



SAPIENZA
UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA

LETTERATURE D'AMERICA

RIVISTA TRIMESTRALE

ANGELA DI MATTEO, *Dalla luna all'Inquisizione: Manuel Antonio de Rivas e il primo viaggio nello spazio della fantascienza americana*

ERIC DROWN, *Rationality and Privilege in Classic American Robot Stories*

MARGHERITA CANNAVACCIUOLO, *De sirenas tecnicizadas (I): lo científico en "La boina roja" de Rogelio Sinán*

RICCARDO BADINI, *La fantascienza no logos in Epílogo en Khoskhowara. Un testo teatrale inedito di Gamaliel Churata*

MARIA CATERINA PINCHERLE, *Um moço muito branco. Un'incursione del fantastico in Guimarães Rosa*

ETTORE FINAZZI-AGRÒ, *Do (bom) uso político do fantástico: amor, humor e terror na ficção de Lygia Fagundes Telles*

FRANCISCO COLLADO-RODRÍGUEZ, *The Imperfections of a Future Past: Trauma, Posthumanity, and Sci-Fi in William Gibson's "The Gernsback Continuum"*

PIA MASIERO, *"This Is What Life Is About": Science Fiction and Dystopias in George Saunders's Tenth of December*

BULZONI EDITORE

ERIC DROWN

RATIONALITY AND PRIVILEGE IN CLASSIC
AMERICAN ROBOT STORIES

In this essay, I read Jack Williamson's "With Folded Hands" (1947) and Anthony Boucher's "Q.U.R." (1943) as science fictional evidence of anxious structures of feelings emerging in the 1940s around white masculinity and privilege.¹ These stories feature men confronting dramatic societal changes brought on by robots. Working as an entrepreneur or a freelancer, they are victimized or valorized by their engagement with robots who embody alien rationalities with the agency to disrupt existing social formations. In so doing, the robots threaten the privileged economic and cultural position of white male protagonists, emplotting fears of the displacement and feminizing of white mental laborers.

In so doing, they champion a universalizing form of possessive individualism that invests white mental labor with a heroic role to play in the rationalization of society. The stories thereby subsume the potentially revolutionary complaints of women and African Americans living in a segregated society structured in part on legal discrimination by sex and race, advancing a paternalistic version of the discourse of possessive individualism, which in the United States is the criteria used to determine whether individuals are entitled to full political, eco-

¹ Jack Williamson, "With Folded Hands," *Astounding Science Fiction* (July 1947): 6-45. Anthony Boucher (writing as H.H. Holmes), "Q.U.R.," *Astounding Science Fiction* (March 1943): 79-91.

conomic, and cultural rights. By universalizing and individualizing the anxieties, experiences and imperatives of men undergoing a crisis of occupational masculinity and denying the legitimacy of feminist, African American, and working class critiques of white male privilege, these stories seek to reserve rationality as a form of white male agency and privilege.

Understood as discourses speaking through writers, rather than intentional expressions of consciously held beliefs, these classic American robots stories help us probe the cultural logic shaping the response of men whose autonomy and privilege was being squeezed structurally on one side by a bureaucratizing social system and on the other by pressure from women and African Americans advocating for an end to legal discrimination and segregation.

The Privilege of Agency Panic

As Andrew Hoberek and Timothy Melley have each shown, the observation that impersonal agents of social control were increasingly circumscribing the autonomy of white middle-class men was a controlling conceit in post-World War II sociology.² As Melley argues, post-war writers responded to this observation with a sense of “agency panic,” a cultural narrative built on the idea that impersonal bureaucratic agencies of social control were targeting individuals with hidden forms of influence understood to be “malevolent, centralized, and intentional.”³ Worse, these big organizations were claim-

² Andrew Hoberek, “The ‘Work’ of Science Fiction: Philip K. Dick and Occupational Masculinity in the Post-World War II United States,” *Modern Fiction Studies*, vol. 43, n. 2 (Summer 1997): 374-404. Timothy Melley, *Empire of Conspiracy: The Culture of Paranoia in Postwar America* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell U.P., 2000).

³ Melley, *Empire of Conspiracy*, cit., p. 5.

ing for themselves qualities once understood to be the province of the individual: autonomy, agency, and moral judgment. For men like C. Wright Mills, William H. Whyte, and Vance Packard, for whom the idea of personhood was deeply rooted in the autonomy, agency, and judgment of individual men, the rise of bureaucratic society threatened a classic form of possessive individualism that, Lisa Duggan argues, was conceived as the exclusive province of white men from the beginning of the republic and the key to their denial of full rights to women and African Americans.⁴

To sociologists schooled on Talcott Parson's 1930 translation of Samuel Weber's *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, the society emerging during war was not a benevolent force creating abundance with "revolutionary potential for social justice," as the emerging liberal consensus ideology held.⁵ As C. Wright Mills wrote in *White Collar*, "rationality seems to have taken on a new form, to have its seat not in individual men, but in social institutions which by their bureaucratic planning and mathematical foresight usurp both freedom and rationality from the little individual men caught in them."⁶ Publishing after the war based on research conducted in the early 1940s, Mills feared that American society was no longer driven by collective interests of individual citizens, but by the interests of military, government, and corporate organizations commanded by a highly-educated, metropolitan power elite. Employing sociologists, psychologists, and other social scien-

⁴ Possessive individualism is defined in C. B. Macpherson, *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism* (Oxford: Oxford U.P., 1962). Lisa Duggan, *The Twilight of Equality?: Neoliberalism, Cultural Politics, and the Attack on Democracy* (Boston: Beacon P., 2004), p. 5.

⁵ Godfrey Hodgson, *America in Our Time: From World War II to Nixon—What Happened and Why* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton U.P., 2005), p. 76.

⁶ C. Wright Mills, *White Collar: The American Middle Classes* (New York: Oxford U.P., 2002), p. xvii.

tists, the power elite used polling, focus groups, and statistics to analyze the masses into interest groups and manipulate public opinion in their own interest.⁷

According to Melley, the “primary cultural function [of agency panic] is to defend the idea that individuals are inviolable, autonomous repositories of internal differences, ideas, and motivations [...] against the consequences of postindustrial economic developments.”⁸ Essentially a defensive stance, agency panic “attempts to conserve this form of individualism by urging individuals to treat large systems as ‘enemies,’ resisting their demand for corporate identity and collective behavior.”⁹ Melley locates this panic in white-collar workers who were permanent, salaried employees, with limited decision-making and goal-setting authority, but it can be found among entrepreneurial free lancers as well, despite the differences in their economic positions.

