tary on the show in question. Though these provide a first evaluation of the series, their erratic format (some as short as 2-3 lines, some as long as 2-3 paragraphs) and orientation (focusing on anything from special effects, to acting, to narrative arc, to production value) make them highly unreliable.

In general, the encyclopedic value of the book is high, giving a thorough account of the 'bricks' that media scholars might want to use when building their specific castles: Are you looking for vampire love stories, camp science fiction, or high fantasy to build your next paper presentation? No problem, you can find material here – that is, with time and effort when browsing the book. The ultimate problem, the one Terrace has missed when dealing with the new "multi-semantic system," is that it continuously changes and adds different layers of meaning on top of old ones.

First, problems already arise in the research for a project like this. The entries given in this book are highly irregular and prone to changes. Series from obscure sources or in hard to reach national places – like China or India – are not even considered. Some entries simply have gone cold: some productions are made by non-professionals, thus websites can easily be switched off or episodes can be taken down. Others are now gathered in aggregator-websites or streaming-services, and thus have become hidden behind a paywall or need to be searched from their archives. Also, the quality of both show and entry vary immensely: SyFy or Netflix productions are included and offer a broadcast television style production, whereas some Youtube-series might not even name their creators and have only a single pilot episode. (At what point does a show constitute a series, one might ask?)

Second, and even more of a fallacy when dealing with a medium that also works as a "meta-archive" in which "knowledge can be accessed through search engines" (Qvortrup 350), is that the book itself as an encyclopedia is utterly out-dated. As a scholar, looking for zombie TV series, I will have to painstakingly look through the book and note down each time the series' description mentions the word 'zombie'. There is an index, but it only provides names of people (most of whom are completely unknown) and titles of series (which are the sorting basis for the entries anyway), not specific themes. In dealing with the new medium and its technological and social dimension, the author should have realized the irony in capturing digital information in an analogue medium. Instead of a book, Terrace would have been more astute in creating an online archive. This could have been up-

dated regularly, producers could have contacted him to be included, and it would have been digitally accessible for research. That this is possible and very useful is not only proved by the *Internet Speculative Fiction Database* (www.isfdb.org), which catalogues literary works of SF, but also by the transmutation of the *Encyclopedia of Science Fiction* (www.sf-encyclopedia.com) into an online archive, migrating from print to online with its third edition. But maybe, after having discovered "an exciting new world of television programming" (2) on the internet, Mr. Terrace will also be able to embrace the exciting new world of publishing that it offers and move his otherwise very intriguing work into the digital age. An account of all that is there, archived and readily available for research, would provide us with the ultimate opportunity to examine the bricks and build castles from this new digital source material.

Works Cited

Mendelsohn, Farah. "Warum schreibt eine Geschichtswissenschaftlerin über Science Fiction?" Trans. Julia Schmeink. *Zeitschrift für Fantastikforschung* 1.3 (2013): 88-96. Original manuscript by Mendelsohn used for the citations.

Qvortrup, Lars. "Understanding New Digital Media: Medium Theory or Complexity Theory?" *European Journal of Communication*.21 (2006): 345-56.

Demand the Impossible: Science Fiction and the Utopian Imagination

Simon Spiegel

Order option(s): Hard | Paper

IT MIGHT SEEM A BIT ODD that a series devoted to the classics of a certain academic field includes a book written by one of the series' editors. But in the case of *Demand the Impossible*, which has now been re-issued

as part of the Ralahine Classics series, the decision is justified. Tom Moylan's book is undoubtedly a cornerstone of both science fiction and utopian scholarship. The concept of the critical utopia, which Moylan introduced almost 30 years ago, has long been part of our shared nomenclature.

In contrast to the utopian novels of the classic tradition, the critical utopia does not present a finalized draft of a better society. As Moylan says in a much quoted passage "[a] central concern in the critical utopia is the awareness of the limitations of the utopian tradition, so that these texts reject utopia as blueprint while preserving it as a dream" (10). But the novels analyzed are not just anti-utopian critiques; they do offer alternatives, though imperfect ones, which are subject to continual change. The emphasis is not on the final design but rather on a dynamic, never-ending process.

