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News Items:


The Aurora Awards, the Canadian Science Fiction Awards presented for works in both English and French, were presented at Whistlercon Convention in Calgary on July 1. Best Long-Form Work in English: Wolfjack, by Edzo van Beekom; Meilleur.

SFRA BUSINESS
Editor's Message
Christine Mains

Looks like I don't have to be a broken record this issue, as President Dave Mead does the honors for me in his message below.

This issue is chock full of conference-related content: speeches from the award winners and those who introduced them, and reports on the conference from the organizers and on the meeting of the executive board, including a financial report from Treasurer Mack Hassler.

Also in this issue is a reprint of a review from the last issue, which was mistakenly attributed to the wrong reviewer. My apologies to Mark Decker for printing his review under the wrong name, and my assurances that steps have been taken to change the editorial procedure to avoid similar errors in future.

SFRA BUSINESS
President's Message
Dave Mead

Well, the annual meeting in Las Vegas has come and gone, an apparent success for all involved (if I do say so myself). 123 persons paid to attend, including a few one-day visitors from Las Vegas. With guests, about 135 came to the awards banquet, where Gérard Klein (Pilgrim), Lisa Yaszek (Pioneer), Muriel Becker (Clareson), Bruce Beatie (Mary Kay Bray), and Melissa Colleen Stevenson (Best Graduate Student Paper at SFRA 2004) were recognized. A special award to Alice Clareson was also announced. The Conference was able to return the SFRA's subsidy, plus a little extra. Some of the extra funds came from the book room, run ably by Ron Larson and Joe Berlant. Special thanks to those who donated books, particularly Joan Gordon and Tor Books.

We are most grateful for the attendance of our guest authors - Ursula K. Le Guin, John Barnes, Kij Johnson, Tim Powers, Joan Slonczewski, Elizabeth Bear and Steven Brust. Their presence and participation was a highlight of the meeting.

We are all looking forward to next year's meeting, which will be held in White Plains, NY. Look for news of the meeting on the website soon. Oscar De Los Santos and Tom Morrissey are hosting SFRA 2006 and have promised a strong list of guest authors, including Nancy Kress and Distinguished Guest Author Norman Spinrad.

Presidential Admonition (You Know Who You Are)

Reviewers must do a better job of sending their reviews to the Editors - Ed McKnight and Phil Snyder - in a timely way. SFRA Review Editor Chrissie Mains is tired of fussing about this, so it is my turn to remind those who accept a fiction or non-fiction book for review that reviewing is a privilege and a professional obligation. Reviewing for The SFRA Review is not a trivial or secondary activity, and it deserves respect. The Review cannot operate on any sort of schedule of reviewers don't send in their work quickly. If you are one of those who have procrastinated, please commit yourself now to turning in reviews faster.

Christopher Gunn Assistantship at University of Kansas

The Executive Committee has voted to donate $1000 to support the Gunn Assistantship in the Center for SF Studies at the University of Kansas. The Gunn assistant will develop an information center for students and teachers, organizing and providing information about academic programs and library holdings in SF/
Changes at Extrapolation

At the executive committee meeting in Las Vegas, the editors of Extrapolation—through Mack Hassler—expressed some concern that SFRA might object to the changes the journal is making in its publication schedule (moving from four to three issues annually). The Executive Committee voted to express the SFRA's continued support of the journal as it makes what changes it must.

SFRA 2007

At present, we have no venue or host(s) for the annual meeting in 2007. At this year's meeting I spoke to some members from the northwest about the possibility of having our 2007 meeting in Portland, Oregon or perhaps Seattle, Washington. At the business meeting, it was also suggested that we might go to the southeast instead.

If you have ideas about where we might go year-after-next or if you would be willing to host the meeting, please email your ideas to me at dave.mead@mail.tamu.edu.

SFRA BUSINESS

A Report from SFRA 2005

Dave Mead and Peter Lowentrot

We want to thank everyone who came to the annual meeting in Las Vegas. You helped make the event a great success. It was one of the larger meetings we have had. Of course, we are especially grateful to the guest authors who came and participated: Ursula K. Le Guin, Tim Powers, Kij Johnson, John Barnes, Steven Brust, Elizabeth Bear and Joan Slonczewski.

We want to thank our universities—Texas A&M—Corpus Christi and California State University—Long Beach—for supporting our work on the conference. Dave's Dean, Dr. Richard Giglio, was particularly generous in underwriting the mailing of the call for papers, etc.

And we really want to say thank you to our spouses and families—Sherwood Smith and Joan Mead, especially—for their help in making the conference successful. Sherwood was instrumental in bringing so many fine authors to the conference, while Joan wrangled the Registration Desk (and with daughter Jennifer Shields designed our line of fashion clothing).

At last count, there were 123 paid registrations (including a few one-day visitors from Las Vegas), as well as 7 guest authors, our Pilgrim winner Gerard Klein, and a few special helpers. We think that 135 attended the Awards Banquet. The conference will return around $3000 to the SFRA's general fund.

SFRA BUSINESS

Minutes of Business Meeting

Warren G. Rochelle

Call to Order: The Meeting of the Executive Committee was convened at approximately 7:30 a.m. Pacific Daylight Savings Time, on June 24, 2005, in the Emperor's Banquet of the Imperial Palace Hotel and Casino, Las Vegas.

Present: Peter Brigg, Mack Hassler, Christine Mains, David Mead, Warren Rochelle.

OFFICER and SFRA REVIEW EDITOR REPORTS:

SFRA REVIEW Editor, Christine Mains:

The meeting began with a report from the SFRA Review editor, Chrissie

livre en français: Les Mémoires de l'Arc, by Michèle Laframboise; Best Short-Form Work in English: “When the Morning Stars Sang Together,” by Isaac Szpindel; Meilleure nouvelle en français: “Ceux qui ne comprent pas,” by Michèle Laframboise; Best Work in English (Other): Relativity: Essays and Stories, by Robert J. Sawyer


John W. Campbell, Jr. Memorial award for best science fiction novel was presented for Market Forces, by Richard K. Morgan and the Theodore Sturgeon Memorial Award for best short fiction went to “Sergeant Chip” by Bradley Denton.

Brian Aldiss was awarded an Order of the British Empire in the Queen’s birthday honors list for his services to literature.
The Hugo Awards were presented at Interaction in Glasgow on August 7. Best Novel: Jonathan Strange & Mr Norrell, by Susanna Clarke; Best Novelette: "The Concrete Jungle," by Charles Stross; Best Novelette: "The Faery Handbag," by Kelly Link; Best Short Story: "Travels with My Cats," by Mike Resnick; Best Related Book: The Cambridge Companion to Science Fiction, edited by Edward James and Farah Mendlesohn; Best Dramatic Presentation, Long Form: The Incredibles, written & directed by Brad Bird; Best Dramatic Presentation, Short Form: "33" - Battlestar Galactica, written by Ronald D. Moore and directed by Michael Rymer; Best Professional Editor: Ellen Datlow; Best Professional Artist: Jim Burns; Best Semiprozine: Plokta, edited by Alison Scott, Steve Davies and Mike Scott; Best Fan Writer: David Langford; Best Fan Artist: Sue Mason; Best Web Site: SciFiction (www.scifi.com) edited by Ellen Datlow.

The annual Mythopoeic Awards were presented at Tolkien 2005 in Birmingham, England on August 14. The fiction awards are given to works which exemplify "the spirit of the Inklings." Mythopoeic Fantasy Award, Adult Literature: Jonathan Strange & Mr. Norrell, by Susanna Clarke; Mythopoeic Fantasy Award, Children's Literature: A Hat Full of Sky, by Terry Pratchett; Mythopoeic Scholarship Award in Inklings Studies: War and the Works of J.R.R. Tolkien, by Janet Brennan Croft; Mythopoeic Scholarship Award in Myth and Fantasy Studies: Robin Hood: A Mythic Biography, by Stephen Thomas Knight.

This year's Sidewise Awards for Alternate History were presented at Mains, and discussion of what Christine described as an ongoing problem with the Review and the reason for the lateness of the most recent issue: the failure of book review writers to send in work in a timely manner. She noted that this is a problem for both fiction and nonfiction reviews. Christine would like to be able to send some reviews back for revision, but she cannot do this if she does not receive them in a timely manner. Dave Mead said he would give this issue special attention in his next Review presidential message and would remind members that this is a professional activity and needs to be treated as such.

Dave also commented on the tax status issue. SFRA is tax-exempt, and is a 501©7 organization; it should be 501©3. According to Janice Bogstad, the SFRA Review's Managing Editor, the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, which is printing and mailing our SFRA Review, is somewhat concerned that SFRA isn't a C-3 (educational group). Because we believe ourselves to be educational, we would like to be categorized as a C-3 rather than a C-7. The change would make UWEC happy (and make our dues tax-deductible). Bruce has given us a report on his investigation of the issue.

Mack noted that he has taken care of renewing the organization's status as being incorporated in Ohio.

WEBMASTER:
No report given.

PAST PRESIDENT, PETER BRIGG:
Peter noted that it was time to start schmoozing with people who could possibly stand for office in the next election. Mack agreed to run again for treasurer. Warren noted that he could not run again, having reached the two-term limit for secretary. Christine, who will defend her dissertation this spring, might be available as a candidate. Everyone was urged to think of names.

PRESIDENT, DAVID MEAD:
Dave noted that everything was fine and as he was most immediately concerned with the conference, his report would be given in his role as conference co-director.

VICE PRESIDENT, BRUCE ROCKWOOD:
Bruce was unable to attend, but will give Dave information on the tax question before the business meeting.

TREASURER, MACK HASSLER:
Mack provided a balance sheet and noted that the organization was quite healthy financially, and currently has 288 members. He has not yet paid the subscriptions for Extrapolation, Foundation, and JES. He does not yet know how much the annual Directory will cost, and will not know until after the conference the final costs for conference support, student travel support, and the special recognition for Alice Clareson.

SECRETARY, WARREN ROCHELLE:
Warren sent out the second reminder to renew membership letters in February. There was a decent response to the follow-up letter. Since then he has been collecting returned letters, which he is sending to Mack so that they can be purged from the database. Minutes of the January Executive Committee meeting were sent to the Board and to the Review, where they were published.

OLD BUSINESS:
OTHER REPORTS, CONFERENCE DIRECTORS:
2005 CONFERENCE, Las Vegas, Nevada:
DIRECTORS, DAVID MEAD and PETER LOWENTROUT, with DAVID MEAD reporting.
Dave felt that SFRA 2005/Las Vegas was a success. As of today, between 135 to 140 people, including authors and guests, were attending. 130 had signed
up for the banquet, which will be the biggest banquet yet. He estimated there would be 140-145 attendees if all those expected show. Financially the conference is doing well. Registration fees totaled about $15,000. Expenses have included about $1000 for grad student scholarships, and about $800 to bring Gérard Klein, the Pilgrim winner, to Las Vegas. Each author-guest has cost about $1000. The Clareson plaque for Alice Clareson looks "gorgeous." Dave estimated that the $1000 seed money from SFRA would be repaid and that maybe a $1000 would be profit. He will know more when there is a final accounting, but right now, we are in great shape.

2006 CONFERENCE, White Plains, NY:
DIRECTORS, OSCAR DE LOS SANTOS and TOM MORRISEY:
The theme, or one of the themes, will probably be global warming and ecological issues. Norman Spinrad will be the literary Guest of Honor. The hotel in White Plains is relatively close to the commuter train lines, so a NY visit by attendees will be easy. Oscar and Tom will give a short presentation at the general meeting.

2007 CONFERENCE:
We discussed possible conference venues. We'd like to have a meeting in the Pacific Northwest. Dave has spoken to a few members about hosting the meeting.

2005 CONFERENCE, Dublin, Ireland:
DIRECTORS, FARAH MENDLESOHN and EDWARD JAMES:
This is definite.

NEW BUSINESS:
Pawel Frelik spoke to the EC about a publishing opportunity with the university press in Lublin, a book of the proceedings of this year's conference. Possible co-editors: Peter and Dave. There is financial support from Pawel's department and the university press; the latter has committed itself to the project. The estimated length of this book is around 180,000 words. The theme would be, as is this year's conference's theme, gambling, and the papers included would not all have to be presented at the conference. 20-22 papers was the number given as the total for the volume. It was noted that Peter could mention SFRA in the introduction. The fall of 2005 was given as a possible publication date.

There was a discussion of a possible conflict with this volume. Mike Levy has agreed to edit a special issue of Extrapolation on Le Guin and will call for conference papers to be submitted, although papers not given at the conference could be included. Mack, Pawel, and Dave said they would talk with Mike to be sure there are no conflicts.