While white-collar men were rewarded by corporations with job security and a family-friendly consumer lifestyle in newly-constructed suburban homes financed by low-interest 30-year mortgages, entrepreneurs’ (in)security depended on

⁷ Like Mills, William H. Whyte feared that white-collar middle-managers in corporations who had traded autonomy for security had been duped by the false promise that “the goals of the individual and the goals of the organization will turn out to be the same” (William H. Whyte, *The Organization Man* [Philadelphia : U. of Pennsylvania P., 2002], p. 129). Vance Packard believed that American citizens were being targeted by big corporations as the hidden persuaders in advertising agencies drew on marketing research to slice the public into demographic groups, turning citizens into consumers whose desires were bought and sold in 30 second spots (Vance Packard, *The Hidden Persuaders* [Brooklyn, NY: Ig Publishing, 2007], pp. 119-23). Troublingly, Whyte thought, too many middle-class Americans acquiesced without much thought to the reorganization, rationalizing, and standardizing of their lives by these organizations (*The Organization Man*, cit., pp. 131, 398-99).

⁸ Melley, *Empire of Conspiracy*, cit., p. 48.

⁹ *Ibidem*, pp. 48-9.

their own productivity and the currents of a wartime market in which they found themselves sometimes swamped in the wake of big business activity. Embedded in hierarchical organizations where “decision making was centralized in a managerial class,” few mid-level organization men would risk acting freely and jeopardizing their own interest.¹⁰ Entrepreneurs, in contrast, without a central authority to direct them, simply had to use their singular judgment to plan, make decisions, and take action.

While there were certainly differences in the ways white-collar men and entrepreneurial small businessmen responded to the emergence of the corporate consumer economy, there were similarities in the ways they understood their positions in the new economy in terms of their manhood. As Andrew Hoberek argues, the agency panic attending the emerging dominance of the managerial corporation was a response to a perceived shift in the foundation of their masculinity.¹¹ Locked into middling positions in corporate hierarchies, trading their ideas and selves for a salary, white-collar men of the post-war period were characterized by Mills as positioned in “youthful and feminizing bureaucracies” between “customer and supervisor.” In an effort to mediate competing demands, they were often required to perform the “traits of courtesy, helpfulness, and kindness.”¹²

For writers such as Mills and Whyte, white-collar men had accepted a fraught bargain: at work they would accept that their minds and selves belonged to the corporation, which demanded docility and consensus, in exchange for the promise of a secure domestic life in the suburbs. In the suburbs white-collar men were not, as Whyte explains, “subordinates

¹⁰ Lisle A. Rose, *Farewell to Prosperity: Wealth, Identity, and Conflict in Postwar America* (Columbia, MO: U. of Missouri P., 2014), p. 19.

¹¹ Hoberek, “The ‘Work’ of Science Fiction,” cit., p. 380.

¹² Qtd. in *ibidem*, pp. 380-81.

or juniors”; they were “the elders of the suburbs,” the ones “organizing the committees, running the schools, choosing the ministers, fighting the developers, making the speeches, and setting the styles.”¹³ With that bargain, the locus of their masculinity (understood in terms of agency and autonomy) shifted from the workplace to their local communities and their suburban homes, where, because they were often the sole breadwinners, they tried to assert their agency and authority over their wives and children, and enjoyed autonomy in their male-centric dens, workshops, and garages.

Whether refusing this bargain or being excluded from it, postwar freelancers and entrepreneurs nevertheless experienced postwar America’s investment in corporate identity and collective behavior as a challenge to their masculinity. With paychecks dependent on the quantity (if not necessarily the quality) of their own production, freelancers and entrepreneurs found their access to the markers of middle class life—marriage, home, family, consumer goods, and entertainment—threatened by the advent of managerial capitalism. Only exceptional entrepreneurs could compete with the resources and mental labor of big corporations, and those, like McDonald’s restaurants founders Richard and Maurice McDonald, did so by creating knowledge, products, or services that they often later sold or subcontracted to big corporations. Other entrepreneurs contented themselves with success in local, niche or vice economies, providing goods and services in areas of the market not yet dominated by big businesses or, in the case of vice economies or the still largely separate African American economies, seen as undesirable by small and big business alike.

Like middle-class organization men, successful entrepreneurs might claim the status of local elder, but unsuccessful

¹³ Whyte, *The Organization Man*, cit., p. 267.

entrepreneurs struggled to wield authority in the community, as did those “pariah capitalists” who found themselves targeted by moral entrepreneurs such as John Sumner for providing “commercialized vice.”¹⁴ Interestingly, in the slightly disreputable field of science fiction, many freelancers like Boucher and Williamson gained authority by developing wide-ranging expertise in cultural matters, which gave them fame and status among aficionados in specific cultural niches.

Working somewhat precariously in a bureaucratizing culture industry, science fiction writers were well-positioned to observe first-hand the challenges of being an insecure mental laborer. A freelancer until the early 1950s, Jack Williamson made an irregular living writing and selling some 100,000 words a year.¹⁵ Always short of money, he dropped out of college after a few semesters, not to return until after his service in World War II.¹⁶ In 1952, stressed by having lost a regular paycheck when his *Beyond Mars* comic strip was cancelled, and fearing that he might not be able to compete well enough with a new generation of science fiction writers to support himself, Williamson used his GI Bill benefits to enroll in Eastern New Mexico State College to study math and electronics. Supporting himself with a graduate assistantship in English, Williamson told Larry McCaffrey that “it was wonderful to be paid for reading good literature and talking about it.”¹⁷ Earning a Ph.D. in English for a dissertation on H.G. Wells, Williamson turned his science fiction experience into

¹⁴ Jay Gertzman, *Bookleggers and Smuthounds: The Trade in Erotica, 1920-1940* (Philadelphia: U. of Pennsylvania P., 2001), p. 21.

¹⁵ Larry McCaffrey, “An Interview with Jack Williamson,” *Science Fiction Studies*, vol. 18, n. 54 (July 1991): 230-52.

¹⁶ *The SFWA Grand Masters: Volume One*, ed. Frederick Pohl (New York, NY: Science Fiction and Fantasy Writers Association, Inc., 2000), p. 146.

