

In the last chapter “Des filles sur des chevaux et *RAW*” [Girls on horses and *RAW*] goes back to Dionnet’s quote: “Ils sont allés vers les horribles filles de calendrier, cheveux brochés [sic] sur cheval blanc” [They went to the horrible calendar girls, brushed hair on a white horse] (12). Dionnet would have wanted an English language *Heavy Metal* with the aesthetics of *RAW* (1987; published by Art Spiegelman and Françoise Mouly) and he was disappointed with the kitsch imagery championed by the American publishers. Labarre observes that there is some truth to this statement if one considers only the covers, filled with pinups in fantasy set-ups. The content of the magazine, however, never completely reflected the covers: “il est ... tentant de renverser la perspective et d’affirmer que *Heavy Metal* aura publié des auteurs importants, pris des risques, soutenu des créateurs avant qu’ils ne rencontrent le succès public, même s’il fallait faire la place aux compromis nécessaires pour garantir rentabilité et rationalité économique.” [it is ... tempting to turn things upside down and claim that *Heavy Metal* published important writers, took risks, supported creators before they became famous, even if it meant making room for the compromises necessary to the profitability and the economic rationality of the magazine] (196). In the general conclusion, Labarre admits that, although *Heavy Metal* had its great moments and most issues still feature quality content, it definitely pales in comparison with the best issues of *Métal Hurlant*, and even with other similar contemporary publications.

A few times, Nicolas Labarre refers to his own book as a “narrative,” but it is a very dense story he is telling. *Heavy Metal, l’autre Métal Hurlant* is filled with factual data and information and it demonstrates very meticulous research—a cross between the work of a specialist and a fan. We need to trust Labarre on the historical details, for only he and those closely involved have knowledge of this information. In this sense, the book is an important one, because it documents an important period in the history of sf and comic magazines. While I was reading Labarre’s study, I found myself wondering who its audience might be. It is definitely an important source for those interested in popular culture and the circulation of cultural practices between France and the United States. Labarre’s monograph is not an easy read, but it provides an overview not only of the magazine industry and of the politics of translation and adaptation, but also insight into the differences in cultural policies and sensibilities.—Sylvie Bérard, Trent University

P.K. Dick, Hegelian Philosopher. Jean-Clet Martin. *Logique de la science-fiction: De Hegel à Philip K. Dick*. Brussels: Les Impressions Nouvelles, 2017. 350 pp. €22 pbk.

The philosophical nature of the genre is a commonplace for sf scholars, but for philosophers probably not so much. Jean-Clet Martin’s recent book, which explores the resonances between G.W.F. Hegel’s *Wissenschaft der Logik* (*The Science of Logic*, 1812) and an array of sf literature and film, is a serious attempt at convincing philosophers of the fruitful connections between these two seemingly very distinct forms of rational speculation. Translated as “The

Logic of Science Fiction: From Hegel to Philip K. Dick,” Martin’s title privileges the author of the *Exegesis* (2011), but his near encyclopedic reading and viewing of sf texts allows him to draw out the resonances between the German Romantic-era philosopher and the fiction of Jules Verne, H.P. Lovecraft, Isaac Asimov, Ray Bradbury, Stephen Baxter, Joe Haldeman, and many others, as well as films by Stanley Kubrick, Ridley Scott, Danny Boyle, and the like. The author of a volume on Gilles Deleuze, Martin also invokes an array of philosophers and critical theorists, including Kant, Bergson, Derrida, and Foucault. This work serves in some ways as a sequel to his unique examination of Hegel’s *Phenomenology of Spirit* (1807) through the lens of detective fiction in *Une intrigue criminelle de la philosophie: Lire “La phénoménologie de l’esprit” de Hegel* [Philosophy’s Criminal Plot: Reading Hegel’s *Phenomenology of the Spirit*, 2009]. In his latest book, Martin uses examples of speculative tropes drawn from sf texts to illustrate aspects of Hegel’s *Logic* and, conversely, demonstrates how sf writers and filmmakers explore Hegelian principles, frequently unbeknown to themselves.

