become spaces of social action and areas of restructuring of social practices. [14]

Starting from Beauvoir, the body is a historical situation, is a manner of doing, dramatizing and reproducing a historical situation (Butler, 1990: 175). The human body and its history presuppose each other. This imaginary body is in fact the anatomical body loaded by culture. Connecting the notion of body with the notion of gender, we can conclude that gender is the cultural significance that the sexed body assumes (or projects). Butler adds to this notion, that one is not simply a body, but in some very key sense, one “does” one’s body, and one “does” or performs one’s body differently from one’s contemporaries and from one’s predecessors and successors as well (Butler, 1990: 175). [15]

As Butler writes in “Gender Trouble”, the body identity that shapes social action and interaction is serving “performativity”, in the meaning of performance and acting within social frames (Butler, 1990). Performativity or performative acts creates an “outside observation”, a kind of reaction towards the perception of ourselves from someone outside from us. Gradually, one is the way she/he acts. Continuing in the line of Beauvoir “Someone is not born a woman, she becomes one”, Butler argues that “someone is defined as a woman by the way she acts and by what she embodies” producing a gender stylization of the body. Body identity became a kind of naturalized knowledge, although it is based on a series of social and cultural influences. In Foucault’s genealogy, the body is figured as a surface and the scene of a cultural inscription: “the body is the inscribed surface of events” (Butler, 1992:176). Foucault argues that micro-political operations of power produce socially appropriate bodies. The imaginary body can be posited as an effect of socially and historically specific practices, an effect of relations of power. Therefore, the body can no longer

be conceived as unproblematic biological and factual base upon which gender is inscribed but must be recognized as constructed by discourses and practices that take the body both as their target and as their vehicle of expression (Barrett & Phillips, 1992: 132f). Power appears to be constitutive of those bodies and marks their limits and capacities. [16]

C.A. Douglas has thoroughly analysed the taboos that institute and maintain the boundaries of the body as such. In her analysis, she suggests that the limits of the body are not merely material but co-exist with the limits of the social per se, where the boundaries of the body are the limits of the socially hegemonic (Butler, 1992:179). Kristeva has given a political dimension to the drawing of bodily boundaries. The construction of the “not-me” establishes boundaries of the body that exclude other subjects. Limits create always aliens, “Others”, that as expelled, form the body (Butler, 1992: 181). Similarly, Ruth Parsons, the protagonist of “The Women Men Don’t See” (Triptree Jr, 1973), considers herself to be an alien, a situation caused by patriarchy’s dividing effect upon humans into dualities that exclude and produce boundaries. In “The Resisting Reader” (1978) Fetterly gives a reason for this: » *Bereft, disinherited, cast out, woman is the Other, the Outsider never simply human...her condition is isolation...and her self image is monstrous because that is the consequence of isolation...Forced in every way to identify with men, yet incessantly reminded of being a woman, she undergoes a transformation to an ‘it’, the dominion of personhood lost indeed.*” (Barr, 1987: 30) [17]

What constitutes -through division the “inner” and “outer” worlds of the subject- is a border and boundary tenuously maintained for the purposes of social regulation and control. The idea that the body is not a “being”, but a variable boundary, a surface whose expansion is politically regulated, a signifying practice within a cultural field of gender hierarchy occurs also in the work of Foucault, who calls the body “a stylistics of existence” and in the words of de Beauvoir, who names it “the styles of flesh” (Butler, 1988). Those styles are never fully self-determined, but influenced by the history that sets the limits of their possibilities. Through this stylization of the body, gender occurs as effect. Gender identity then is the stylized repetition of acts that appear according to various social performances that create a gender reality. By theorizing the body as a political scene, onto which culture and social constructions are projected, feminist theorists put the very important issue of self-determination and self-regulation of biological and physical functions onto political agendas. From the images of the female body projected by the media and enforced by institutions (school, church, family) to the issues of reproduction and abortion, women are still being oppressed through social norms and even “medical” advice. Many women across the globe have been offered no option to determine the functions of their own body and before realizing it, they are used to think of their bodies as a way to fulfil social pre-descriptions. Even if the issue has a permanent central position in the feminist agenda since the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (especially regarding the issue of reproduction and family), women still follow – most of the times unconsciously – the vicious circle of eating disorders, illegal abortions, physical violations in the name of modern medicine and birth control, plastic surgeries, depression, all caused by the denial of women’s right to determine their own body and their own embodied personality by a patriarchal system and the capitalist mechanisms of image promotion. What Butler calls as one of the “gender troubles”, and as many other feminists try to articulate by theoretically analysing the social and political implications of the body, is exactly the different aspects and forms that women’s

oppression takes, how they are being adopted and reproduced unconsciously and sometimes consciously by its own victims. [18]

## **Gender, power, violence and militarization**

In her essay “Is gender Necessary?” LeGuin explains how she conceived in her novel “The Left Hand of the Darkness” the link between gendered identities of masculinity and femininity and enforced separation, conflict and violence.