¹⁷ McCaffrey, “An Interview with Jack Williamson,” cit., p. 250.

credentialed expertise that enabled him to use his mental labor to earn a secure place in an intellectual organization.

Like Williamson, Anthony Boucher worked as a freelance critic and reviewer throughout his life, but he was also embedded in the mystery and science fiction sectors of a professionalizing magazine industry, working relatively autonomously for Fantasy House, a subsidiary of Lawrence Spivak's Mercury Press, as the founding co-editor (with J. Francis McComas) of *The Magazine of Fantasy and Science Fiction* and house reviewer for *Ellery Queen's Mystery Magazine*. Though his asthma often made it difficult, Boucher worked tirelessly writing and reviewing, both as a freelancer and for a time in 1934 for the *United Progressive News*.¹⁸

The life histories of both men include stories about how their domestic prospects intertwined with their financial solvency. According to his friend, science fiction writer, editor, and agent Frederik Pohl, "poverty" kept Williamson from asking his childhood sweetheart, Blanche, to marry him, and so she married another.¹⁹ When Williamson returned to Portales, NM in 1947, Blanche had been widowed. Employed as a wire editor at the *Portales News-Tribune*, Williamson proposed. James Gunn, another of Williamson's friends, told me that Blanche had a business of her own selling infants' and children's clothing.²⁰ Boucher proposed to his wife, Phyllis, in 1937 once he got paid for *The Case of the Seven of Calvary*, but she worked part-time as a librarian to help support the family until 1940.²¹ Phyllis "remembers giving a multitude of parties in the

¹⁸ Jeffrey Marks, *Anthony Boucher: A Biobibliography* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2008), p. 10.

¹⁹ Frederik Pohl, "Jack The Wonderful Williamson, Part 5: Blanche" *The Way the Future Blogs*

<http://www.thewaythefutureblogs.com/2010/09/jack-williamson-5/>.

²⁰ Personal communication via SFRA list serv – 5/19/2017.

²¹ Jack Williamson, *Wonder's Child: My Life in Science Fiction* (Dallas, TX: BenBella Books, 2005), p. 170.

early days of the magazine, while being worried that the electricity might be turned off at the same time.”²² The Bouchers’ financial instability was exacerbated by Boucher’s asthma, which in 1941 forced him to move in with his mother, Mary, while Phyllis, pregnant with her second son, returned to her parents’ home for a time.²³

As these brief sketches indicate, neither Williamson nor Boucher should be considered organization men. Though near exemplars of the successful science fiction writer, each worked somewhat insecurely in a niche of the magazine publishing industry. But they nevertheless wrote stories that hinged on an individual man’s adjustment to the demands for corporate identity and collective behavior. In “With Folded Hands,” freelancer Williamson told the story of the displacement of the entrepreneur by a somewhat incoherent robotic figure of alien rationality that at times articulates with corporate rationality, and at others with the potential threat represented by resentful African Americans embedded in segregated white society in domestic and civic service. Boucher’s “Q.U.R.” can be read as a story about the falsely-universalizing paternalistic claims of white men to use clear-sighted rationality to build a society that serves the interests of all beings willing to accept their defined social roles. Both stories, I argue, work in agency panic mode to reclaim rationality as the basis for white male privilege.

The Resignation of the Small Businessman: “With Folded Hands”

Jack Williamson’s “With Folded Hands” emplots the agency panic that accompanied the shift in location of masculine agency from work to home and community, revealing the loss

²² Marks, *Anthony Boucher: A Biobibliography*, cit., pp. 24-5.

²³ *Ibidem*, p. 21.

of individual autonomy that necessarily accompanied the promise of the liberal consensus that society could be managed rationally, creating the abundance necessary to solve social problems. In the story, Mr. Underhill, an entrepreneur struggling to keep his “electronic mechanicals” agency afloat in a “sadly saturated” market, finds his agency and autonomy severely limited by alien humanoid robots charged with a prime directive of “guarding men from harm” (7). Connected to one another by way of a centralized electronic brain, the humanoids are a unified collective, acting like a corporation with complete autonomy to fulfill their prime directive. They not only undermine Mr. Underhill’s own position in the robot market by sending trial humanoids to every home in the city for free and interrupting his line of credit with the Two Rivers bank, but they also force him to liquidate his business, explaining that “human enterprise is no longer necessary, now that we have come” (18). In short, they seek to put an end to “human enterprise,” seeing it as logically “unnecessary” to the fulfillment of their imperative to “increase the happiness and safety of mankind” (139).

The humanoids are, arguably, a figure for the centrally-governed managerial Alfred Sloan type corporation that C. Wright Mills feared had “splintered and refashioned [the world of the small entrepreneur] into an alien shape.”²⁴ For Mills, the Jeffersonian small entrepreneur thrived in the “naturally-harmonious” nineteenth-century America because society was “self-balancing [...], requiring little or no authority at the center, but only wide-flung traditions and a few safeguards for property.”²⁵ “With Folded Hands” starts with the disruptive self-introduction of the alien humanoids into the “quiet and secluded” town of Two Rivers (15). In the first

²⁴ Mills, *White Collar: The American Middle Classes*, cit., p. 19.

²⁵ *Ibidem*.

paragraph, Mr. Underhill is “annoyed and surprised” to discover that he can no longer walk his “usual diagonal path across a weedy vacant block” because “a new wall stopped him” (8). Mr. Underhill’s feelings about his path being blocked by the glittering wall of the Humanoid Institute building foreshadow the loss of autonomy to come as the humanoids, working to “increase the happiness and safety of mankind,” force the small businessman to accept the fraught white collar bargain, exchanging agency and autonomy for security (17).

The humanoids’ appropriation of Mr. Underhill’s agency is not limited to the business world. Though they begin their remaking of human society by outcompeting the small businessman by way of their superior resources, the corporate humanoids rapidly expand their activity to perform other social functions, privatizing policing and, by the end of the story, health care. Driving home from the bank “seething,” Mr. Underhill drives through an intersection against the lights, only to be stopped by a “little black mechanical” who “sweetly” chides him to “respect the stop lights” so not to “endanger human life” (19). Chillingly, the humanoid explains: “as soon as every human being is completely supervised, there will be no need for any police force whatever” (19).