Martin’s study is divided into three main sections, entitled “L’Être” [Being], “L’Essence” [Essence], and “Le Concept” [Concept], which also reflects the structure of Hegel’s *Science of Logic*, and smaller subdivisions help focus the reader’s attention and organize Martin’s leaps of logic into more manageable units. Still, the reader searching for a linear argument might easily get lost; Martin is a Deleuzian, after all, and his style invokes the “lines of flight” central to the latter’s collaborative projects with Félix Guattari. At the same time, however, his main project—validating sf as a serious form of speculation, a valuable contribution to Western humanity’s efforts to make sense of the universe—fascinates and sometimes surprises. Most of Martin’s discussion connects specific passages from writers as diverse as Jorge Luis Borges, A.E. Van Vogt, Robert Silverberg, Christopher Priest, the Greys (Benford, Bear, and Egan), Vernor Vinge, and the Wachowski brothers (he seems unaware that they are now sisters) to various aspects of Hegel’s thought. But he also occasionally documents sf writers’ direct or indirect influence by Hegel and other philosophers.

The volume’s tone is set with two epigraphs. The first is a passage from the *Exegesis* in which Dick states, “Je suis donc hégélien” [I am, then, a Hegelian] (qtd. in Martin 5). In the second, Gilles Deleuze asserts that “Un livre de philosophie doit être ... une sorte de science-fiction” [a philosophy book should be ... a sort of science fiction] (qtd. in Martin 5). Later he asserts that “Lovecraft will undoubtedly be closer to Hegel than anyone else” (109; my translation), citing passages from Lovecraft’s “The Dreams in the Witch House” (1932) to argue that Gilman’s dreams parallel Hegel’s quantitative approach to being in which, with each degree, reality jumps to another “power” (111). Prefiguring the logic of the quantum, Hegel’s *Logic* is also frequently paired with *2001: A Space Odyssey* (both the 1968 Kubrick film and Clarke’s novel published in the same year), as Martin posits that both offer “a logic that is no longer at all that of Aristotle” (113).

Each subsection of the book begins with a philosophical concept or subdivision explored by Hegel and then connects it to a trope of science fiction, revealing how sf texts speculate about the same problems that philosophy does. These include broader categories such as metaphysics, logic, and being, as well as more specific concepts such as the finite and the infinite, identity and difference, freedom and necessity. Martin reads sf texts as exploring existential angst in the deepest of ways, citing passages from Stephen Baxter's *Titan* (1997) that express more effectively than any argumentative text the depths of ontological stress experienced by a protagonist on Saturn's moon, facing a setting absent of all human imprint. Extravehicular activities (EVAs) function in a similar manner, placing the sf protagonist in a situation in which the precarity of being could not be clearer. Martin thus reveals how a text such as Alfonso Cuarón's *Gravity* (2013) forces viewers to reflect on existence in the same way (or even more effectively) that the philosophical treatise does. He also outlines how fictional accounts of parallel worlds and realities or the effects of near- or faster-than-light-speed travel relativize things that are taken as immutable constants by the average human, but that the philosopher and the sf writer and reader are willing to question. Above all, he describes Hegel's *Science of Logic* itself as "an extremely strange speculation that does not resemble philosophy or theology" of its time (19-20; my translation).

Occasionally irritating, despite his extensive readings and viewings, Martin makes some of the mistakes typical of French scholars when discussing the Anglo-American sf canon. He leaves out what we might see as essential elements of authors' names, referring to "l'excellent roman de [Robert] Charles Wilson, *Bios*" (79), to "Edgar [Allen] Poe," and "[P.] K. Dick" (89); he cannot be blamed, though, for his editors' allusion to "Stanislas Klem" in the book's table of contents. But his discussion is also frequently illuminating, even in its footnotes: did you know that Rick Deckard is a reference to René Descartes (80n81)? Or that Lovecraft invokes Hegel in a short defense of poetical meter titled "Metrical Regularity" (1915) (109n119)?

Not for the faint at heart, Martin's book requires a more than basic knowledge of Hegelian philosophy. The casual scholar need not apply here, but sf theorists who read French may find his approach fascinating and I hope it will attract the attention of philosophers. The work is significant in its up-front and in-your-face validation of sf as a form of logical speculation that contributes to human understanding of ourselves and the universe around us. This is yet another example of the French academic world's increasing validation of sf studies, and I only wish Martin had drawn more than the very occasional examples from the French sf canon.—**Amy J. Ransom, Central Michigan University**

Literary and Military Symmetries. Andrew May. *Rockets and Ray Guns: The Sci-Fi Science of the Cold War.* Crewkerne, UK: Springer International, 2018. vi+214 pp. \$27.99 pbk.