In his informative new introduction, Moylan stresses this activist aspect. Although *Demand the Impossible* was not published until 1986, the book itself, as well as the works it deals with, grew out of the specific situation of the 1970s, "a time that produced a structure of oppositional, indeed utopian, feeling" (xii). The critical utopia as conceived by Moylan is therefore both an interpretive and a periodizing concept. It designates not only textual features but also a moment in history when utopian writing "was saved by its own destruction" (10).

After a compact introduction to the history and theory of literary utopias, the bulk of the book is devoted to the analysis of four novels: Joanna Russ's *The Female Man*, Ursula K. Le Guin's *The Dispossessed*, Marge Piercy's *Woman on the Edge of Time*, and Samuel R. Delany's *Triton*.

Moylan proceeds chronologically and starts with *The Female Man*, finished in 1971 but published in 1975. He underlines the fact that all four critical utopias are science fiction. This is not self-evident. While the two genres have always shown considerable overlap, several important utopian texts of the 20th century, e.g. Charlotte Perkins Gilman's *Herland* or B. F. Skinner's *Walden Two*, can not really be called sf proper. The premise of alternative temporal probabilities, which lies at the heart of Russ's novel, is an established sf trope, however. And it is precisely this sf setting that not only allows the novel to tell the story of its four female protagonists living in different times and places, but that also enables Russ to reject "single-minded, linear, authoritarian, totalized visions of reality or indeed of opposition to the present reality" (59).

The Female Man is in many ways a typical New Wave novel, a complex and often challenging mixing of "a variety of literary forms" (81). Its critical quality is actually as much an effect of its content as of its formal strategies, since they prevent a single totalizing perspective. It is instructive that the most formally traditional of the four novels examined, Le Guin's *The Dispossessed*, has not only turned out to be the most successful one but also serves as the target for Moylan's harshest criticism. In the new introduction, the author expresses regret for some of his remarks; nevertheless his observation that Le Guin's "ambiguous utopia" surprisingly often remains in a conservative and heteronormative position is still convincing.

In terms of style, Piercy's novel is located between Russ and Le Guin, but its story, the rebellion of protagonist Connie who is put into a mental institution and ends up poisoning her doctors, shares Russ's radical vision. Finally, Delany's *Triton*, which "can be read as a response to both [Russ and Le Guin]" (149) is the most extreme reworking of the utopian model. Not so much interested in the description of a society but rather in a look "from the underside" (161), it focuses on a protagonist unhappy with the utopian order. Delany's "heterotopia," a term borrowed from Michel Foucault, "flatly denies utopian writing in order to set free the impulse […] toward a future fulfillment that is not yet achieved but yearned for" (185).

For the new edition, Moylan has not only written a new introduction but also added a chapter on Huxley's *Island*. In addition, there are twelve shorter pieces from colleagues and friends who share their thoughts on his book. The texts vary in length, content, and style, but one of the main issues discussed is the double nature of Moylan's concept. Should it better be reserved for a particular period or can it serve as general heuristic tool? It's no surprise that the different authors arrive at different conclusions.

Although Moylan states that he didn't set out to canonize the four novels, today all of them are considered classics. It might have been interesting to investigate to what degree Moylan's book was nevertheless instrumental in establishing their canonic status. Unfortunately, this question is picked up by none of the authors. Also, there is little discussion of critical utopias after 1980, but rather a strong focus on early predecessors. This is also true for the new chapter on *Island*, Huxley's last novel, which has been much-neglected in utopian studies. While certainly interesting in its own right, Moylan's final assessment that *Island* can not really be called a critical utopia does not add much to the exist-

ing book. Perhaps a chapter on writers who have taken the tradition further would have been more insightful. This criticism aside, *Demand the Impossible* remains an important study and the additional material of the new edition – altogether more than 100 pages – is very useful for putting Moylan's achievement into a historical perspective. Let's hope that other classics of our field – Suvin's *Metamorphoses* comes to mind – soon undergo a similar treatment.