The humanoids’ usurpation of all forms of public agency continues in the private sphere. Embedded in his own home as domestic servants, they also undermine Mr. Underhill’s authority and alter his relationships with his wife and children. They invade his private domain and, ultimately, remove his need to support his family (18). No longer a successful entrepreneur, no longer needing to work to support his family, Mr. Underhill ultimately loses the foundation of his agency. Against genre expectations, he even fails at his effort to use science and engineering to combat the humanoids, failing to disrupt the rhodometric beam that connects local “mobile units” to the central brain on Wing IV (17).

While “With Folded Hands” ends with the humanoid

transformation of society yet incomplete, the story is clear about the ultimate fate of humanity under humanoid supervision. Sledge, the inventor of the humanoids, tells the story of the humanoids' first efforts at social re-engineering on his home planet, Wing IV:

The humanoids were too efficient with their care for the safety and happiness of men. There was nothing left for men to do [...]. Most active sports were declared too dangerous for men.... Science was forbidden, because laboratories can manufacture danger. Scholarship was needless, because the humanoids could answer any question. Art had degenerated into grim reflection of futility. Purpose and hope were dead. No goal was left for existence [...]. [The humanoids] were stronger than men, better at everything, swimming or chess, singing or archaeology [...]. There was no escape from that dead futility. Alcohol was rationed. Drugs were forbidden. Sex was carefully supervised. (82)

Far from the “self-balancing” society of the Jeffersonian republic, the humanoid social order, like the bureaucratic/consumer society Mills rejected, requires continuous monitoring and containment of its subjects' actions and desires. When human discontent becomes a threat to the humanoids' mechanistic social order on Wing IV, they learn how to *make* human beings happy. That is, they suppress dissent and ensure human tranquility through brain surgery, an invasive form of hidden persuasion. In the post-revolutionary robot-run society, there are no politics, no courts of appeal, no institutions of governance. Closed to persuasion, unresponsive to argument on human terms, the humanoids simply do what they think will “guard men from harm.” Their action follows from reasoned need, not from self-interest; ethical and philosophical nuances do not trouble their responses to situations menacing the Prime Directive.

At first glance, “With Folded Hands” seems to be about a threat to the human spirit. Williamson suggests that it is human nature to take risks and strive beyond current limits. The coming of the humanoids saps human will by demonstrating irrefutably humanity’s physical and intellectual inferiority to beings driven by “efficiency [...], dead facts, abstract truth, mechanical perfection” (29). Understood as an embodiment of corporate logic, the humanoids see the desires, freedom, and ambitions of individuals as simply irrelevant to their pursuit of the Prime Directive. They take their injunction literally, protecting men from harm, while promoting the stagnation of humankind.²⁶ But read against the grain, “With Folded Hands” makes a second set of claims about gender and race privilege, revealing the stakes of the android game in mid-twentieth century America. If one stands outside the logic of the story, it becomes difficult to see the difference between the dominance of men in the first few pages of the story and the rule of the humanoids. Carrying out the Prime Directive of patriarchy, legitimating their behavior through appeals to reason and intellect, such men become nothing more than reasoning enforcers of their power and privilege.

Seen this way, the humanoids threaten the position of white men—male human beings—more than they threaten humankind. Even before the humanoids are in wide-spread use, the society of “With Folded Hands” operates according to reason and intellect at the expense of emotion. That is, it is structured by and for white men, who imagine that they manage society without malice or anger, taking as *their* Prime Directive the cultural enjoinder to guard women and children from harm. The few women in the story are largely irre-

²⁶ The story, continued in “And Searching Minds,” assuages agency panic by reclaiming agency for human beings, who, cast in Melley’s terms as heroic individuals “resist [the] demand for corporate identity and collective behavior” (Melley 48-9).

levant in terms of shaping the society in which they live. Rather they represent the rewards and the stakes in the battle of position between the humanoids and men. One model of femininity is visible in an advertisement for humanoids; purchase of one as a domestic servant will transform a working drudge into a sexy companion given to wearing “daring negligees,” “revealing sun suits,” and “dancing in the arms of a golden-haired youth” (8). The story’s only other female characters are Mr. Underhill’s daughter, Gay, and his wife, Aurora, who represent the untroubled bloom of youth and the cost in feminine beauty and temperament of male economic failure:

Aurora, when he married her, had been as utterly adorable as now her little daughter was. She might have remained so, he felt, if the agency had been a little more successful. While the pressure of slow failure was gradually crumbling his own assurance, however, small hardships had turned her a little too aggressive. Of course he still loved her. Her red hair was still alluring, but thwarted ambitions had sharpened her character and sometimes her voice. (10)

Aurora’s character, temperament, and even the shape of her figure, depend on her husband’s actions, particularly on Underhill’s scant success as an android salesman. Not surprisingly, once she agrees to humanoid service in her home, she does in fact fulfill the promise of the advertisement, greeting her husband at the door wearing “her sheerest negligee” (21).

Whereas women and children represent the stakes of the game in “With Folded Hands,” African Americans are menacing fellow competitors for social privilege. Among the first thing Underhill notices about the new, fully autonomous humanoids is their physical presence:

Smaller and slimmer than a man, it was nude, neuter as a doll. A shining black, its sleek silicone skin had a changing sheen of bronze and metallic blue. Its graceful oval face wore a fixed look of

alert and slightly surprised solicitude. Altogether it was the most beautiful mechanical he had ever seen. (7)

Again and again, Williamson emphasizes the blackness of the humanoid body and presents dioramas of the black humanoids in domestic service: delivering refreshing beverages, serving dinner, cooking, cleaning, doing dishes, dressing hair, watching children, doing yard work, and even rebuilding the Underhill home. The humanoids' strange silicone beauty adds to their menace as they begin to spread through town, offering domestic service to human beings in exchange for the assignment of all human property. The humanoids, who sell themselves, need no human salesmen. Effecting societal change through domestic service, acquiring property for power, entering fields previously reserved for white men, disrupting existing social relations, the black humanoids represent a substantial threat to white privilege.²⁷

While Mr. Underhill experiences the re-organization of society by the humanoids as a threat, Mrs. Underhill does not. The humanoids simply remove masculine privilege by disrupting the "wide-flung traditions and protections for property" that prop up patriarchy in Mills's myth of the self-balancing society (19). Consequently, the humanoid threat is not really to human progress, but a threat to white male social position. However neuter their physical forms, the silicone humanoids are the new men in town, beings that have not lost their "assurance" due to failure (10). They have a cold unerring logic that saves them from sentiment and emotional suffering, a logic that allows them to take action to preserve their social status

²⁷ In *A Consumer's Republic* Lizabeth Cohen details the consumer activism of black communities in securing jobs in white businesses and access to national chain stores. (*A Consumer's Republic: The Politics of Mass Consumption in Postwar America* [New York: Knopf Doubleday, 2008]).

and assures their dominance. Men like Mr. Underhill, failures at business, marriage, and progress, are reduced to the status of subordinated women. By the end of the story, Mr. Underhill has become like his wife: invisible, passive, irrelevant, worn by “thwarted ambitions,” reduced to sitting with “his futile hands clenched and relaxed again, folded on his knees. There was nothing left to do” (45). While white men have lost their privilege and their status to the new black men, nothing has changed for women.