Mack moved that the Executive Committee endorse, support, and encourage these publication projects. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Extrapolation changes:
Mack announced that Javier has made an editorial decision to go from 4 to 3 issues a year of Extrapolation, and he noted that Extrapolation needs reassurance that this is OK. Dave stated that SFRA acknowledged the necessary change as being made due to costs and supported the editor's decision to make this change. Dave asked that this information be published in the Review.

SFRA support for the University of Kansas Gunn Assistantship:
After discussion, it was agreed to support the assistantship with a $1000 one-time grant, with the possibility of renewing the grant in the future. Warren moved the SFRA do so, the motion was seconded, and passed unanimously.

Business Meeting Agenda:
Officer Reports
Conference reports, including a presentation by De Los Santos and Morrissey
ies that hover on the cusp of mainstream even as they move into cyberpunkish territory, the boundaries between science fiction and related genres seem to be increasingly blurred. Topics might include authors who have often blurred boundaries in their stories (Norman Spinrad, Harlan Ellison, Ursula K. Le Guin, and Bruce Sterling), fresh interpretations of classic writers (Arthur C. Clarke and Robert A. Heinlein), and writers that move between science fiction and fantasy (Nancy Kress, Nalo Hopkinson, R. Garcia y Robertson, Ray Bradbury, Anne McCaffrey, Octavia Butler, Connie Willis, and Brian W. Aldiss). SUBMISSIONS: 150-200-word proposals to: sfra2006@yahoo.com DEADLINE: April 15, 2006 INFORMATION: www.sfra.org

WHAT: Drawn by the Fantastic: Comics, Graphic Novels, Art & Literature
WHO: ICFA 27
WHEN: March 15-19, 2006
WHERE: Wyndham Fort Lauderdale Airport Hotel

TOPICS: The focus of ICFA-27 is on the fantastic in media other than the written word or film, including comics and graphic novels, web design and photo manipulation, cover art and illustration, picture books and pulps, film posters and CD covers, trading cards and tarot cards, cityscapes and landscapes, maps and tattoos and costuming, not to mention the stuff you hang on walls. Examine the role of art and artists as subjects of the fantastic, or the influence of the fantastic, written or filmed, on the world of art. Explore the construction of race and gender in images of vampires, elves, and aliens. In addition, we look forward to papers on the work of Guest of...
CLARESON AWARD

Introduction to Muriel Becker

Joe Sanders

It's very difficult to imagine the SFRA without Muriel Becker.

Like most of us, Muriel has worked her critical and scholarly skills—the "research" part of our name—into publication. Among other things, she produced the Gregg Press bibliography of Clifford Simak in 1980, contributed to early editions of Neil Barron's *Anatomy of Wonder*, and edited the Young Adult section of Collins and Latham's *Science Fiction and Fantasy Book Review Annual*.

Also like most of us, Muriel has taught fantastic literature whenever possible. She started early, with an sf course for junior high students in 1960. She began teaching sf to college students in 1967, and continued offering popular sf and fantasy courses for the next thirty years. Even after retirement, she was invited back to teach a breakneck pre-session sf class.

It was only natural that Muriel would join the Science Fiction Research Association as soon as she heard of it, in 1972. She attended her first conference in '73 and has been at 90% of the annual conferences since then. As a veteran member, she has found herself working on many committees, serving a term as vice-president, and inaugurating the Thomas D. Clareson Award as the first chair of its selection committee.

These facts qualify Muriel to receive this year's Clareson award, but they don't explain the delighted reaction I received when I shared the news of her selection with members of the SFRA executive committee who know her. What Muriel has given the SFRA over the years is not just her scholarly-academic-organizational resume but her generous, encouraging presence. For many of us new members, Muriel was the SFRA's unofficial greeter. The reason she has been named to so many committees is that she works hard, cheerfully, and effectively. The reason we are happy to see her at these conferences is that she is smart, warm, and witty. She makes us laugh and think. She makes us better than we are. She has, over the years, given the SFRA service in many, many ways—especially as our ideal colleague and friend.

CLARESON AWARD

Acceptance Speech

Muriel Becker

Thank you, Joe Sanders. Thank you for the wonderful things you've said about me, Muriel Becker.

When I received the email from David Mead telling me that I had been selected as the "Clareson Award honoree for 2005, I shouted out: "Oh, what joy! Thank you, Dave." [I did know he couldn't hear me.]

My thanks too to the members of the selection committee (Joe Sanders, Parah Mendelssohn and Neil Easterbrook) and other SFRA members who offered their opinions to the committee. I'm reasonably certain Alice Clareson did. When I spoke to her last month, she said how much she regretted that she couldn't be with us today.

You know, without Alice, the Thomas D. Clareson Award would not be the way it is. Alice made sure that Tom, her husband and partner, was memorialized by an award that reflected the service both he and she gave particularly in the early years of SFRA and *Extrapolation*.

I wish, too, that Charlotte Donsky, my frequent roommate at SFRA conferences, who served on the first Clareson Award selection committee with Alice
Arnold calls the "new conceptions," i.e., science. For a critical collection on the relationship between science/technology and literary imagination in the American West, I seek essays that investigate the role and influence of science on writers and texts from the 18th century to the present moment. New analysis of canonical texts AND work that addresses the gendered, racialized, sexualized, and class-based struggles with science in the American West are welcome. How does scientific advance enter the imagination and practice of western American writers? How does science shape the way western American writers represent self, land, and culture? How are Romanticism, scientific materialism, modernism and postmodernism triangulated with science and the West? How do innovations in physics and astronomy, evolution and biology, and geological sciences figure in the western American literary imagination? How do specific examples of scientific boosterism and/or scientific skepticism within the literature of the American West promote or resist the culture of progress, manifest destiny, regeneration through violence, or other deeply entrenched western American myths?

SUBMISSIONS: Gioia Woods <gioia.woods@nau.edu>
DEADLINE: Jan. 30, 2006 proposals, Aug. 30 completed articles

WHAT: Exploring the Multiverse: A Study of the Works of Michael Moorcock
WHO: Editor: Thomas Fortenberry.
TOPICS: Submissions are invited for a new collection of essays studying the writings of British author Michael Moorcock. Moorcock has had a long and amazingly successful career as both editor and author. Winner of Clareson and me in 1995-96, was here as well. When I telephoned her to tell her of the honor I was to receive, I learned she had died this past January. I know those of you who were members in the 70's, 80's and 90's will recall the many wonderful arguments which Charlotte frequently initiated night after night in those then smoke-filled rooms or corridors. I can't quite recall where we were when the smoke alarm sounded, and we, "sedate professors & prestigious scholars," were soundly chastised by the security people. It wasn't Evanston! There, men and women were restricted to separate floors. Does anyone remember where we were when the smoke alarm sounded not just once but twice?

It's such memories of events, places, and people, more than the scholarly pride I have in the work I've accomplished or the satisfaction in the services I've rendered, that has made SFRA my lifelong passion—until recently. That's the year I attended the 4th SFRA conference held at Penn State. Hosted by Arthur O. Lewis & Philip Klass (aka William Tenn), Penn State is where I first met Tom Clareson and James Gunn, Fred Pohl, Theodore Sturgeon, Jack Williamson and others.

You can imagine the effect on a lowly assistant professor who had just received administrative approval for a course in science fiction—approval undoubtedly influenced by my ability to cite the existence of SFRA itself and of Extrapolation. I had serendipitously found out about SFRA just before I was to submit my proposal.

I know it counts as little as the claim of the 1981 Pilgrim, Sam Moskowitz, that he had taught college science fiction before Mark Hillegas's 1962 course at Colgate—the recorded first US science fiction course. Sam's claim was discounted because it was "only" a special lecture series on science fiction with guest speakers. I also taught science fiction before 1962, but mine was not even in the running. It was an elective in science fiction for 7th, 8th, and 9th graders. Interestingly, only boys signed up—validating the old shibboleth that SF attracts the pre-pubescent male. The boys established an SF lending library, enjoyed doing book reports and oral reviews for class, and took Machiavellian delight at the start of each year in initiating new class members. The old timers fed the newbies "Venus marsh rat eggs" and "Martian lizards"—actually caviar and frogs legs. I had fun too. I like caviar and frogs legs. And the boys read and read and read whatever they could from Aldiss to Zelazny and they talked and talked.

When I transferred to Montclair State University, which had been first a normal school and then a teacher's college—a place where the faculty were at that time mostly men and the students primarily women—my science fiction classes were predominantly young men. My later course in fantasy, on the other hand, had a more balanced population, but still attracted more males than any other English Department offering. In alternating semesters, these two courses were always oversubscribed. To my delight, and I'm sure to the chagrin of those colleagues who had originally tried to veto these courses, those courses, in addition to my responsibility for administering the Program for Future Teachers, resulted in my being the only English Department faculty member exempt from teaching remedial freshman composition.

Since 1973, SFRA has given me the universe: constant support for my efforts to further the study of that literature I read by choice—resources for teaching opportunities for presentations, reviews, research, interaction with authors and editors; and friends with whom, though we meet but once a year, there is never a lack of subjects about which to talk.

As I've said earlier, I have a multitude of memories of events & places I would never have experienced without SFRA: presenting the Clareson Award to Jim Gunn in '97 and to Art Lewis in 2000 were highlights; the time several of us
stopped at a restaurant on the way to the airport from the Kent conference in '85 and, in the time taken to have a snack, organized a superior panel on our secret services ("space opera," "comics," "romances," and the like.) At least I think that was the subject—or maybe it was another year that we did "our vices."

... and there were such soul-satisfying ones as viewing the beautiful gardens in Midland Michigan in '83.

... and funny ones: walking down the stairs of a very tall dorm building in Milwaukee in '74 during a power outage and bonding with whomever we met in the stairwell; traversing the ravine each morning in '86 to reach the sessions; of trotting from the bow to stern and back again to attend the sessions on the Queen Mary in '97. [I doubt I could today accomplish those physical feats.]

And at teacher conferences and workshops, I promote the idea of science fiction and fantasy as a literature that speaks of man's relation to the universe—that gives readers an understanding of our own world by association and internalization—that makes easier the teacher's task of prejudice reduction.

Now I am no longer in the classroom. I am un-repentantly un-retired and un-salaried. I remain Professor Emerita of English at Montclair State University-NJ and a life member of the Modern Language Association. I continue to support the National Council of Teachers of English and work for the New Jersey Council of Teachers of English. One of my roles for the latter is Student Awards Coordinator. This is why the NJCTE Annual Student Writing Contest has a special category for science fiction, and that's why the first place science fiction winners are honored by the New Jersey Governor's Awards in Arts Education.

I am so appreciative that the 32 years of "little things" I've done and my passion for SFRA and the literature it promotes has brought me before you today to accept the Thomas D. Clareson Award for Distinguished Service.

Oh, what joy! Thank you.

**PIONEER AWARD**

**Introduction to Lisa Yaszek**

Paweł Frelik

Everybody in this room probably knows by now that the 2005 Pioneer Award winner goes to Lisa Yaszek for her essay "The Women History Doesn't See: Recovering Midcentury Women's SF as a Literature of Social Critique," which was published in the Spring 2004 issue of *Extrapolation*. Now, a Pole presenting an award to another Pole, or at least someone bearing a Polish-sounding name, might look suspicious and border on nepotism. This time it is not the case as the decision was taken unanimously by the whole award committee, which this year also included Jan Bogstad and Hal Hall.

Needles to say, we arrived at our choice after a long deliberation. Like in previous years, practically all serious contenders came from journals rather than themed volumes. We finally decided to choose Lisa's essay for two major reasons. The first was the originality of the subject—the essay explores literary and cultural territories that have so far been largely unexplored. It's also worth noting that another of Lisa's essays was a runner-up for the Pioneer Award the year before. The other reason was the fact that the winning essay covers the material that is not readily available in every library and which, probably more often than not, is not a very gracious and easily interpretable read.

We would also like to recognize the close runner-up: Samuel Collins, whose essay entitled "Scientifically Valid and Artistically True: Chad Oliver, Anthropology and Anthropological SF" published in the July 2004 issue of *SFJ* was almost until the last moment very seriously considered for the award.