Environments in Science Fiction: Essays in Alternative Spaces

Jerome Winter

Environments in Science Fiction: Essays in Alternative Spaces. Ed. Susan M. Bernardo. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland, 2014. Paperback, 208 Pages, $37.95, ISBN 978-0786475797.

Order option(s): Paper | Kindle

FROM FREDERIK POHL and Cyril M. Kornbluth's *Space Merchants* (1952) to Paolo Bacigalupi's *Wind-Up Girl* (2009), science fiction has arguably always been green. In *Environments in Science Fiction: Essays on Alternative Spaces* (2014), number 44 in the *Critical Exploration in Science and Fantasy Series*, Susan M. Bernardo joins in the recent call to arms — see, for instance, *Green Planets* (2014) edited by Kim Stanley Robinson and Gerry Canavan, Eric Otto's *Green Speculations* (2012), and *Environmentalism in the Realm of Science Fiction and Fantasy Literature* edited by Chris Baratta (2012) — to make the case that a parallel greening should take place in science-fiction studies as well. In this collection of critical essays, Bernardo curates a bridging of canonical science-fictional works and "ecocriticism" or the academic study of literature and the environment that began to accelerate in the early 1990s and is perhaps best typified by Lawrence Buell's *The Environmental Imagination* (1995).

To pre-empt charges of misrepresentation, however, I must hasten to add a necessary *caveat emptor* that the title of the collection, as well as its opening forays into literary ecology, may be misleading. Bernado's book immediately expands its focus well beyond the specifically ecocritical in scope. In the introduction, Bernado states that the book explores the connection between the environment and science fiction in a wider, more theoretical sense of both operative terms. The essays that Bernardo has edited are primarily concerned with the broad way "space, place, and the environment" (Bernardo 2) intersect with individual human beings and larger group dynamics in a rather capacious sense of what counts as speculative fiction in a long historical view that dates back to Mary Shelley. Bernardo therefore splits the book into three parts: essays that focus on the science-fictional representation of excluded minorities through spatial metaphors, that is, "In the Margins: Recentering Individuals, Societies, and the Environment"; essays on science-fiction texts that set out to reinvent the received categories of space and place attachment, that is, "Shifting Worlds Through Re-Creation"; and the final section of essays entitled "Re-Viewing Damaged Worlds Through Quests" that concern modern quest narratives seeking to recuperate cataclysm for a brighter future.

The first section begins with Lauren J. Lacey's "Heterotopian Possibilities in Science Fictions by Stephen Baxter, Terry Pratchett, Samuel Delany, and Ursula K. Le Guin." This essay deploys Foucault's deconstruction of alternative, resistant spaces ("heterotopias") to explore the simultaneous co-extension of hierarchy and reciprocity in humanity's complicated relationship with its natural surroundings. In the next essay, "Acceptance of the Marginalized in Marge Piercy's *He, She, and It* and Melissa Scott's *Trouble and Her Friends,*" Melanie A. Marotta charts what she categorizes as prototypical second-wave cyberpunk texts and their depiction of the corporate foreclosure of utopian communities. The section concludes with "*Anathem*'s Flows of Power," in which Jonathan P. Lewis contends that the tug-of-war between right-wing climate change deniers of the contemporary United States political world and the data-driven academic generation of technoscientific regimes of knowledge is allegorized in Neal Stephenson's *Anathem* (2008) by way of the struggle between the cloistered Concents and the State powers in the far-future space-opera world, Arbe, following the paradigm-shifting discovery of an ancient alien starship in their orbit. Lewis relies on Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari's controversial "schizoanalysis" and its high-theoretical arsenal of "rhizomes," "striations," and "lines of flight" to make the case for the serious contemporary relevance of Stephenson's space opera.

The first essay of Part Two also enters Deleuzian air space as Adam Lawrence uses the complicated notions of "deterritorialization-reterritorialization" to interpret Karel Capek's *War with the Newts* (1936). This essay is