To be fair to Williamson, “With Folded Hands” is the first installment of a longer tale, one that he returned to throughout his career. What I am taking as the end of the story—the moment when Underhill is figuratively over-the-hill suppressing his true feelings like a good organization man to avoid being literally under-the-hill—is merely a dramatic pause in an epic tale of struggle against humanoid oppression for a human social order that is also humane. Still, “With Folded Hands” introduces the themes and motifs that resonate in variation throughout the rest of the humanoid cycle of stories, and Williamson never uses the cycle to examine the social or psychological differences between men and women; indeed the dramatic effect of his story depends on readers’ simply accepting his portrait of marriage, family, and gender roles as natural and inevitable. The intensity of the story arises from the horror readers are meant to feel by the subordination of all white men: the loss of their autonomy, their reduction to hand wringing, their frustration at being ruled by soulless black “mechanicals.” So, for Williamson—at least in 1947—male privilege and male dominance are definitive parts of white manhood. Men without these characteristics are not, in fact, men.

“Q.U.R.”: Looking Straight at Paternalism and White Male Privilege

In “With Folded Hands,” the humanoids effect their societal transformation through paternalistic means, reversing a dynamic that shaped African American employment in a segregated economy, even during wartime. As labor historian Joe W. Trotter argues, African Americans made some gains securing “skilled, managerial, and clerical positions” in the defense industry during World War II in part because the NAACP had pressured President Roosevelt to issue the 1941 Executive Order 8802 prohibiting racial discrimination in the war effort.²⁸ But African Americans still faced considerable, sometimes violent, opposition from white employers, workers, officials, and citizens, who, as oral historian Michael K. Honey explains, “sought to keep them from access to skilled jobs, higher wages, and citizenship rights.”²⁹ Violence, enacted or threatened, to person or property, enforced workplace and community segregation. But white efforts to reserve skilled, managerial, and clerical positions for themselves were not always pitched in overtly hostile terms; often their efforts were couched in the seemingly benevolent rhetoric of paternalism. As Brannon Costello explains, paternalism functioned “well into

²⁸ Joe W. Trotter, “Perspectives on Black Working-Class History and the Labor Movement Today,” *Working Papers in Labor Studies*, Comparative Labor History Series, Working Paper no. 8 (Seattle, WA: Center for Labor Studies University of Washington, 1996), p. 18.

²⁹ Honey explains: “In both country and city, whenever African Americans owned homes, land, good tools, or a new car, held good jobs, ran businesses, or behaved ‘above themselves,’ white landlords, police, factory supervisors, guards, and workers put them back ‘in their place.’ For simply driving a new car onto his employer’s parking lot, for example, Coe found his tires slashed by the company’s security guard.” (Michael K. Honey, *Black Workers Remember: An Oral History of Segregation, Unionism, and the Freedom Struggle* [Berkeley, CA: U. of California P., 1999], p. 45).

the twentieth century” as a means of sustaining and signaling white power and privilege:

Paternalism encompasses a whole range of racialized social practices stemming from a belief that African Americans are fundamentally inferior, even childlike, and, as such, require the almost parental care and protection of well-to-do whites who claim to have their best interest at heart, though they may in fact be ruthlessly exploiting them. Kindhearted whites might give African-Americans money, clothes, food, shelter, and advice, but, typically, only if their beneficiaries conform to the proper social roles.³⁰

Costello’s explanation of paternalism provides a key to understanding how Boucher’s seemingly progressive story about segregation masks the way it denies possessive individualism to Venusians and robots, both arguably figures for African Americans living and working in a society in which racial segregation was both legal and, in some circles, starting to be a topic of public and private discussion.

Between 1940 and 1942, several events put the “Negro Problem” and segregation on the national agenda. For instance, Chicago’s African American Congressman Arthur W. Mitchell asked the U.S. Supreme Court to uphold an award for damages for being forced to ride in a second class Pullman car despite holding a first-class ticket.³¹ NAACP leader Walter White called for an end to segregation in the Air Force.³² Alabama governor Frank M. Dixon resisted the provisions of

³⁰ Brannon Costello, *Plantation Airs: Racial Paternalism and the Transformation of Class in Southern Fiction, 1945-1971* (Baton Rouge, LA; Louisiana State U.P., 2007), p. 12.

³¹ “High Court is Asked to Back Race Equality; Negro in Congress Attacks Arkansas Law,” *New York Times*, December 4, 1940, p. 14.

³² “Progress By Negroes for 1941, But Walter White Criticizes Air Force Segregation,” *New York Times*, January 6, 1942, p. 16.

Executive Order 8802, rejecting on behalf of Alabama State Prisons a federal contract that came with the provision that the employer “not discriminate against any worker because of race, creed, color or national origin.”³³ Dixon objected to the clause because it would “break down the principle of segregation of races and force Negroes and white people to work together, intermingle with one another, and even bring about the situation where white employees would work under Negroes.”

Williamson and Boucher and their wives socialized together in 1941 with other Los Angeles-area science fiction writers and editors at Robert and Virginia Heinlein’s home in the Hollywood Hills. As Williamson remembers in, *Wonder’s Child*, they “told shaggy dog stories and recited dirty limericks and talked about science fiction and life in the future and sex and nearly everything” (129). With politics ranging from libertarian to progressive, the Mañana Literary Society surely considered itself enlightened and fair minded. While, as his friends and colleagues remember,³⁴ Boucher was a liberal Catholic, passionate about Democratic party politics and approving of civil rights for African Americans and women, “Q.U.R.” demonstrates a paternalistic approach to racial difference that, ultimately, leaves white masculine privilege in place, denies autonomy to the story’s racial surrogates, and locks them into subordinated social and economic positions.