**numorous awards (including the British Fantasy Award, World Fantasy Award, and being shortlisted for the Whitbread [Mother London]), he is most famous for having created a vast and fantastic multiverse of interconnected realities centered around the concept of a recurrent Eternal Champion. This collects endeavors to explore that multiversal on many levels and examine the many incarnations of the Eternal Champion. Moorcock, much like Edgar Rice Burroughs, Robert E. Howard, H. P. Lovecraft, and J. R. R. Tolkien, has created unique worlds and memorable characters that have become archetypal and influenced a generation of readers and writers.**

CONTACT: Thomas Fortenberry <kurvanas@thomasfortenberry.net>

DEADLINE: none

**WHAT: Life, the Universe, and Everything XXIV: The Marion K. "Doc" Smith Symposium on Science Fiction and Fantasy**

WHEN: February 16–18, 2006
WHERE: Provo campus of Brigham Young University.

TOPICS: We are especially interested in papers in the following areas: • Literary criticism/analysis of sf&f and related literature (medieval, renaissance, mythology, magic realism, etc.) • Science and technology (especially new or unusual) • Analysis of sf&f relating to poetry and/or theatre • Mormon culture, literature, and society in relation to sf&f • Serious analysis of sf&f in cinema, television, radio and other media.

SUBMISSIONS: full papers for consideration to LTUE-Academics, 4171 JFSB, Provo, UT 84602

DEADLINE: November 18, 2005.
Acceptance Speech
Lisa Yaszek

I want to begin by thanking Pawel for his incredibly kind introduction. Then I'd like to take a few minutes to tell you how I became interested in postwar women's science fiction and to thank everyone who has helped make my work on this topic possible.

The essay for which I'm receiving this award, "The Women History Doesn't See: Recovering Midcentury Women's SF as a Literature of Social Critique," is part of a larger project that explores how the new technologies that emerged after World War II—including everything from atom bombs and communication satellites to deep freezers and automatic coffee makers—radically transformed the relations of technoscience, society, and gender. I'm particularly interested in demonstrating how postwar women writers created the first body of literature to systematically assess these changing relations. By invoking some of midcentury America's most dearly-held beliefs about sex and gender in specific science fiction scenarios such as the nuclear war narrative and the media landscape story, these authors created a rich and vibrant tradition of women's science fiction that prefigured the literature we now know as feminist science fiction.

I came to this project through my work at Georgia Tech, where I am both assistant professor in the School of Literature, Communication, and Culture and curator of the Bud Foote Science Fiction Collection. As a professor in LCC I teach postmodern literature, science fiction, and gender studies. As you might well imagine, at a technical institute where men outnumber women four to one, it's fairly easy to sell students on the value of postmodern literature and extremely easy to sell them on the value of science fiction. Gender studies, however, is a much tougher sell. Now, to their credit, Georgia Tech students aren’t hostile to the notion of gender studies, it's just that, as my first class told me, they didn’t really get it—the ideas felt too abstract, and nothing else in their training at Tech had prepared them to talk about the history of gender and literature.

So I thought about this for a while and thought, well, what if we approached gender studies through the lens of science fiction? And so off to the library I went. As I mentioned a moment earlier, we have an excellent science fiction collection at Georgia Tech. When my predecessor, Irving “Bud” Foote retired in 1999 after teaching science fiction for nearly thirty years, he donated over 8000 science fiction items to the institute, and the Bud Foote Science Fiction Collection was born. Since I took over the Collection in 2002, we've received 2000 more book donations from David Brin, Kathleen Ann Goonan, Paul di Filippo, and a host of local Atlanta authors. We've also initiated a Science Fiction Lab, started an online science fiction dictionary, hosted a regional conference, and started a science fiction studies program in LCC. So surely, I thought, there should be more than enough material in the Collection for my purposes.

And indeed there was. I already had a good deal of feminist science fiction in my own collection. What I was most interested in at that point was science fiction—feminist or not—written by women in the decades immediately following World War II. I was particularly interested in women’s SF from this period in part because it marks the beginning of the technocultural era we live in today, and in part because Georgia Tech first starting admitting women in 1951. So I thought it would be nice if I could find a few stories about gender and technoculture from this era.
What I didn’t realize was quite how many I would find! I expected to see names like Judith Merrill, Carol Emshwiller, and Katherine MacLean, but who the heck were Anne Warren Griffith and Helen Reid Chase? And where did science columnists like June Luzie and Mildred Murdoch come from? When all was said and done, I’d found more than 250 new women writers who joined the SF community after World War II. And when I started reading them, I noticed something fascinating. In an era that was a real low point in feminist history—an era when women weren’t supposed to be interested in science and technology, and when, literary critics assure us, they most definitely weren’t writing fiction about science and technology—women turn out to have been doing just that. And they did it by boldy going where few women had gone before: into the science fiction community of the 1940s, 50s, and early 60s. Now, this is not to say that these women authors were necessarily challenging cold war gender ideology. But they were definitely invoking it in specific science fiction scenarios to critically assess the new scientific, social, and moral arrangements that defined cold war America as a whole.

And then the Georgia Tech whistle blew and I realized I actually had to go teach. So I took some of those stories with me and I was both delighted and amazed by my students’ enthusiastic response. This led me to think, well goodness, I should write about these stories for adults, too. And so far I have been both delighted and amazed by all your enthusiastic responses as well.

And so, now it is time to thank a few of you specifically by name. First and foremost—always first and foremost—I want to thank my colleague and husband Doug Davis. Doug is an excellent cold war and science fiction scholar in his own right. Furthermore, he is the only person I know who is genuinely interested in talking about unhappy housewife heroines and nuclear war before the first cup of coffee in the morning.

Next, I want to thank Bud Foote for making this project possible. His generous gift to Georgia Tech has made science fiction history come alive for me, my colleagues, and my students. And at this point I want to thank my research assistants Jessica Dillard, Kate Sisson, and Amelia Shackleford, all of whom are aspiring science fiction scholars and authors as well as excellent representatives for the collection. Young women like Jessie, Kate, and Amelia are definitely our best hope for the future, and I believe that that the work we’ve done together in the Bud Foote Collection has taught them something about our shared literary and cultural past as well.

As I noted earlier, my work on postwar women’s science fiction began as a teaching exercise and exploded into a professional research project. And so I want to thank two institutions that made this financially possible: the School of Literature, Communication, and Culture, which gave me a semester long paid leave to complete my research, and the National Endowment for the Humanities. And then the Georgia Tech whistle blew and I realized I actually had to go teach. So I took some of those stories with me and I was both delighted and amazed by my students’ enthusiastic response. This led me to think, well goodness, I should write about these stories for adults, too. And so far I have been both delighted and amazed by all your enthusiastic responses as well.

And so, now it is time to thank a few of you specifically by name. First and foremost—always first and foremost—I want to thank my colleague and husband Doug Davis. Doug is an excellent cold war and science fiction scholar in his own right. Furthermore, he is the only person I know who is genuinely interested in talking about unhappy housewife heroines and nuclear war before the first cup of coffee in the morning.

Next, I want to thank Bud Foote for making this project possible. His generous gift to Georgia Tech has made science fiction history come alive for me, my colleagues, and my students. And at this point I want to thank my research assistants Jessica Dillard, Kate Sisson, and Amelia Shackleford, all of whom are aspiring science fiction scholars and authors as well as excellent representatives for the collection. Young women like Jessie, Kate, and Amelia are definitely our best hope for the future, and I believe that that the work we’ve done together in the Bud Foote Collection has taught them something about our shared literary and cultural past as well.

As I noted earlier, my work on postwar women’s science fiction began as a teaching exercise and exploded into a professional research project. And so I want to thank two institutions that made this financially possible: the School of Literature, Communication, and Culture, which gave me a semester long paid leave to complete my research, and the National Endowment for the Humanities, which provided me with a summer stipend to write the first half of my manuscript.

And of course, many, many kudos to Justine Larbalestier, Javier Martinez, and Farah Mendlesohn. None of them are here with us tonight, but they have all been instrumental in helping me develop my ideas about postwar women’s SF and then preparing them for publication. And many more thanks to the Pioneer jury, Paweł Frelik, Jan Bogstad, and Hal Hall for further endorsing my ideas with this award.

Finally, I want to thank all of you who are here tonight for helping me celebrate this moment. My colleagues at Tech have told me on more than one occasion that they envy the kind of community we have here in SFRA, and I have
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PILGRIM AWARD

Introduction to Gerard Klein
Veronica Hollinger

This is the centenary year of the death of Jules Verne, whose influence on the history and development of science fiction can’t be overestimated. Given this, it seemed appropriate to the members of the Pilgrim Award committee—myself, David Hartwell, and Andy Sawyer—to look outside as well as inside the Anglo-American science fiction communities in its deliberations. Among other things, we wanted to acknowledge the fact that science fiction is a flourishing literature in many nations and in many languages, and not least in the France that gave Jules Verne to the world.

For this reason, among many others, I am delighted to introduce the winner of this year’s Pilgrim Award for life-time contributions to science fiction and fantasy scholarship: one of the principal spokespersons for science fiction in France for almost half a century, M. Gérard Klein.

Gérard Klein was born in 1937, in Neuilly, France. His wide-ranging education emphasized economics, but also included attention to political science, sociology, and psychology. By the time he was 18, he was already contributing short stories and articles to the French sf magazines Fiction and Galaxie. He published his first short story in 1955, and in 1958 he published a co-authored sf novel, Ambushes dans l’espace (Ambushes in Space). As a young man in Paris, M. Klein came to know other figures who were to become central to the development of French science fiction: Michel Butor, Michel Pilotin (alias of Stephen Spritel), who created the Rayon Fantastique series for Gallimard; Pierre Versins; and Boris Vian, among others.

M. Klein’s first novel as sole author was also published in 1958, Le Gambit des etoiles, translated into English in 1973 as Starmaster’s Gambit, very appropriately, this first novel was nominated for the first Prix Jules Verne. In 1958, M. Klein also published his first collection of stories, Les Perles du temps (The Pearls of Time), in the Présence du futur [Presence of the Future] series of Editions Denoël. His 1971 novel, Les Singeures de la guerre (published in English as The Overlords of War) was the single best-selling novel published in the Ailleurs and Demain [Elsewhere and Tomorrow] series for the Robert Laffont publishing house. And, from 1960 to the early 1970s, M. Klein became, arguably, the most famous French sf author of his generation. He continued to publish many novels and stories until the middle of the 1970s or so, at which point he turned his attention almost exclusively to the development of the Ailleurs and Demain series as its editor. Publishing both leading French authors and the very best of classic and contemporary Anglo-American sf (in high-quality translations), it continues today and currently boasts over 185 titles.

Another (and often overlooked) aspect of M. Klein’s illustrious career in sf involves his many critical essays on the genre: from Défense et illustration de la S.F. (1967, with Alan Dorémieux and Jacques Goimard), to “Malaise dans la science-fiction américaine” (1977), to “Trames et morés” (1986), to articles in the influential fanzine Nous les Martiens [We the Martians] during the 1980s and 1990s, to the dozens of prefaces, afterwords, and forewords that he has penned for published works of sf during his more than fifty years in the field. As Arthur B. Evans recently noted, Gérard Klein is the John W. Campbell of French science fiction.
I'd like to quote briefly from an article by M. Klein published in the March 1977 issue of *Science Fiction Studies*, "Discontent in American Science Fiction," based upon his full-length study, *Malaise dans la science-fiction*. His observations on the state of American science fiction strike me as truly prescient, as relevant today as when they were first written:

in many works of the best authors, the predominant feeling is that there is no future for science, for society, for the human race. This seems paradoxical in a literature which pretends to deal in anticipations.

Disenchantment entered American SF [during the 1960s], increasing steadily until it reached the blacklist pessimism, and uttering imprecations not only against society but against science itself, which had, in the end, failed. Even before 1970, we had arrived at the great triple malédiction: pollution, overpopulation, dehumanization.

M. Klein goes on to consider the works of Philip K. Dick, Frank Herbert, and John Brunner as significant examples of this "malaise dans la science-fiction":

Using extremely different methods, much imitated since, they tell of the rise of monopolies, the disintegration of the individual, the dislocation of the social universe, the degradation and destruction of the physical world, the failure of humanity.

These themes are as prevalent today as they were in the 1970s.

Mesdames et monsieurs, mes amis, c'est avec grand plaisir que je vous présente M. Gérard Klein. Ladies and gentlemen, friends, it's with great pleasure that I present this year's Pilgrim Award winner, a science fiction author, editor, and critic sans pareil, M. Gérard Klein.

PILGRIM AWARD

**Acceptance Speech**

Gérard Klein

Many thanks to all.

I must thank everybody here tonight for the great honor you do me in giving me the Pilgrim Award for 2005. I am particularly proud to be the second Frenchman to receive this award, after my regretted friend Pierre Versins.

When I received Dave Mead's kind letter, I was astounded, amazed, dumb-founded, flabbergasted... Well, in a word, I was surprised... but you know how writers are: I had to show off and use many words where one was enough!