“The ‘female principle’ has historically been anarchic; that is, anarchy has historically been identified as female. The domain allotted to women ‘the family’, for example- is the area of order without coercion, rule by custom and not by force. Men have reserved the structures of social power to themselves (and those few women whom they admit to it on male terms, such as queens, prime ministers); men make the wars and peaces, men make, enforce and break the laws.

At the very inception of the whole book, I was interested in writing a novel about people in a society that had never had war. That came first. The androgyny came second.” (LeGuin, 1978: 164) [19]

How gender and violence are interconnected is a matter analysed thoroughly by feminist theorists and activists and the great connection between them is demonstrated by military policies today that marginalize women and entrench the masculinisation of political life at home and abroad. As Cynthia Enloe writes: “The military plays a special role in the ideological structure of patriarchy because the notion of “combat” plays such a central role in the construction of concepts of “manhood” and justifications of the superiority of maleness in the social order.” (Enloe, 1983: 234) And she continues by underlining the connection between violence and masculinity: “To be masculine is to be not feminine. To prove one’s manhood is imagined to be to prove (to oneself and to other men and women) that one is not a “woman”.

Consequently, experiencing military combat and identifying with that institution totally committed to the conduct of combat is, for those men trying to fulfil society’s expectations, part and parcel of displaying and proving their male identity and thus qualifying for the privileges it bestows” (Enloe, 1983: 235). The recent phenomenon of women soldiers performing excessively brutal behaviour- sees US women soldiers in Iraq- is a reaction to a superior ‘masculine’ image. The adaptation of male roles by women, for example this of the ‘fighter’, shows the social pressure imposed on women to achieve standards set according to masculine ideals. This is not a sign of simple ‘masculinization’ of women’s roles. It shows rather a partly conscious individual eagerness to fit into structural patterns that promote ‘ethical virtues’, such as braveness, strength and sacrifice, formed through male perspectives.

On the other hand, the celebration of the soldier, the fighter and the protector of the country or the nation is common national policy, one which promotes nationalization, racism and protectionism and enforces the patriarchal system. This mechanism has worked its way into the system of social structures and notions becoming broadly accepted as a moral fact. Susan Faludi has observed this effect in her book “The Terror Dream” (2008), drawing from nationalistic and “idealising- the- heros-who saved- the New Yorkers-from mortal danger” atmosphere that captured U.S citizens, after the 9/11 incident. [20]

As Enloe explains in her later book “Bananas, beaches and Bases” (1989), international politics has relied on the manipulation of masculinity. Men’s sense of

their own manhood has derived from their perceptions both of other men's masculinity and of the femininity of women of different races and social classes (Enloe, 1989: 200). Enloe links the notion of power with the construction of femininity and masculinity, in a long process over time and through changes in social constructions. As she writes: "We are also coming to realize that the traditional concepts of masculinity and femininity have been surprisingly hard to perpetuate: it has acquired the daily exercise of power- domestic power, national power, and international power" (Enloe, 1989: 3). Enloe sees a great connection between the violent tendencies that drive international politics and the constructed connection of manhood with violence. "That is, men are men, and men seem almost inherently prone to violence; so violence is bound to come about if men are allowed to dominate international politics." (Enloe, 1989: 5). Enloe shows how women fall into the trap of accepting masculinity as national politics, accepting to adopt themselves in secondary roles of motherhood and child-protector, while men are pulling political strings in a national and international arena. "A real 'man' will become the protector in such a world. While, if a woman is a mother, then she will think first of her children, protecting them not in a manly way, but as a self-sacrificing mother." (Enloe, 1989: 13). [21]