The project of “Q.U.R.” is to model a kind of common-sense cultural pluralism and suggest that indifference to race is not merely polite or proper, it is a rational and functional behavior. This cultural pluralism is made possible by a rational

³³ “Dixon Rejects WPB Order, Alabama Governor Objects to Clause Regarding Negro Labor,” *New York Times*, July 24, 1942, p. 7.

³⁴ Lenore Glenn Offord, “A Boucher Portrait: Anthony Boucher as Seen by His Friends and Colleagues,” *The Armchair Detective*, vol. 2, n. 2 (July 1969): 69-76.

manner of thinking which seems to eliminate sentiment from problem solving without discarding ethics and morality, and which is offered as the defining characteristic of the possessive individual whose clear sight inevitably makes his society more rational. It is important to note here the absence of women in the story. Oddly, there are no indications that women exist in any way at all. If they exist, women are simply beneath notice or irrelevant to the story's project. Trying to interpret the absence of women is certainly problematic, but the fact that the social actors in a story that takes reason as its ethic are exclusively and by default male seems significant. Without insisting on the claim, I suggest that the reason "Q.U.R" takes the masculinity of agency, autonomy, reason, and individuality as a given without need of comment is that the exclusive possession of rationality by men is a conceit in need of the narrative protection of a world where women are always off-stage.

"Q.U.R." postulates a society in which "humaniform" robots perform all forms of industrial, clerical, and domestic labor. There are robot air traffic controllers, robot transcriptionists, and robot household servants. Human beings spend their time engaged in supervisory and administrative work. In fact "foreman" is "the lowest laboring rank possible to a being" (87). One might expect that under such conditions new social conditions might have evolved. There might, for example, be few reasons for persistent bigotry. In fact, the focal characters casually accept a black man as Planetary Head (86). The story shares the emerging liberal assumption that in time, economic growth would remove the reasons for white bigotry and privilege. But even as the story seems to want to be read as a parable on the obsolescence of racialized thought in a thoroughly industrialized society, its own rhetoric and narrative belies its discomfort with the proposition. The Planetary Head, held up as a shining example of intrahuman tolerance, is nevertheless the victim of Boucher's rhetorical excess. When we first meet him, he is the very portrait of an Uncle Tom: "the

white teeth gleamed in the black face in that friendly grin so familiar in telecasts” (86). Despite Boucher’s paternalistic portrayal of the Planetary Head, readers are invited to see racism as a working class behavior pattern when early on, lowly “factory executives” and “office foremen” torment a Venusian who had “ventured out of the Venusian ghetto” (80).

In “Q.U.R.” the Venusians are figures of African-Americans, functioning as a despised, racialized other; they live in segregated neighborhoods, are subject to lynchings, and are characterized as sullen and resentful. Boucher’s rewriting of African-American laborers as Venusians makes it possible for him to think about racial politics abstractly, without having to consider the specific sociological and historical nuances of segregation in his time. It also helps him write about African Americans as a racialized other without alienating his largely white readers who might respond to a more direct narrative about racism with feelings of guilt, hostility, boredom, impatience, self-righteousness, or maudlin sentiment. By splitting his racial other into the executive class black Planetary Head and the laboring green Venusians, he can admit to the persistence of class-intersected racist thought even while advocating for a general politics of racial indifference. Moreover, he can do so without having to imagine the specific processes of social change. In “Q.U.R.” racial equality is achieved simply by author fiat. Time passes, humanity matures and discards juvenile beliefs and behaviors.

The story personifies the agency, autonomy, and rationality of the possessive individual in free-lancer Dugg Quinby, who is enjoying a liminal period between technical college and taking up an occupation (81). Not yet positioned in the economy, he is free to do as he sees fit. As the story unfolds, Quinby’s clear vision and autonomy enable him to challenge the political, cultural, and economic foundations of Robinc., the untouchable corporate monopoly on whose robots the Terrene Empire depends. Quinby’s central characteristic is

that he “looks at things straight;” that is, he sees only facts and acts in accordance to them, properly but dispassionately (81). According to Quinby, “Everybody looks around the corners of his own prejudices. If you look at a problem straight, there isn’t a problem” (81). The essence of his method is to reject social convention, common sense, and received knowledge as unnecessarily restrictive. This method leads him to an empiricist ethical stance that guides his actions even when it puts himself or his financial interests at risk. Readers first see the ethical implications of Quinby’s manner of looking straight when he rejects the conventional wisdom that Venusians are inherently inferior beings, and therefore subject to harassment without recourse or punishment for the offenders. He “rages silently” into the crowd of men tormenting the Venusian, using his fists to force reality to fit his conception.

Quinby’s actions in defense of the Venusian provoke a brawl and inspire the reluctant unnamed narrator to wade into the melee fists flying. The fight prompts the characters to retire to a bar to reflect on the reasons for the Venusians’ inferior status. Quinby asks:

What I don’t see is why Venusians.... After all, they’re more or less like us. They’re featherless bipeds, pretty much on our general model. And we treat them like they weren’t even beings. While Martians are a different shape of life altogether, but we don’t have ghettos for them or Martian-baiting. (81)

While Quinby’s characteristic method of looking straight enables him to see similarity in apparent difference, which seems like a first step towards seeing Venusians as equals, it also prevents him from understanding the cultural significance of seemingly non-functional differences. Rejecting the idea of inherent racial differences determining social position, Quinby overlooks a key material function of the concept of race in a segregated society, which is to justify as natural and inevitab-

le the existing racial formations that privilege whites over blacks.

Mike, one of the Venusian's tormenters, explains that the problem is that the "gillers" (despite claiming to have "learned a lesson," he cannot bring himself to use "Venusians" in place of the racist epithet) "are too much like us" (81). Only recently converted from his unexamined position of racial superiority, Mike explains his anti-Venusian sentiments to his new friends: "They're like a cartoon of us. We see them, and they're like a dirty joke on humans, and we see red" (81). Mike's own lowly social position is bolstered by his irrational disgust. His visceral disgust not only justifies his personal treatment of the Venusians as something less than "beings;" it also justifies the segregation of Venusians in the economy, where they function as exploitable, disposable labor in manual, service, or dangerous jobs.