It is true that, as a writer, I have published more than a dozen books, novels and short stories collections. As an editor, I have published hundreds of books. And as a critic, I have produced hundreds of papers (more than five hundred at the latest count), a great number of them being forewords and afterwords to the books I've published, often insisting on the relationships between those books and scientific topics. But very few of these works of mine have been translated into English in a form accessible even to the formidable erudite readers that you are. Many of them are available on the Web, but only in French. So I asked myself: what have I done to deserve such a distinction?

Certainly, I have made some good friends among your ranks. This must have helped. But I feel I must also thank someone who died a long time ago, a century ago exactly, a man known as "Jules Verne". I suppose you thought it would be appropriate to choose a Frenchman on such an occasion, and my name must have come out of the hat.

By the way, I will try to correct a small error made by my friend George Slusser in a recent article published in *Science Fiction Studies*, the March 2005 issue.
In reviewing the book "Pourquoi j'ai tué Jules Verne", by Bernard Blanc, he ascribed to me, with obvious puzzlement, some ideas and proposals I've never actually made. In fact, I have written practically nothing for this book, but Bernard Blanc used me, as well as some others, as characters for a story, a fiction, and put in our mouths some ideas that are not our own. So, George, I plead "not guilty" on this point.

Nevertheless, I did write something for this book. A very short story, possibly the shortest fantasy story in the world. I will quote it for you:

With the face you have, said the dying dragon to the knight, you should have killed the princess and married me.

This is my only literary attempt in the field of fantasy.

Let us get back a moment to Verne. More than twenty years ago, I published in the magazine Fiction, the French edition of The Magazine of Fantasy and Science Fiction, a rather obvious observation. Jules Verne was most definitely fond of scientific marvels. But he chose to destroy them systematically at the end of each of his books that contained such marvels. For instance, the submarine Nautilus is even destroyed twice. It disappears once in the Maelstrom, and then it is utterly destroyed at the end of The Mysterious Island.

You can pick any marvel, it is destroyed.

This is also interesting because it resorts to the same construction as in modern fantasy, at least as John Clute sees it, in which the technological marvel is a kind of sickness, and only by destroying it you can make the world whole and sound again.

Now, believe it or not, I have read dozens of papers and books about the works of Jules Verne and never, never have I found even an allusion to this systematic destruction of his scientific marvels. Why is Verne so obsessed with this destruction, and why did almost no one see, apparently, the obvious? The remarkable thing is that Verne is practically the only writer to have proceeded in this way. Almost all other writers of the same period allowed the scientific marvels to live their lives.

As to Verne, I have outlined the beginning of an answer. He was fascinated by modernity while at the same time he was afraid, even terrified by the idea that this very modernity would deeply modify his world.

Besides, each scientific marvel he invented or described implies a monopolistic concept. Nemo has a monopolistic control of the oceans, Robur of the air, and so on. This is contrary to the liberal and "bourgeois" view of the political and economical world Verne was attached to.

This is the reason why I consider Jules Verne as a kind of Moses of modern science fiction. He has seen the Promised Land, but has never set foot in it. He cannot accept the changes, the transformation that Science and Technology must inevitably bring to society. In my view, the real inventors of modern science fiction are men like Wells and Rosny Ainé, who recognized, and even called for such transformations.

But as to the second question: why did all those writers whose commentaries on Verne I have read overlook this aspect of the destruction of the scientific marvel? ... I have no definite answer. Perhaps you will give me one, or several.

I'd like to add something about how science and technology are related to science fiction. In my view, this relationship is never direct, immediate, automatic. It's always mediated by pictures and representations originating in Science and strongly remodeled by science popularization, what we call in French "vulgarisation". This mediation seems to me very important, and is generally overlooked by science fiction analysts. I tried to make this point clear in a short paper published in
**Learning from other worlds**, a collection of essays dedicated to my friend Darko Suvin. I was probably not clear enough since a guy who published a review of this book in *SF3* was rather critical of my little paper. I'm sorry, I forgot his name... and have not found the relevant issue of *SF3* before coming here. He may be here with us tonight... If so, I hope we will have a friendly chat about all this.

The other point I wanted to clarify is the consanguinity but radical difference between science fiction and pseudologies such as flying saucers, prehistoric astronauts and so on. Science fiction is fiction, a suspension of disbelief for a period of time only; pseudologies are trying to make themselves believable for all times, against all odds.

I ought to say something about science fiction in France, I suppose, but I feel it would be too long a story. I prefer to answer your questions, if you have any.

However, science fiction goes way, way back in France, and is older even than Verne's works. But it fell into decline between the two World Wars and reappeared only in the early 50's, reintroduced along with jazz and other novelties when we were liberated by the Allied troops.

I began to read science fiction, and especially American and English SF — but also all the old French SF — when I was ten; I became what is known as a "distinguished writer" when I reached twenty, and a successful publisher just a bit after turning thirty. By the way, I learnt English by myself, essentially to be able to read science fiction in the original text. You can hear for yourself what a terrible mess I made of THAT!

But my real occupation was elsewhere. For many years, I have worked as an economist. It helped me survive in the difficult field of publishing. But not as a writer, because it is too time consuming.

The field of science fiction publishing is particularly difficult at the present time because of the competition between commercial fantasy and good science fiction. Young people read fantasy, but they don't move on to science fiction afterwards, because they think it's too "difficult". So our readership is gradually growing older. Well, you know all that, and that is life...

Another problem is the absence of reciprocity between the markets: almost ninety percent of science fiction and fantasy published in France is translated from the English language, from American or British writers mostly. Almost no texts written in French are translated into English. This is just an observation. I have no illusion about the possibility of changing this state of things, except speaking entity, if he, she, or it, agrees to do that...

But if you have any idea...?

All in all, that's what led me here [today/tonight]. And I owe it all to you.

So, again, many thanks. And I am waiting for your questions. I will try to answer them with the help of Arthur B. Evans, or any other available French-speaking entity, if he, she, or it, agrees to do that...

**MARY KAY BRAY AWARD**

**Introduction to Bruce A. Beatie**

Margaret McBride

What do we expect in a review of a non-fiction book? The review should summarize the book's main arguments and give some sense of the work's strengths and weaknesses. What elevates a book review beyond these normal expectations? —a review with style, pizazz, a review that discusses the work in a larger context?

The winner of this year's Mary Kay Bray Award does all these things...
exceptionally well. His review begins by telling us of other biographical and critical works on Frank Baum, including the reviewer's own on-line search that revealed Lewis Carroll and Wonderland to be six times more popular as an academic subject than the Wonderful Land of Oz. A Google search, however, showed "Oz" with two times as many hits as "Alice in Wonderland" and even slightly more sites than "Middle Earth" suggesting the great popular appeal of Baum's fiction.

The review also gives us some background on the expertise of the author, Katherine Rogers, as a biographer. This review makes few generalizations—giving us specific page count on how much space the book devotes to various time frames of Baum's life. We learn that this work focuses much more on the contribution of Frank's wife and feminist activist mother-in-law to his writing than other works have—suggesting a feminist slant to the critique. We are told of the book's original and insightful arguments—for example, a unique section contains information about the 1930's Judy Garland film. Ms. Rogers speculates on how Baum might have felt about the film. Such information is not found in other biographies but the reviewer argues it is relevant to understanding Baum's contribution to speculative works. The review mentions other fictional revisioning of Baum's works like the wonderful W's by Geoff Ryman.

The reviewer also lets us know that some of the critical analyses, while fascinating, may sometimes be to the slight detriment of the book as a biography. Simply reading the review will tell most of us something about Frank Baum that we didn't know. However, for two of us on the committee, the review achieved the highest purpose of a review—we subsequently read the book for ourselves!

The Mary Kay Bray Award for 2004 goes to the review article of L. Frank Baum, Creator of Oz by Katharine M. Rogers—in SFRA Review #268, April/May 2004. The author of the review was Bruce A. Beatie.

Ed. Bruce A. Beatie was not in attendance.

**GRADUATE STUDENT PAPER AWARD**

**Acceptance Speech**

Melissa Colleen Stevenson

Thank you. I would like to express both my deep gratitude and delight at being honored with the graduate student paper award tonight. Discovering the Science Fiction Research Association and this conference three years ago marked a turning point in my career as a student of science fiction. Being able to surround myself with so many incredible critics and theorists of science fiction and fantasy, not to mention the opportunity to interact with many of the great writers in the field, has been a revelation.

I have been particularly fortunate to find here, not only well established critics who have been generous with their guidance, but also a peer group of young scholars who continue to share with me the challenges and joys of starting out in the field. I am pleased to say that many of those I met at my first conference are here today: They have become my friends, colleagues, and fellow travelers.

This is my final year as a graduate student at this conference, but I hope that this occasion marks not an end, but merely the beginning of a new chapter in my relationship with SFRA. The encouragement and support I have found here has been formative and I hope that as an organization we will continue to reacht out to graduate students and other young scholars as they enter the field.
And so, again, I thank you, not only for this award tonight, but also for offering the kind of critical community that is both so incredibly rare and so invaluable.

NONFICTION REVIEW

‘Alias’ Assumed
Karen Hellekson


The television program Alias (ABC, 2001–present), unlike Star Trek and Buffy the Vampire Slayer, hasn’t entered the domain of academic discourse or garnered the attention either of these other cult shows has, and this book does not remedy that lack. The program, a frothy blend of sex appeal, outrageous outfits, and convoluted plots, follows Sydney Bristow (played by Jennifer Garner) and her exploits in covert ops, first with rogue agency SD-6 as a double agent, then with the CIA. Complex plots weave around her relationship with her father, Jack, also a CIA agent; her mother, Irina, a Russian spy; her love interest, Vaughn; her boss/ex-boss/boss, Sloane; and Milo Rumbaldi, a long-dead fifteenth-century artist-seer whose before-their-time artifacts push many of the plots forward.

Twenty-one short essays comprise the book, all with short, catchy titles along the lines of “Torturers Wanted” (by Sally D. Stabb—yes, that’s her real name), “They Scanned Our Brain Waves From Orbit...” (by Roxanne Longstreet), and “Why Sydney Has No Social Life...” (by Jody Lynn Nye). Even a cursory flip through the book reveals that this text’s purpose is not heavyweight analysis. Few bibliography sections grace the essays. The contributors run the gamut from fiction writers to journalists to psychology professors, and although the essays are not scholarly—that is not the purpose of this book—they are smart and accessible, and I appreciate their breezy, informal style. They also rely on a comprehensive knowledge of individual Alias episodes and mention other TV programs, most frequently The X-Files and Buffy, in comparison. The informed reader will get the most from this book.

Various aspects of Alias are treated. Fiction writer Tracy S. Morris, in “Geek Chic,” a personal essay, explains her fascination with the character of Marshall J. Flinkman and links it to the point of the program itself: “the quest for the ultimate geek” (81). Physicist and journalist David Harris, in “The Science of Alias,” analyzes the plausibility of the cutting-edge (some would say science fictional) technology seen on the program in terms of plausibility and realism. Technical writer Mary Lavoie engages in more serious analysis in “Alias Alice,” which compares and contrasts Through the Looking Glass with Alias in terms of knowledge, discovery, and agency. Professor Lee Fratantuono, in “Classical Mythology, Prime-Time Television,” analyzes Alias’s archetypes, concluding that the ancient pattern of a woman’s preordained destiny is Sydney’s fate as well. Stabb (a professor), in “Torturers Wanted,” links military and intelligence communities to cults, emphasizing how the organization, whether good or bad, inculcates and trains its members. Kevin Weisman (better known as the guy who plays Marshall J. Flinkman), in his introduction, doesn’t explain the rationale of the book as much as engagingly explain his role in the show and note that the interest lies not in the “espionage, stunts and sexiness” but in the relationships (2). Still, avid fans...
SF journals to a good home.

Due to retirement and relocation, I need to downsize my research library. Therefore, I want to give away the SF journals I've accrued since the late 1970s: *Extrapolation*, *Science Fiction Studies*, *Locus*, and the *SFRA Newsletter/Review*. I also have the *New York Review of SF* from about 1989 as well as issues of now defunct SF magazines *SF Eye* and Delap's *Review of SF*. All runs are nearly complete. Preference will be given to a person or library that will take the whole collection but no response will be ignored. I would prefer that the recipient pay all or part of the postage, but I won't insist on it. This is a great opportunity to enhance personal or campus research holdings in SF. The collection will delight those who still believe that the interpretation of scholarly work is enhanced by having access to the actual paper journals in which articles/reviews appeared. Please contact me by email (<Cummins@umr.edu>), by telephone (573-341-2959), or by mail (Dr. Elizabeth Cummins, Department of English and Technical Communication, University of Missouri-Rolla, Rolla, MO 65409-0560).

of the show will enjoy his insights, particularly his on-set stories, and his headnotes to each essay display some thoughtful analysis just as often as they crack wise. Overall, the book is fluffy, but it's fun fluff, accessible fluff, fluff that makes you think.