The link between gendered identities of masculine and feminine and violence has been recognised by LeGuin years earlier than Enloe's analysis appeared. This is a profound example of the progressive "thought experimentation" Science Fiction offers through its narratives. Feminist science fiction seems to offer a laboratory of experimentation and research to feminist theory, where a mutual exchange of ideas and analysis works in an interconnected way. [22]

All through this chapter, we followed a parallel analysis from both feminist SF and feminist theoretical thought of similar ideas concerning gender and body identities, the isolation of 'woman' as the other-the alien (in Beauvoir, Butler, Irigaray and LeGuin) and the patterns of masculinity that promote violence and militaristic policies (Enloe and LeGuin). The category of 'woman' is theorized by feminist theory as politically and socially constructed and its deconstruction became a main task of various feminist debates and discourses. On the same line, feminist SF has created its own mechanisms of deconstruction of the notion of woman, gender and sex. Feminist theory sees the notion of gender as a 'forced upon' category created by institutions, practice and discourse with multiple points of origin (Foucault, Butler). Through gender deconstruction SF literature sees a chance to experiment with its transcendence, deconstruction and reconstruction and through its elimination it presents new opportunities freed from social divisions and constructions. The body is also altered and transformed in SF literature in order to escape from its formation by social and cultural projections that appear upon it- as feminist theory analyses. Power is often seen as male characteristic that builds up masculine images, which promote violence. The ideal of 'male fighter' is often promoted by national policies and leads to militarization of national politics, racism, separation and aggression. [23]

This dialectical relationship between feminist theory and SF works often in two directions. Theory influences literature by introducing complex issues and discourses. On the other hand, the political imagination of SF opens new horizons of cognition that often show the way to theory to expand. This maybe seems as a technique of "foretelling", but the beauty and power of theory and SF lays not so much on its

capacity to explain current phenomena, but rather to make sustainable assumptions about the future. The concluding point made in this chapter and through all the article is that feminist SF has mirrored (as it still does) contemporary feminist theoretical debate and activism-sometimes even being ahead of it- and offers a unique source of creative, experimental and inspiring ideas, utopias and visions not only to feminist theory, but also technoscience and politics. [24]

## **Bibliography**

Barr, M. (1992) *Feminist Fabulation*, Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.

Beauvoir, S. (1974) *The Second Sex*, New York: Vintage Books.

Butler, J. (1993) *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of 'Sex'*, New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1990) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (2003) Performative acts and gender constitution: An essay in phenomenology and feminist theory. In: McCann, C.R.; Kim, S. (eds.): *The Feminist Theory Reader*, New York: Routledge.

Cixous, H. (1976) 'The Laugh of the Medusa'. Trans. Keith Cohen and Paula Cohen, *Signs* 1, 4: 875-93.

Enloe, C. (1988) *Does Khaki Become You? The Militarization of Women's Lives*, London: Pandora Press; San Francisco, Harper\Collins.

Enloe, C. (1989) *Bananas, Beaches and Bases. Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Featherstone. (ed.)(2000): *Body Modification*, London: Sage.

Foucault, M. (1979) *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley, New York: Vintage.

Haraway, D. (1991) *A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century*. In: *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*, New York: Routledge.

Hollinger, V. (1999) '(Re) Reading Queerly: Science Fiction, Feminism, and the Defamiliarization of Gender', *Science-Fiction Studies* 26: 23-40.

Irigaray, L. (1977) *This Sex Which Is Not One*, Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.

Kristeva, J. (1986) *The Kristeva Reader*. (ed. Toril Moi), Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Lefanu, S. (1988) *Feminism and Science Fiction*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

LeGuin, U. (1978) 'Science Fiction and Mrs. Brown' in Wood, S. (ed.): *The Language of the Night: Essays on Fantasy and Science Fiction*, New York: Perigee Books.

LeGuin, U. (1993) *Earthsea Revisioned*, Wisconsin: Green Bay Publications.

LeGuin, U. (1973) On Norman Spinrad's *The Iron Dream*. In: *Science-Fiction Studies*, V.I.

LeGuin, U. (1978) *the language of the night*, New York: HarperCollins Publ.

LeGuin, U. (2004) *The Wave in the Mind*, New York: Tambala.

LeGuin, U. (1969) *The Left Hand of the Darkness*, New York: Ace Books.

LeGuin, U. (2001) *The Telling*, New York: Ace Books.

Oakley, A. (1972) *Sex, Gender and Society*, London: Temple Smith.

Wittig, M. (1973) *Le corps lesbien*, Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.