To the narrator, the subordinated position of Venusians in Terrene society stems not from the inherent inferiority of Venusians, but from history. During the "First War of Conquest" Earth humans "licked the pants—which they don't wear—off the Venusians." Having forced its will on the Venusians, humanity "can push 'em around" (81). In contrast, the "Second War of Conquest" against the Martians "damned near put an end to the Empire and the race to boot, so we've got a healthy respect for the Martians [...]. We only persecute the ones it's safe to persecute" (81). Though racism is a "narrow stupidity" once practiced "ten centuries ago," the "doctrine of Terrene Supremacy" is nevertheless alive and well in Quinby's time. The narrator snorts when Quinby ponders the possibility of someday seeing a "Venusian as Interplanetary Head" of the Empire (86). This thread of the story clearly establishes the irrational basis of human racism, and positions Quinby as the voice of benevolent reason. Quinby's appeal to reason over history, culture and emotion fails to undermine the racial hierarchies built to function in his society. Boucher's

paternalistic appeal to cultural pluralism ultimately leaves the idea of inherent racial traits in place.

Readers are meant to identify with Quinby and his method of straight looking. Repeatedly, it solves apparently intractable problems—with one exception. No matter how Quinby and readers look at them, Venusians are simply too alien to be integrated into Terrene Society. Boucher's storytelling choices make it impossible to see Venusians as beings possessed with personal histories, voices, and agency. The story never allows the Venusian to speak or enters the Venusian ghetto, and though a Martian joins Quinby's group, it is unthinkable that a Venusian might. Instead, in a remarkable moment of self-analysis, the story puzzles at the Venusian's absence at its end. "By all the rights of storytelling," the narrator says,

the green being should have vowed everlasting gratitude to his rescuer, and at some point in our troubles he should have showed up and made everything fine for us. That's how it should have been. In actual fact the giller grabbed his inhalator and vanished without so much as a "thank you" [...]. Which means, I think, that seeing straight can work with things and robots, but not with beings, because no being is really straight, not even to himself. (91)

So while the Venusians function as a surrogate for segregated African Americans laborers in Boucher's tale, its project is not to recuperate them and redefine them as fully-integrated beings. Rather, it is to use them in service of establishing the moral superiority of Quinby's privileged paternalism.

This ending forces reconsideration of the ethical value of Quinby's characteristic way of seeing, revealing its crucial blind spot; it cannot see its own privilege or recognize the way it is predicated on the denial of other viewpoints, especially those of the oppressed. "Looking straight" seems to function for everybody in the story. Guzub, the Martian bartender,

seems to do it by nature, the Planetary Head sees its value, working-class Mike and the middle-class narrator devote themselves to realizing Quinby's vision. *Only* the Venusian seems not to be straight. Had it been straight, the story insists, it "*should* have been" grateful for Quinby's efforts—but it was not. While "Q.U.R." wants readers to endorse the idea that "prejudices will seem [...] comical to our great-great-grandchildren," it nevertheless finds the Venusians inscrutable because it fails to recognize domination as a significant structural feature of its society (86). Just as Boucher's focal characters, members of a dominating culture, can neither recognize the paternalistic cast of their own thinking, nor fathom the thought-processes of the dominated, so too the story simply cannot recognize its own rhetorical excesses, omissions, and brutalities. The story's quizzical rejection of the possibility of seeing straight in cultural politics suggests that the story's anti-racist theme is secondary to the establishment of the reasoning ability of the possessive individual as the determining social force. With its critique of irrationality and prejudice and its valorization of pure reason as the key to agency and privilege, "Q.U.R." reserves possessive individualism for the dominant classes and denies it to the classes it deems inferior, protecting the privileged vantage point of white masculinity. "Looking straight" is a privilege denied the Venusians and to the other class of dominated beings in this story, the robots, because to grant it to them would reverse the story's paternalistic lens, and open up the potential of looking straight at white privilege.

The story's treatment of the racist and geographical violence aimed at living Venusians is best understood alongside its paternalistic treatment of inorganic robots. Together they tell us something about the twin approaches whites took to maintain their power and privilege and restrict African-American progress. Whereas the alien Venusians are inscrutable, inferior and ultimately unintegratable, the robots of

“Q.U.R.” are utterly intelligible to Quinby, and can with judicious and seemingly benevolent retrofitting be made to thrive in service to society. Humaniform robots all over the Metropolitan District of New Washington are malfunctioning. As the narrator relates, “it would be an arm that went limp or a leg that crumpled up or a tentacle that collapsed. Sometimes mental trouble, too, slight indications of a tendency towards insubordination, even a sort of mania that wasn’t supposed to be in their make-up” (79-80). The problem, it turns out, is not mechanical, but social. When robots were invented, they were modeled on human beings, and so given the personalities and emotions that are prerequisites of possessive individualism. But since their lives were strictly limited to their economic functions, they became neurotic. The robot “operating the signal tower” at the space port “had gone limp in the legs and one arm. He’d been quoted as saying some pretty strange thing on the beam, too. Backsass to pilots and insubordinate mutterings” (82). A humaniform housekeeping robot had become jealous of the tentacled Martoid robots he had seen because “he realized that flexible tentacles would be much more useful than jointed arms for housework. The more he brooded about it, the clumsier his arms got” (83). According to Quinby, the source of the robot neurosis is that their design does not match their function: “almost every robot [...] does only one or two things and does those things constantly. All right. Shape them so that they can best do just those things, with no parts left over” (84). But above all, he insists, do not give them functionality that they cannot use because “the robots became physically sick, sometimes mentally as well because they were tortured by unrealized potentialities” (84).

Quinby’s solution to this crisis is to relieve humaniform robots of the “burden” of parts “they don’t need” (84). When he gets through with the humaniform space traffic controller, it is no longer recognizable as an android. It is just “a box [from which] there extended one arm [...], [which] punched

regularly and correctly at the lights, and out of the box there issued the familiar guiding voice” (83). To “cure” the android, Quinby has removed an arm, the legs, and much of its torso. While Boucher’s illustration indicates that it retains some anthropomorphic features, it is clear that Quinby does not think of these robots as beings with the potential to be possessive individuals, since he never considers the alternative solution—persuading employers to grant their robot “servants” the full and autonomous lives their form inspires them to desire, complete with time off, recreation, and growth.