This book is part of the Smart Pop series, which includes titles on *The Matrix* as well as TV shows *Buffy*, *Angel*, *NYPD Blue*, and *Firefly*. Judging by the amount of serious critical work that has been done on these titles, the publication of "Alias" *Assumed May* be a bellwether for an upwelling of critical interest in *Alias*, a smart, complex show that, despite all its appeal, may be in its last season as a result of declining ratings.

I consider this text, which lacks deep analysis but which does a wonderful job of laying out the basics, merely a pointer toward more work that remains to be done.

**NONFICTION REVIEW**

**Projections**

*Mark Decker*


Anthologies of criticism—academic or otherwise—present a special difficulty to a reviewer. Since such works are, by definition, a collection of self-contained parts, it is difficult to give attention to all of the contributions in the space of a short review. That difficulty is compounded when the anthology itself does not take its own announced boundaries seriously. Does a reviewer ignore strong contributions simply because he can't understand how they relate to the anthology as a whole? Since even critical reviews should help books find their audience, should it matter that a collection featuring several strong articles doesn't really function as a coherent whole if that collection would nevertheless find readers?

*Projections: Science Fiction in Literature and Film* presents such challenges. Editor Lou Anders has assembled a very readable book, but this should not surprise anyone who glances through the contributor biographies in the back. Nebula and Hugo winners like Robert Silverberg and David Brin abound, and every single essayist has published novel-length fiction. Yet while there is much readerly pleasure here, there is little global coherence, despite Anders' annoying decision to number all the footnotes in the text consecutively. The vaguely academic-sounding title advertises essays on science fiction as it appears on screen and on the page and strongly implies a good deal of attention to the relation between science fiction film and science fiction literature. And there are several essays—both outstanding and problematic—that fit somewhere within the scope implied by the title. The collection's strength can be found in essays that bring controlled analysis and clear writing together to a degree rarely seen in literary or film criticism. The best of these is Adam Roberts' "The Matrix Trilogy," which presents a neatly turned and eminently readable application of Deleuze and Guattari to the Wachowski brother's trilogy. Other examples of complex but readable criticism include Howard V. Hendrix' "The Thing of Shapes to Come: Science Fiction as Anatomy of the Future," and "The Body Apocalyptic: Theology and Technology in Films and Fictions of the MIME Era," and Cathenne Asaro's "Strange Loops of Wonder."

The weaker essays, though entertaining reads, suffer from a tendency either to present a catalog of film and fiction titles without giving much analysis,
parisons don't really help critics understand the cultural importance of genre underpinning, appeal to an audience that does not believe it dabbles in kids' genres, such as mystery writer P.D. James and spy novelist John Le Carre, see their works with the substance of Clute's argument. But such mundane and invidious com­


texts to this anthology are working fiction writers, there is an insider quality the way Science Fiction is marketed. Clute asserts that writers in other popular "knowledge about the way the covers for objects of art that have profound social and cultural meaning, not as products that implies that the works of written and filmic

For example, in the essay to much of the discussion that may limit the appeal of the arguments being made. The tone is especially unfortunate since Brin does much to advance his thesis that there are crypto-fascist overtones in the Star Wars films.

There are also several very short pieces that fit within the thematic bounds that the title lays out, but do not reach the level of rigor or depth of treatment usually seen in anthologies of serious criticism. For example, Lucius Shepard's "excrement" is a review of the film X-Men, not a critical essay. In other words, it's the type of writing about film designed to help someone decide whether or not to go and see a particular film, and it is therefore difficult to understand why it would be anthologized outside of a casebook of criticism focusing on X-Men. Proof of this comes in Shepard's conclusion, which compares X-Men to other commodities. Employing a pizza metaphor, Shepard tells his readers that the "film is not a top-of-the-line pie" neither "the slimy cardboard with orange sauce" sold by street vendors, so if they "need a nosh, hey, go for it" (245). One could make much of the discrepancy between the title and the review's conclusion—who noshes on excrement, after all?—but the real issue here is deciphering why such an explicitly ephemeral exercise merits preservation.

Many of the essays, however good or bad, fall outside the boundaries that the anthology's title announces. Indeed, the most amusing essay in this collection is John Grant's "Gulliver Unravels: Generic Fantasy and the Loss of Subversion." Here, Grant bemoans the impact of "Dragonspume Chronicles of the Sorcerer Kingdom Ancients, or whatever bloated trilogy the publisher's presses choose next to excrete into the toilet bowl of the book trade" (181) on a genre he sees as essentially subversive. Yet that genre is Fantasy, not Science Fiction, and Grant's analysis does not breathe a word about film. Furthermore, as the quote above suggests, the essay spends a great deal of time dealing with how fiction is manufactured and marketed. Yet the term "literature" in the anthology's title at least implies that the works of written and filmic Science Fiction will be treated as objects of art that have profound social and cultural meaning, not as products that need to be matched with the right consumers.

These market-based concerns recur frequently, however, and since all of the contributors to this anthology are working fiction writers, there is an insider quality to much of the discussion that may limit the appeal of the arguments being made. For example, in the essay "In Defense of Science Fiction," John Clute speculates about the way the covers for Science Fiction novels are designed, wondering why "knowledge about the difference between a book and its cover" is not applied to the way Science Fiction is marketed. Clute asserts that writers in other popular genres, such as mystery writer P.D. James and spy novelist John Le Carre, see their works "slide 'upmarket' with some ease; and, without losing the allure of their genre underpinning, appeal to an audience that does not believe it dabbles in kids' stuff" (26) because of the way their novels are packaged. I do not wish to take issue with the substance of Clute's argument. But such mundane and invidious comparisons don't really help critics understand the cultural importance of Science Fiction.

Yet despite the inevitable weak essays and lack of focus, this collection does
have an audience, albeit a small one. Because of the anthology's overall readability and breadth of subject matter, this would make a good addition to the hardcore fan's library. Furthermore, the accessibility of the strong readings of literary or filmic Science Fiction would make it of interest for teachers looking for supplementary material for undergraduate courses. Projections, however, will not do much for scholars engaged in serious research.

**NONFICTION REVIEW**

**Encyclopedia of Science Fiction**

Michael M. Levy


The first thing one notices about this new reference book, part of the Facts on File Library of World Literature, is that it lists an author rather than an editor. Most major reference works, consider the Clute/Nicholls *Encyclopedia of Science Fiction* or Neil Barraon's *Anatomy of Wonder*, are edited by a major figure in the field, but with most of the entries produced by a wide range of scholars. The idea that one person might actually write an entire encyclopedia calls to mind visions of Dr. Johnson toiling away in the distant past. If one person in our field is capable of handling such a task, however, it may well be Don D'Ammassa. One of the most prolific book reviewers in the history of science fiction, he is best known for his work in *Science Fiction Chronicle*. A successful novelist and short story writer, he is also a four time nominee for the Hugo Award for best fan writer. D'Ammassa is a near-legendary figure in science-fiction fandom and undoubtedly one of the best-read authorities in the genre.

The advantages of having one enormously knowledgeable person do all the entries in an encyclopedia should be obvious. D'Ammassa brings to this project a unified vision of the field. He knows what he likes and, while one might not agree with him all of the time, he's consistent in his preferences and does his best to be objective. When he assesses a writer's or a work's importance in the field, you can be reasonably certain that his opinion will be both intelligent and in line with opinions expressed in other entries.

The book does have some problems, though. As encyclopedias go, a perhaps inevitable effect of its only having one writer, this is a very stripped down volume indeed. Much smaller than Clute/Nicholls, its coverage is significantly less complete. D'Ammassa includes entries for far fewer authors than are found in Clute/Nicholls and leaves out a number of significant people (among them A. Merritt, Eleanor Arnason, and M. John Harrison to mention three very different examples). He includes no entries for key concepts in the field, movements, magazines, publishers, non-printed media or any of the categories that make Clute/Nicholls so valuable. There's very little on pre-twentieth century literature. What D'Ammassa does include, however, are numerous entries for individual works of science fiction. His entries for novels are generally excellent. To take two specific examples, D'Ammassa deals intelligently with both Jack Williamson's 1949 *The Humanoids* and Dan Simmons's much more recent *Hyperion* series. Both classics are summarized in a graceful fashion, with their key themes clearly outlined. More problematic, however, are some of his short story choices. Of course he does include most of the award winners and genre touchstones, stories like Heinlein's "All You Zombies" and Bradbury's "The Golden Apples of the Sun," but I was surprised by how many genuinely minor pieces were given entries. Do we really need a half-page on Asimov's "All the Troubles in the World" or Anvil's "Bill for
Delivery,” a story even D’Ammassa admits is “generally forgotten”?

In general, D’Ammassa’s choices, and some of his evaluations, also seem a bit dated. In his Introduction he discusses the “immense popularity of science fiction in preference to fantasy, particularly in the United States.” This may have been true twenty years ago, but is hardly borne out by contemporary publication statistics. He also references Jack Vance and Ray Bradbury as examples of genre writers who “have now gained respect outside the field,” a statement which seems similarly applicable to the 1980’s. One wonders why he didn’t reference Le Guin, or Neal Stephenson, or William Gibson. Further, many of the best current science fiction writers are given relatively small entries or are entirely absent. It’s difficult to understand why enjoyable, but minor SF writers like Roger MacBride Allen and Charles Eric Maine should receive nearly two pages of text, while far more important authors like Iain M. Banks, David Brin, and Octavia Butler receive significantly less space, and major (relatively) new figures in the field such as Ken MacLeod and China Miéville aren’t represented at all. One almost wonders if this volume might not have actually been written a number of years ago and then had its publication delayed significantly.

At the end of his alphabetical listing, D’Ammassa includes a number of useful appendices. There’s a Glossary of key science fiction terms; a listing of the Nebula and Hugo Award winners for fiction through 2003; a bibliography of major works of science fiction which runs through 2004 but which ignores significant fiction by authors who haven’t received an entry in the main alphabetized listing; a Selected Bibliography of Secondary Sources and an Index. The Selected Bibliography is quite short and omits a number of important and recent books in the field, including Edward James’s magisterial Science Fiction in the Twentieth Century, Neil Barron’s widely-respected Anatomy of Wonder, and Brian Stableford’s recent Historical Dictionary of Science Fiction Literature.

Ultimately, D’Ammassa’s Encyclopedia of Science Fiction comes off a poor second when compared to the Clute/Nicholls Encyclopedia of Science Fiction, but it’s not without its value. D’Ammassa’s opinions are always intelligent and worthwhile. If his book is less complete or erudite than Clute/Nicholls, it is often more readable, not to mention somewhat more up to date and significantly easier to hold. To my mind Clute/Nicholls and Anatomy of Wonder in its recent 5th edition remain the field’s most important reference sources, but D’Ammassa’s book (along with Stableford’s) has earned the right to a spot on library reference shelves.

NONFICTION REVIEW

Inside the World of Philip Pullman
Amelia A. Rutledge


The subtitle of Nicholas Tucker’s study, Inside the World of Philip Pullman: Darkness Visible, taken from Book I of Paradise Lost, does not evoke either the plot or the engaging lucidity of Pullman’s work: “...[Satan] views/ A Dungeon horrible, on all sides round/As one great Furnace flam’d, yet from those flames/ No light, but rather darkness visible” (I, 60-63). Tucker is aware of the historical and literary contexts of Pullman’s work, but he tends to indicate these contexts without necessarily elucidating their significance with any thoroughness. The reviewers’ “blurbs” for the volume focus on the compactness or handiness of this short book, and therein lies the need to read with caution.
Tucker begins with a biographical section, liberally illustrated with photographs of Pullman from childhood to adulthood. The connections he makes between Pullman's early loss of his biological father, separation from his mother while she worked in London (a separation deeply felt despite the loving nurture by his grandparent), and other disruptions, verge on the facile at times, even though Pullman has alluded to some of these influences. The complexities of life-and-art connections are matters for more nuanced exploration.

The most useful sections of Tucker's work are his surveys of Pullman's varied literary output, especially the earlier novels, including *Galatea*, a work for adults. Although readers of Pullman may know of his interest in graphic novels from *Spring-Heeled Jack* (1989), they might not know that the 1991 edition of *Count Karlsten* was lavishly illustrated and practically a graphic novel in its own right; the sample illustration from that edition will probably encourage readers to seek it out. At the same time, Tucker fails to note Pullman's rescripting of Weber's opera *Der Freischütz* (even to the name Zamiel for the demon); providing this kind of useful intertextual detail is part of the function of author studies, but it is absent here.

Tucker devotes half of the book to a discussion of *His Dark Materials*, providing readings of the three novels *The Golden Compass* (Northern Lights in the UK), *The Subtle Knife*, and *The Amber Spyglass* (1996-2000), and very brief discussions of the influence of Milton, Blake, and Heinrich von Kleist; for the latter, the book provides a translation of "On the Marionette Theatre," an essay whose influence, along with Keats's "negative capability" (which Tucker does not mention), Pullman has more than once acknowledged. Again, the discussion combines astute readings (I was especially grateful for the reference to Winnicott's concept of the "internal caretaker" in the context of the daemons), with a tendency not always to distinguish between a character's assertion and one that can reasonably be attributed to the implied author. For example, Tucker suggests that the Spectres may be a reference to humans' dangerous curiosity; this is the opinion of one philosopher, but to grant it much currency without noting the more complex explanations that connect the Spectres to William Blake's concept is a disservice to the author and to the texts.

Some parts of the discussion of *HDM* seem to have been written without checking textual details: Tucker asserts that Lyra follows Asriel and Roger into another world (97) — Roger dies in his own world. Later, he describes the work of the physicist Mary Malone as "bringing up on a computer screen some elementary particles" (98) when what has occurred is communication by means of manipulated pixels.

Tucker's admiration for Pullman's work leads him to contrast the optimism of Pullman's work with the generally bleaker viewpoint taken, in his view, by mimetic fiction for young adults. Since he does not provide titles, his comments remain at the level of assertions and must be taken with the same caution required by his statement that "although Pullman chooses a fantasy setting... his characters still basically achieve their ends through hard work" (27), a statement readily countered by numerous serious works of fantasy for children and young adults.

For an experienced reader of Pullman's work, Tucker's book may be a handy quick reference for bibliography and brief comments about Pullman's lesser-known works. On the other hand, Tucker's brisk, assured style can mislead readers seeking a "key" to Pullman's work, so the book is a dubious choice for general or academic libraries.

**NONFICTION REVIEW**

**Liminal Lives**

Mark Decker


Generally, academics at least pay lip service to the need for more interdisciplinary investigations. When confronted with scholarly hybrids, however, most find themselves picking and choosing, skimming and slowing down in direct proportion to the materials' relevance to their own specialized training. Typical readers of *SFRA* would approach Susan Merrill Squire's *Liminal Lives: Imagining the Human at the Frontiers of Biomedicine* in this way, becoming engaged when she discusses SF and feeling...
more or less detached when she discusses bioethics, issues in biotechnology, or methodological concerns within the field of science studies. This does not mean that Squire, Brill Professor of Women's Studies and English at The Pennsylvania State University, has not written an interesting book, and does not mean that serious students of SF will not benefit from her discussion of biotechnology and the genre. Instead, it is fair warning that the interests of readers of this review may not square exactly with Squire's, and her book should be approached accordingly. Before I begin this review, however, I should disclose that I know Professor Squire slightly. I was a graduate student at Penn State when she wrote this book, but my interactions with her were limited to no more than a handful of brief conversations at reading groups.

Scholars of SF will certainly be comfortable with Squire's core thesis. Squire posits that there is a "biomedical imaginary," a transdisciplinary creative space where both fictions about biomedicine and biomedical technologies themselves are generated. Consequently, any serious attempt to discuss bioethics needs to include fictive treatments of biotechnology because such tales generate "biocultural meanings from new technologies" (16). Yet Squire is deliberately hazy about the exact mechanism of the biomedical imaginary, and this may disappoint some readers. According to Liminal Lives, "the transformative processes of biomedicine are enabled somehow by the transformative narrative that is science fiction" (19, italics author's). While Squire's "somehow" is intellectually honest, it captures the argumentative lacuna in her book: rarely does she attempt to document direct influence on or communication between the artistic and scientific realms of the biomedical imaginary. Instead, Squire places fictive and technical discussions of similar issues—aging, reproductive technology, transplantation, etc.—side by side and then posits that the resemblance demonstrates the flow of ideas that penetrate the artificial disciplinary boundaries between fiction and science. And while this juxtaposition may not be fully convincing, it does allow Squire's extradisciplinary readers to view familiar texts in new ways.

To illustrate Squire's method, we'll take a look at Chapter 4, "Giant Babies: Graphing Growth in the Early Twentieth Century." Squire reads two SF novels that deal with scientifically engineered growth in the context of the increasing influence of statistical representation of growth on early twentieth century scientists like Harvard Medical School's Charles Sedgewick Minor and British medical researcher Hastings Gilford. This allows Liminal Lives to see H.G. Wells' novel The Food of the Gods as anticipating Minor's statistical theorization of a population-based growth rate (126) while reading Philip Wylie's Gladiator as warning of what would happen if abnormal growth or other physical attributes were restricted to an individual and not a broad segment of the population (130). Squire also examines several texts from Amazing Stories, including Charles H. Rector's "Crystals of Growth" (1927), Earl Repp's "The Gland Superman" (1938), Ross Rocklynne's "Big Man" (1941), and Frank Patton's "The Test Tube Girl" (1942). Squire finds that all of these tales "focus on the way that rate of growth is determined by the earliest stages of life; an awareness of the linkages between the macro- and microprocesses of growth; and an appreciation of the differential growth rates not only characteristic of different species but present within each species" (135). Since all of these issues were of deep concern to scientists working on questions of growth and aging, then, both groups—writers and researchers—were tending the same corner of the biomedical imaginary that would eventually lead to the creation and acceptance of medical treatments like Human Growth Hormone therapy.

SF scholars will also be interested in Squire's larger project of injecting speculative fiction into important policy debates, though they may feel that it is beyond the scope of their own intellectual projects. Squire believes that in bioethics, "literature can articulate an alternative to the dominant discourses of risk management and expert control" that so often inform policy debates (22). She urges policy makers to "consider how the discursive flexibility provided by fiction can serve as a guide to 'the ethics and laws' we must generate in response to novel biomedical strategies" (255). Although Squire provides no concrete policy recommendations, then, her text strongly implies that SF writers should be allowed to participate in ethical and legal decisions involving biotechnology and that their participation should primarily be in the form of fictive treatments of the ethical and legal issues under consideration. And it is pleasant to consider a society where the no-nonsense expert and the imaginative writer are given equal billing.

Yet for the SF community the major limitation of Liminal Lives is precisely its status as expert discourse. This book is theoretically dense and readers will need to be at least passingly familiar with the work of Bruno Latour to avoid occasionally feeling at sea. Also, while Squire writes very clearly in general, there are some passages that would give Fredric Jameson at his most opaque a run for his money. Of course, critical theory is often indispensable for framing cultural critique and complex ideas often require complex language for their proper expression, but the consequence of these necessary inclusions is the creation of an ideal readership that at least has graduate training. An instructor may be able to cull some of Squire's ideas for a lecture, but it would be unwise to assign readings from this book in an undergraduate classroom. Additionally, even those
who would be comfortable with the text's complexity may be put off by some of its secondary concerns. Squire makes it abundantly clear throughout the text that she is having an extended discussion with her colleagues in science studies. For example, *Liminal Lives*‘ first chapter is entitled “The Uses of Literature for Feminist Science Studies” and is dedicated to answering two central questions “Why has feminist literary criticism been so indifferent to the question of science?” and “Why are feminist science studies so little marked by the methodology and epistemology of literary studies?” (28). Clearly, these are very good questions and Squire should be raising them, but they may seem, well, academic for people who do not see themselves as doing science studies.

For someone who is working on biotechnology and SF and employing a theoretically advanced and interdisciplinary methodology, *Liminal Lives* is a very important text. Many more would be interested in Squire's illuminating analysis, but for most of that group this text will probably become another one of the books that would be read if there was but world enough and time.

**NONFICTION REVIEW**

**H. G. Wells’s The Time Machine**

Justin Everett


I approached this book, like others of its kind, with some trepidation. Critical editions and reference guides are rarely enjoyable to read. However, I was pleasantly surprised to find Professor Hammond’s guide to Wells’s novel informative and occasionally engaging. It is useful, I think, for both literary critics and teachers of science fiction.

The organization of the book is not particularly innovative. Like many books of this sort, he begins with a general introduction, followed by a summary of the text and several chapters of historical context and literary analysis. I must say that I found his introductory essay the most engaging part of the book. I will unquestionably refer to the biographical information contained in this section the next time I teach the novel.

The discussion of the evolution of the novel was also informative. However, I found the organization of the latter part of the book at times confusing. The author’s chapters are organized into sub-topics that at moments consist primarily of his own analysis when some review of the opinions of other scholars seems called for. In certain chapters, instead of discussing the various critical lenses that could be used to view (or teach) this book, his analysis is limited by his own mythopoetic perspective. Though he does include a brief bibliographic essay at the back of the book that discusses significant works and trends in criticism, I would have preferred that this come earlier in the book, followed by the author’s own analysis.

One omission I would like to mention that, in my opinion, would have increased the book’s value for me would have been a chapter on approaches to teaching *The Time Machine*. But these are relatively minor points. Generally speaking, I think Hammond’s book is a welcome addition to the scholarship that already exists in this area.

**NONFICTION REVIEW**

**Voices of Vision**

Amelia A. Rutledge


The cover illustration of Jayme Lynn Blaschke’s *Voices of Vision: Creators of Science Fiction and Fantasy Speak* creates, via its digital surrealism, a visual pun on the title and an expectation of content more estranged than the solid, informative interviews, dating from 1999 to 2002, that make up this volume. The interviews of SF editors and writers were undertaken for the magazine *Eidolon*; others were published in *Interzone* or *Black Gate*, and several were published on line in sfSite.com, or The Unofficial Green Arrow Fansite. Blaschke indicates for several interviews that he has restored previously-cut material. The interviews are grouped under the headings of “Vaster than Empires and More Slow: Editors,” “A Source of Innocent
Merriment: Unique Voices in Speculative Fiction,” “Worlds Finest Comics: The Comic Book Creators,” and “I Am Legend: Masters of Fantasy and Science Fiction.”

The implicit large claims in the headings draw attention to the limited sample of writers Blaschke was able to interview; the last section presents Samuel R. Delany, Gene Wolfe, Harlan Ellison, and Jack Williamson, all legendary and all masters, but their presence underlines the exclusionary force of categories, as well as their arbitrariness: Gene Wolfe’s section has almost nothing about the “New Sun” series that made him a legend, and his new fantasy series could just as easily have been discussed under “Speculative Fiction.” One wonders how Blaschke’s acknowledgment of Elizabeth Moon’s “gritty fantasy” squares with the “Innocent Merriment” of Part 2. Categories aside, there is much that is useful in this collection.

For those who generally read and study novels, the sections focusing on editors and comic book writers and artists may be of greatest interest. Blaschke is careful, in the editors’ interviews, to ask a generally consistent set of questions, e.g., what seem to be the current trends in magazine publishing or what would constitute an ideal issue of The Magazine of Fantasy and Science Fiction (Kristine Katherine Rusch and Gordon Van Gelder) or Analog (Stanley Schmidt), or Asimov’s Science Fiction (Gardner Dozois) so that the reader is offered multiple perspectives on significant questions. Occasionally, there is near-unanimity: three of the editors remark on the reluctance of writers to attempt “far-future” fiction. The view, for some, that there is a fear of being outpaced by scientific advances needs to be set against the critical view that there has been little predictive value in SF across its history, as well as major writers’ creative engagement with the current state of society. Blaschke’s original assignment had been to ask for the editors’ opinions about Australian SF; from the editors’ perspective, Australia provides a marketing climate that is, for now, more vigorous than the US market for SF magazines.

The comic-book writers range from those who began as comic-book writers such as Neil Gaiman or the team of Frank Cho and Scott Kurtz, to Brad Meltzer, the writer of legal thrillers who is also writing for the Green Arrow series. These interviews balance discussion of artistic development with insights, especially in the Cho/Kurtz interview, into comic book aesthetic. Readers not familiar with the works under discussion can profit from these very brief insiders’ views of the profession and its dynamics.