Unlike in Karel Capek’s *R.U.R.*, which Quinby indicates he has read (84), the question of the rights of robotic beings is never raised in “Q.U.R.” But the weaving together of a meditation on the causes of racism and a philosophical manifesto on the value and superiority of functional thought and design necessarily prompts it. These robots are clearly sentient. They aspire, emote, and dream. In a different social system, they would be possessive individuals with rights. But, without a second thought, Quinby dismembers the robots to prevent them from torturing themselves by perceiving their own unrealized potential.³⁵ What Quinby must prevent, what the story must repress, is the android revolution of Capek’s *R.U.R.*, a revolution we should remember which ends with human extinction. The threat in *R.U.R.* and “Q.U.R.” both is the establishment of an alien logic, one rooted in the experiences of the dominated, one which does not look straight in the same way that Quinby’s privileged functionalism does. Until the robots are “fixed” by Quinby, what they seem to aspire to with their grumbling, backsass, and jabberwocky-inspired verses (86) is not greater functionality, but improved self-image

³⁵ The Head’s decoder robot has no need for speech, so it exercises that faculty by composing Jabberwocky-inspired verse: “Over the larking lunar syllogisms lopes the chariot of funereal eclipses” (86).

and aesthetic pleasure, based not on human models of self or art, but on their own terms.

Like Rossom's Universal Robots, Boucher's usuform robots are a subordinated class, whose activities are limited strictly to their occupational functions. The new usuform robots are ideal workers precisely because they are undistracted by family, aspiration, or aesthetics. In contrast to the ungrateful Venusian, who never acknowledges Quinby's intervention in his life, the pruned robots are thankful for their adaptation and testify that they have never felt better (83, 86). None of the robots presented in the story escape this mutilation, and none is described as regretting it. None is defined, that is, as a being with the agency to do more than fulfill a service function. Boucher presents Quinby's robot solution as a society-changing example of straight-looking that should guide the lives of everyone, beings and robots alike: "What is there to do in life," Quinby asks, "but find out what you're good for and do it best you can" (90). But Quinby misses a crucial distinction. While *beings* enjoy a certain degree of autonomy, the humaniform robots are not ceded the freedom to "find out" what they "are good for." Despite their talents and potential, their functional roles as workers are rigidly limited by their society. Agency and innovation are reserved for men like Quinby, Mike, and the narrator. Even as "Q.U.R." denies the robots consideration as beings entitled to a rich inner life, complete with memories, desires and motivations, it suggests paternalistically that the amputation of their potential is in their own best interest.

Grumbling with discontent and aspiring for a more fulfilling life, the usuform robots can be read as fictional surrogates for black workers resisting relegation to service jobs. Honey reminds us that, during this time,

No matter how much seniority or skill they might actually have, black men were still called "boy" and

classified as helpers, and virtually all black workers came under intense white supervision [...]. Squeezed on all sides, African Americans only rarely found middleclass jobs as schoolteachers, preachers, or entrepreneurs, and these jobs were within the framework of a segregated black community.³⁶

“Q.U.R.” seems to recognize this dynamic and even seems to see resistance, but Quinby’s solution to the problem denies the humanity of robot workers, forecloses on their future, and perpetuates racial hierarchies.

While the characters in the story seem to recognize that, seen straight, tormenting Venusians is wrong, they revel in the retrofitting of the robots, seeing it as wholly transforming society for the better. In usufruct robots, “Q.U.R.” provides humanity with a class it can victimize without guilt. As machines which consume far less than they produce, robots can absorb economic loss and make an abundance economy possible for all. Human beings have transcended racial prejudice and economic disparity, it seems, by benevolently modifying artificial people into servants who cannot help but comply with the deferential service roles defined for them in a paternalistic society. Having the power to retrofit people and claim that it is in their own best interest is the ultimate signal of privilege. With this paternalism in mind, it becomes clearer why Boucher cannot bring himself to have Quinby enhance the quality of robot existence or lead a robot revolution. To do so would mean recognizing the economic functionality of racism, racial discrimination, and class privilege as a structural feature in his own industrialized society.

³⁶ Honey, *Black Workers Remember*, cit., pp. 46-7.

Conclusion

The biographies of Williamson and Boucher reveal them to be enlightened sons of the project of modernity, the idea of which, as David Harvey explains,

was to use the accumulation of knowledge generated by many individuals working freely and creatively for the pursuit of human emancipation and the enrichment of daily life [...]. The development of rational forms of social organization and rational modes of thought promised liberation from the irrationalities of myth, religion, superstition, release from the arbitrary use of power as well as from the dark side of our own human natures.³⁷

But as Horkheimer and Adorno argued, enlightened men are perfectly capable of using instrumental reasoning to conclude that permanent unemployment, radical alienation, and genocide were acceptable means to utopian ends.³⁸ While Williamson was uneasy with unmitigated rationality and Boucher saw it as liberating, both men were unable to see how their own paternalistic and panicky endorsement of possessive individualism as the solution to unequal social relations trapped white men like themselves, women and African Americans in social hierarchies that dehumanized them all.

To do better, to have imagined a future that truly fulfilled the project of modernity, would have required them to tell stories that actively unraveled essentialist beliefs about white male superiority. Doing so might have been particularly difficult writing for John W. Campbell at *Astounding*, during the

³⁷ David Harvey, *The Conditions of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1990), p. 12.

³⁸ Max Horkheimer and Theodore Adorno, *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (New York: Continuum, 1993).

period when, as John Huntington has argued, American science fiction was most committed to heroic rationality embodied in technocratic protagonists whose agency depended on “repressing emotionality and [...] denying subconscious or irrational motives.”³⁹ For Huntington, heroes such as Robert Heinlein’s Chief Engineer Larry Gaines (“The Roads Must Roll”)⁴⁰ can only see their actions as “reasonable responses to the situation” by denying “strong feelings, especially hatred or envy” (5). To imagine a future in pursuit of human emancipation and an enriched daily life would have required Williamson and Boucher to decenter rationality, individualism, and masculinity by desegregating reason and emotion. To imagine truly liberating social structures for all, they would have needed to look straight at feelings of hatred, paternalism, and privilege. That they were unable to do so in these stories suggests just how powerfully the discourses of paternalism and agency panic constrained the thinking of men in their position.

³⁹ John Huntington, *Rationalizing Genius: Ideological Strategies in the Classic American Science Fiction Short Story* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers U. P., 1989), p. 5.

⁴⁰ Robert A. Heinlein, “The Roads Must Roll,” *Astounding Science Fiction* (June 1940).