There is less unity in the two sections of writers’ interviews. The interviews of speculative writers tend to focus on dominant themes, choices of protagonists (especially Charles de Lint and Elizabeth Moon), and writing habits. The interview with Patricia Anthony is of interest primarily for its discussion of her negotiations for James Cameron’s cinematic adaptation of her novel Brother Termite. In the “Masters” section, the writers speak (or write, in Delany’s case) at length, and the interviews are dominated by the authors’ distinctive voices; in the case of Harlan Ellison, astute commentary is sometimes submerged by the voice. The Delany interview ends with a brief, and eloquent, consideration of the student as audience; the Williamson interview is primarily an act of homage. As noted above, there is little in the Wolfe essay to place the interview here instead of among the speculative writers.

Any library that contains Gary Wolfe’s Science Fiction Dialogues or Larry McCaffery’s Across the Wounded Galaxies should include this volume. Despite its limitations, it supplements brief biographical entries in reference texts and, at times, may provide “reality checks” for aspiring writers, artists, and perhaps editors.

NONFICTION REVIEW

Dying Planet

Thomas J. Morrissey


If you are reading this review, you are probably a Martian, at least in the sense that Ray Bradbury says that we are all Martians now. When I was about nine years old, I read Robert Richardson’s Exploring Mars (1954), and I have been a Martian ever since. I remember quite distinctly that Richardson told his young readers about lichens basking canalside. He even included a Martian calendar featuring an annual five-day holiday that made the arithmetic work out. Markley’s Dying Planet is a must read for all Martians and Marsophiles.

Markley set out for himself the daunting task of tracing in detail the evolution of Mars as an object of scientific enquiry and as a cultural stimulant and mirror. He has provided a reasonably concise chronicle of our growing acquaintanceship with
the Red Planet, focusing on how scientific discoveries or conjectures have interacted with societal values over a nearly four hundred-year span. Mars becomes a prominent example of how European (and Euro-American) culture reacted to the Great Decentering of Humanity that began when Ptolemy gave way to Copernicus, Kepler, and Galileo. Mars has been at the center of conflicting paradigms. Sometimes astronomers saw what they needed and wanted to see; sometimes what they saw changed our ways of seeing.

Markley does a very fine job of detailing the rise, fall and partial renascence of Lowellian Mars. Percival Lowell went to his grave convinced that Mars was a dying world populated by a noble race of engineers. A couple of years ago, it was easy to scorn Lowell. His canals were a fantasy, and there are almost certainly no intelligent Martians (present company excluded). On the other hand, recent revelations about Mars' apparently abundant water supply and the presence of trace amounts of methane in the atmosphere suggest that the planet may be richer than we ever imagined, and that it may harbor life, or least geothermal activity.

The example that best illustrates for me the wonderful dance that Mars has done with culture involves the differing socio-political assumptions made by Lowell and the man who first described the canals, Schiaparelli. Both believed that the Martians were great engineers who were adapting to desiccation and desertification. The Italian socialist assumed that they must be communists, since such an undertaking would take the total commitment of the populace. The American arch-conservative assumed that an engineering elite directed the effort. Markley also does a very good job of catching the vehemence with which some people of science have continued to reach sweeping and definitive conclusions based on what even now is very flimsy evidence.

Storytelling is certainly one way that science and culture meet and interact. The myriad Martian fictions that have appeared over the last century and more collectively tell their own story of what Mars means to us. Markley's catalog of Martian stories is impressive. He has dug up some pretty well hidden stuff (some of which should be allowed to go back into obscurity). The sheer volume of literary output results in some important works getting short shrift. Hence, his discussions of conflicting paradigms. Sometimes astronomers saw what they needed and wanted to see; sometimes what they saw changed our ways of seeing.

Markley does a very fine job of detailing the rise, fall and partial renascence of Lowellian Mars. Percival Lowell went to his grave convinced that Mars was a dying world populated by a noble race of engineers. A couple of years ago, it was easy to scorn Lowell. His canals were a fantasy, and there are almost certainly no intelligent Martians (present company excluded). On the other hand, recent revelations about Mars' apparently abundant water supply and the presence of trace amounts of methane in the atmosphere suggest that the planet may be richer than we ever imagined, and that it may harbor life, or least geothermal activity.

The example that best illustrates for me the wonderful dance that Mars has done with culture involves the differing socio-political assumptions made by Lowell and the man who first described the canals, Schiaparelli. Both believed that the Martians were great engineers who were adapting to desiccation and desertification. The Italian socialist assumed that they must be communists, since such an undertaking would take the total commitment of the populace. The American arch-conservative assumed that an engineering elite directed the effort. Markley also does a very good job of catching the vehemence with which some people of science have continued to reach sweeping and definitive conclusions based on what even now is very flimsy evidence.

Storytelling is certainly one way that science and culture meet and interact. The myriad Martian fictions that have appeared over the last century and more collectively tell their own story of what Mars means to us. Markley's catalog of Martian stories is impressive. He has dug up some pretty well hidden stuff (some of which should be allowed to go back into obscurity). The sheer volume of literary output results in some important works getting short shrift. Hence, his discussions of The War of the Worlds and The Martian Chronicles are not very comprehensive. I found his treatment of Edgar Rice Burroughs to be important and convincing. Markley tends to give more space to obscure items, no doubt because very few readers will know them. His discussions of Lasswitz's On Two Planets and Bogdanov's Red Star and Engineer Meni help to broaden readers' awareness of just how ubiquitous Mars has been in fictional visions of twentieth century political and social thought. The intellectual tie-ins are more important to this book than aesthetic concerns; hence the movie Rocketship X-M, which mesmerized me as a boy but which I now know is really quite lame, gets a fair amount of ink without much of it being devoted to its cinematic shortcomings. In this same vein, the book omits Zelazny's "A Rose for Ecclesiastes," perhaps the most elegant and evocative of all Martian fictions. Absent too is A. E. Van Vogt's "The Enchanted Village," a tale that gives a prescient kick in the pants to Zubrinites who want terraform Mars because it is our destiny to make the universe fit our needs. Markley wisely and effectively devotes an entire chapter to Kim Stanley Robinson's Mars trilogy, affirming it the place it deserves as the premier achievement in late twentieth-century Martian lit. Robinson has consciously responded to old paradigms and boldly described new ones, and Markley has elucidated the process very well.

Markley's research is exhaustive. As a cultural critic, he must and does survey artifacts from a variety of disciplines, including hard and pop science, social theory and lit crit. No one who writes a book like this can find everything that's ever been written on the subject. I am sorry to say that he does not cite either my 1999 article on the Martian Megatext or political scientist Carl Swidorski's insightful piece on Robinson's trilogy in The Utopian Fantastic (2004) (which probably appeared too late for consideration). I think that my discussion of metaphor and Swidorski's analysis of Martian Marxism in Robinson would have been useful to him, although I hasten to add that I certainly learned much more from his book than he would have from my article.

Markley's prose is sound and clear. It is not especially flashy. He occasionally exhibits passion, such as when he trashes the Space Shuttle and Strategic Defense Initiative as pork barrel diversions or counters Robert Zubrin's interplanetary Manifest Destiny. I imagine that Markley would be as horrified as I to see First Officer Zubrin blast off for Mars under the command of Captains Rumsfeld or Wolfowitz.

This must have been a hard book for its author to finally abandon since we learn new things or make new knowledge about Mars almost daily. Also, as a co-author of a book with a high price tag, I commiserate with Markley, whose book is probably too expensive for many who would love to dig into it.

Perhaps his book will spur new interest in some of the lost contributions to Martian musing, such as those of Lasswitz and Bagdanov. Perhaps, too, it will cause some readers to think more about the ethics of space exploration, a serious...
Concern for all of us and a topic central to this book. Dying Planet certainly deserves a place on library shelves, and every good Martian should peruse it since in our minds Mars is very much alive.

FICTION REVIEW

Cultural Breaks
Donald M. Hassler


This new collection of twelve short stories by Brian Aldiss includes three very short pieces, never before published, as well as some substantial novella-length pieces from 1968 and 1978. The new pieces are wonderful—only eleven printed pages—and worth the cost of the book just in themselves. Two deal with small insects, a bee and a beetle, and the third titled "National Heritage" is about a man who accumulates ninety recorded disks of every utterance he has made in his life, and then the disks are destroyed. The insect shorts, also, are about readers and writers and potential destruction. In other words and in short, Aldiss is exhaustively self-conscious and reflective about the writing process, about the examined life and its precariousness. The longer, more classic pieces, reprinted from Galaxy and other respectable venues, are similarly reflexive about writing and, also, about decaying British colonialism. Previously, Aldiss has published several collections of short fiction, which is perhaps his favorite mode although he has done series novels, and at least two "Best of" collections. None of that is here in this book. But what is here is wonderful Aldiss—witty, urbane, trivial and silly at times, but always the serious writer and champion of writing.

The book includes a clever and sensitive introduction written by Andy Duncan which notes that the collection is intended as a celebration of the eightieth birthday of Aldiss and that it has been generated, in part, by his fans and friends from the annual International Conference for the Fantastic in the Arts. I have never made the March pilgrimage to the ICFA in order to meet Aldiss there, but I have read about and seen pictures of its fecundity and lushness as a celebration of the arts with Aldiss at the center of events always. I first met Aldiss myself at the 1978 SFRA conference in Iowa where also we had Ursula Le Guin, Gene Wolfe, and Darko Suvin in attendance; and the tone and feel of that conference, as I recall, was much different from ICFA as Duncan describes it in this book. At that moment nearly thirty years ago, I had just discovered through his Billion Year Spree that Aldiss was one of the few people who valued as much as I did the nearly-forgotten work of Erasmus Darwin as important in the origins of SF. Aldiss is an individual who has had a remarkable run as a champion and player of the work of imagination whether it takes place in a stem Iowa setting or in the hothouse of Florida or in his Oxfordshire garden with small insects. Finally, I sense that Aldiss somehow has inherited the tough British endurance and flair for diplomacy that has allowed him to range the planet all these years on behalf of the imagination and writing. This has resulted in a genuine "cultural break" for us all. So buy this book, save the disks, and watch Aldiss work his nearly alchemic magic of creation and recreation.

FICTION REVIEW

Century Rain
David Mead


Alastair Reynolds' most recent novel is a 'stand-alone' and is not set in the Revelation Space cosmos. But it is like them in a number of ways: it employs some exciting super-science ideas that are integral to the story (not just window-dressing), it portrays a rather bitter future in which humanity has splintered into a number of violently competitive political factions, and its human characters are often harsh, driven and distinctly unlikeable.

Century Rain might appropriately have been called Artifact, had that title not been used already for books by Greg Benford and Kevin J. Anderson. Some three hundred years in our future, Earth has become a barren object, of anthropological and political interest only. For surviving humanity, this world has become a strange, remote and dangerous historical relic.
which has been rendered lifeless, and nearly inaccessible, as a result of human error which loosed a 'nanocaust' – a mass extinction of all organic life effected by nanotechnological mechanisms run amok. What little history remains to humanity is a puzzle locked beneath the ice that covers most of the planet, reachable from mankind's orbital habitats only at enormous risk of infection by the intelligent nanorganisms that permeate almost every cubic inch of the planetary ecology.

What remains of humanity survives in Earth-orbit (in a vast complex of habitats known collectively as Tanglewood) and on the various worlds of the solar system. The descendents of the nanocaust seem quite comfortable there, empowered by a high level of technology but divided into bitter political factions that for the past century have fought hot and cold war over the problem of what to do with Earth. Do you treat it as a memento mori, a telling warning to mankind of its hubris, a mere artifact to be mined for its sad remnants of human history? Or do you use even more nanotech to reclaim and terraform Terra, destroying the past in order to reconquer and repopulate mankind's homeworld? The violence of the conflict between Thrashers and Slashers may seem exaggerated to readers at first, until we realize the pettiness of so many political divisions in the here-and-now.

Verity Auger is a Thrasher historian, searching the glaciated remnants of Paris for bits and pieces of the past. In deep trouble when a student assistant is infected by nanocytes and dies, Verity is sent on an extraordinary and wonderful adventure – to Paris in 1959. But this Paris is not the gigantic artifact whose history Verity has labored at great sacrifice to recover from the nanocaust. This Paris exists at the end of an alien-created hyperweb wormhole on an Earth that seems to be descended from an exact copy of our world as it was in the 1930s, a snapshot evolving inside a vast artificial containment vessel at a distant and unknown site somewhere in the Milky Way. The existence of the alternate Earth, which seems to be a backup copy of our world, is undeniable; artifacts are being sent back up the wormhole by specialists Verity knows. But those anthropologists may be in trouble, perhaps at the hands of political factions among the Slasher "Polity" who are willing to eradicate all life on the copy-Earth in order to resettle it with their order of humanity and try again.

Told in parallel with Verity's investigations of the ruins of Paris is the story of a murder investigation in Paris in 1959 by an American named Floyd. Floyd and his sax-playing ex-cop partner Andre Justine are private detectives by day, jazz musicians – when they can find work – by night. They are hired to look into the death of Susan White of Tanglewood, Dakota, who turns out to be one of the anthropologists Verity Auger is being sent to rescue. As Verity has labored to reconstruct the puzzle of ancient Paris, so Floyd struggles to decode the mysterious documents the increasingly mysterious Susan has left for her sister. Through the magic of the alien hyperweb, Verity and Floyd connect, discover the reason for Susan's murder, and join forces to thwart the destruction of copy-Earth. And they fall in love believably.

Although it is a great talent to create characters who seem ‘natural’ in a remote future, both recognizably human yet also appropriately other, Reynolds' characters in the Revelation Space novels (Revelation Space, Chasm City, Redemption Ark, Absolution Gap) have always seemed to me insufficiently sympathetic. Happily, the characters which Reynolds develops in Century Rain seemed very plausible, perhaps because for much of the book we are reading about events in our recent past, not the distant post-nanocaust, future. Moreover, the humanization of the tech which informs this story is really quite clever. Really, who would have thought that the trip down a cosmic wormhole would be bumpy?

To say much more about the plot – and there is a lot more to it – would be to ruin the fun. And it is fun, well worth reading. Reynolds is one of the bright stars of the British SF firmament, with McAuley, Miéville, Banks, Harrison and Hamilton. This book will confirm his growing reputation as a writer of great sf.

**FICTION REVIEW**

**Live! From Planet Earth**

Warren G. Rochelle


I have not read a lot of Effinger's work before I found Live! from Planet Earth in my mail box a few days before leaving for Las Vegas, and so I didn't know quite what to expect. That each story had an introduction written by a science fiction notable, such as Michael Bishop, Mike Resnick, Howard Waldrop, Pamela Sargent, to name just a few, seemed promising. I had, after all, promised Phil I would read it on the plane going to and coming from Las Vegas and this year's SFRA annual...
conference. I did begin to get an idea of what Effinger might be about when I read Michael Bishop's introduction to "The Aliens Who Knew, I Mean, Everything." According to Bishop, Effinger wrote stories of "surreal intelligence and deadpan wit" (8) and this first story was among his "downright funniest," with its "allusions to low-budget alien-invasion films from the 1950s and 1960s" and the echoes of such "influential Cold War satire" as that of Robert Sheckley and William Tenn (4-6). An individual alien in the story was a nup; the plural, nuhp. Or, in reverse: pun and phun—all of which Bishop found funny.

Puns, phun, Sheckley, Tenn. Satire. And if I didn't get it from Bishop's intro, I surely did from George Zebrowski's Afterword for the same story: "Effinger belongs to the great line of SF's satirical humorists, beginning with Aesop and Jonathan Swift and continuing with William Tenn... Robert Sheckley..." (23). There was my context, and an affirmation of what I kept thinking as I read "The Aliens Who Knew, I Mean, Everything"; this story reminds me of the stories I read in Dimensions of Sheckley: the Selected Works of Robert Sheckley (reviewed in SPRA Review 261). It is a tale about taste. The nuhp, who show up unexpectedly in true "take me to your leader" style at the White House, are blessed with true knowledge of what is the best of, well, everything. The best flowers? Hollyhocks. The best human musical composition? The score from the motion picture Ben Hur, by Miklos Rozsa. The greatest novelist: Alexander Dumas. And the nuhp are so damn cheerful and assertive about their unarguable opinions and insistent on sharing them that they drive everybody crazy. They came, offering us a way to end poverty and hunger and overpopulation—and their insufferable opinions. They give us their interstellar drive, and we use it to leave the Earth in droves, fleeing the nuhp's oh-so-helpful advice. Thus: room in the cities, more than enough food, and more than enough jobs.

This, I thought, is Effinger: science fiction satire, poking fun at human foibles, perhaps a bit "surreal," science fiction of the absurd, humor sometimes a bit black, but humor nonetheless. The collection's second tale, "All the Last Wars at Once," which I am pretty sure I read while cooling my heels in the Richmond airport, my flight of economy class delayed for an hour, reaffirmed my take on Effinger. A Final Solution is offered to racial tension: 30 days of open warfare between blacks and whites. Then, between men and women. Roman Catholics and Protestants. The young versus the old, the right-handed versus the left-handed. Definitely poking fun at human foibles and the humor is definitely black.

The third story, "Two Sadnesses," (read, most likely, at thirty thousand feet), made me reassess my take on Effinger and this collection and in what context to place it. According to Howard Waldrop, who introduces the story, several of what today are considered the classics of children's literature, such as The Wind in the Willows (1908) and Winnie-the-Pooh (1926) were written in the first half of the twentieth century, many before World War I. Waldrop argues that in one sense these stories reflect the "Great Change": "from rural to urban, from the handcrafted to the mass-produced." It is, Waldrop argues, as if writers like Grahame sensed "the Great Change coming in some form or shape. What it was, they didn't know, but they felt things would never be the same, and wanted to get it all down, before it was all gone: (4). For Mille, it is a reaction to the war's horrors and the changes that came with them. Effinger does what is difficult to do: he uses Grahame and Mille as models, capturing the tone and feel of their work, and producing what I would call a postscript to both writers, one last tale for Rat and Mole, and for Pooh and Piglet and Eyore. This time, "What happens to them... is exactly like what would happen to them if their original authors had been afforded glimpse of fifty or sixty years into the future..." (42): Vietnam, defoliation, Agent Orange, pollution, urban sprawl. The result: a heartbreaking and disturbing story, a parable, a cautionary tale.

So, SF satire is not Effinger's only generic context. Like all good writers, he does not have a single vision; he has more than one dream. In addition to the parable, which is often used in speculative fiction, he conducts his own thought-experiments, such as "One," which asks: what if we are alone in the universe? What then? Or "My Old Man," a "sad, funny"—two words which could sum up Effinger—tale of a man's coming-of-age, as he comes to terms with his feelings for an abusive father, and also a tale of what seems to be a haunted computer chess game. The narrator of "My Old Man" is also an example of another of Effinger's "recurring dream[s]": "the image of the lone man trying his best to perform an assigned task that is both impossible and meaningless" (86). Thomas Placide, the protagonist of "Everything but Honor" is yet another, as he seeks to rewrite history by traveling through time to murder a particular Confederate general, "an act he's certain will liberate American blacks from the racist hardships and injustices of the twentieth century" (125). Given Effinger's use of irony and the darkness of his humor, the even darker warnings of his parables, it is not surprising that Placide's "noble" efforts meet with disaster after disaster. There is one last context for Effinger: the writing teacher. The O. Niemand stories in this collection are evidence of that. Like "Two Sadnesses," Effinger again does what is difficult: these stories are written and written well in the style of O. Henry, Steinbeck, Hemingway, Lardner, Thackeray, Thurtle, and O'Connor, and at the same time, they are
successful science fiction tales. Gardner Dozois, in his introduction to these eight tales, argues these are both “stunts, of course, finger-exercises, muscle flexing” and examples of great writing skill, as they are lessons in control of language and tone and voice.

What might a scholar do with this collection? For the Effinger scholar, it would go on the same shelf as the other posthumous Golden Gryphon Press Effinger publication, the 2003 short story collection, Budayeen Nights. Although that universe, “the Muslim underworld of the Budayeen” doesn’t appear in this collection, together these two books would give the scholar and the reader a sense of the range of Effinger’s vision and talent and the diversity of his dreams. Any course that focuses at all on SF humor would have a place for Live! on the book list. And any course that examines the darker, dystopic and often parabolic visions of SF would also be suitable for this collection. If either course gives students the option of writing a story of their own, following Effinger’s example of the use of literary models would not be a bad way to start.

Perhaps Live! from Planet Earth was an apt choice for a top there and back again, from Fredericksburg to Las Vegas: the ordinary and mundane, the surreal (just remember standing in the middle of the Imperial Palace casino), and the darkly funny. As for the rest—the cautionary tales, the lessons in writing, the coming of age and the single man alone with an impossible task motifs—what happens in Vegas, stays in Vegas. Or gets told as a story to the Galactic Overlords on Planet 10. They like good stories.

**Fiction Review**

**Nine Muses**

Philip Snyder


In this welcome offering from small press publisher Wheatland Press, editors Aguirre and Layne present an original anthology featuring some of the top women writers in science fiction, fantasy, and experimental fiction. Along with an introductory essay by Elizabeth Hand, *Nine Muses* collects a baker’s dozen of stories exploring the mysterious relations between creative spirits and the people, places, and energies that inspire them.

As is common in themed anthologies, the contributors vary widely in their degree of adherence to the volume’s ostensible unifying device. Of the stories here that rely most explicitly on the literal presence of muses, one of the most impressive is Kit Reed’s “Spies.” Writing in celebration of Thalia, Muse of Comedy and Idyllic Poetry, Reed brings the Fates down to Georgia, where their lethal designs are comically thwarted by, yes, the Muses. Frankly allegorical—the climax features “Death watching while Art staves her off” —the story also shines as a piece of funny, homegrown magic realism, and reads like a weird lovechild of Neil Gaiman and Hannay O’Connor. Another fine story with a literal muse is Jai Clare’s “Without the Dreaming,” the poignant tale of a lost muse, once the bearer of dreams, who has faded over time into a domesticity “scrubbed, cleaned, and flattened.” And in “She Who Remembers,” a story for Chio, Muse of History, Diana Rogers constructs (or perhaps reconstructs) a Choctaw myth addressing the collision of Native culture with its white military conquerors.

For most of the other writers here, the notion of a Muse figures chiefly as a conceptual springboard, often leading to intriguing experiments with narrative structure and style. One of the best of these is Ruth Nestvold’s “Scraps of Eutopia,” an assemblage of textual fragments from and about the Lost Generation, blending the voices of real and imagined literary figures in a vivid evocation of the High Modernist era. The other standout is Catherine Kaspar’s “Melody,” an offering to Fraterpe, Muse of Music. Set in a nursing home, “Melody” is a quiet but powerful meditation on senescence, on social abandonment, and on the redemptive value of music as a spiritual escape. It’s a beauty.

On occasion, however, the Muses bring dark dreams indeed. Sarah Totton’s “The Teasewater Fire,” for instance, serves up a Pinocchio story that is distinctly twisted, nasty and chilling. An even darker delight is afforded by emerging writer Heather Shaw’s “Skatebirding.” Dedicated to Urania, Muse of Astronomy, “Skatebirding” begins as science fiction: a space station scientist is grounded by her pregnancy, confined to a bubble town on Earth because the open environment isn’t safe for mothers-to-be. A group of friendly skateboarders add a punk note to the story, and along the way, Shaw works in some provocative takes on “Homeland Integrity” politics and feminist issues. In the end, though, it’s a horror story, with an incredible sting in its tail.
Not all of the stories here achieve the same high standard. Beth Bernobich's "The Colors of Tomorrow" is essentially a retelling of "Cinderella" that could have been one of the lighter contributions to Ellen Datlow and Terri Windling's long-running series of adult fairytale anthologies. Victoria Elizabeth Garcia's "Ask For Her Hand" invents an amusingly eccentric family, but doesn't do much with it. Tamar Yellin's "The Day After Tomorrow" tells a story of unrequited love—two stories, actually, linked by one of the four characters—but the ingenuity of the narrative structure is diminished by the lack of much corresponding depth in its characters. Toiya Kristen Finley's "Cue the Violins," meanwhile, is a promising story about a tangle of abusive relationships—a story, ultimately, about fates and destinies—but for me, at least, the story is too self-conscious, too entranced with its own telling to be genuinely inviting. Competent stories all, but not the best of the lot.

That honor would have to be shared by Ursula Pflug's "The Eyes of Horus" and Jessica Treat's haunting "Meeting M." Pflug's story is urban fantasy at its best, set in the world of young people and temp jobs in Toronto, a city which may or may not be host to reptilian aliens, ancient magic, and news flashes from the future. But though the story is awash in the spirits of Egyptian gods, telepathy, and time travel, what draws us in are its characters, their struggles and losses, and not just the shiny surfaces of the narrative's clever inversions, reversals, and twists. Pflug writes magic realism with heart. Equally moving, and equally sophisticated, is Jessica Treat's account of a literal meeting between a writer and a muse who may be an alter ego, and whose role is subsumed at story's end into the protagonist's own identity. We make our muses as best we can, the story suggests. Of both the difficulty and the deep rewards of such an enterprise, this fine collection of stories bears ample testimony.
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