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Introduction: A battle not yet won

The reflections presented here spring from preparing a new course on sf scheduled for the academic year 2015-16. As I searched for a suitable introduction—one accessible to second-language undergraduate students—I frequently came across statements declaring that teaching sf at a college level was no longer controversial. “For a long time, science fiction struggled with what might be called a ‘crisis of legitimation’”, Brian Baker writes. He adds that

Now, in a sense, many of these battles have been won. Courses on science fiction are now commonplace in undergraduate degrees in English literature (I teach one myself); there are countless books on the subject, and more published every year; there are major academic journals dedicated to its study (the first, *Extrapolation*, was founded some 50 years ago) (1).

Similarly, Andy Sawyer and Peter Wright claim in the introduction to their edited volume *Teaching Science Fiction* that “Given the contemporary context, the question is not whether to teach sf but what kind of sf to teach?” (6, original italics). I cannot claim that teaching sf in the Spanish university is impossible for, of course, others have done it before me; I cannot complain, either, that my Department colleagues have objected in any way to my new course. Nonetheless, I must stress that the ‘crisis of legitimation’ already solved for sf in anglophone countries is by no means over in Spain. The boundaries limiting our task as college teachers and researchers interested in this genre are still too many and need to be urgently broken.

My initial impression of the differences between the Anglo-American university, about which I am relatively informed as an English Studies specialist, and the Spanish university, in which I work, was quite sketchy. This is why I have given myself the task of examining how exactly the boundaries of the Spanish university system operate as regards sf. I cannot pretend to have produced here a complete diagnosis of the situation as hard data is difficult to find and even more to verify. I hope to have raised at least the key issues and to have traced a panorama that should generate debate. This debate should, besides, extend beyond sf to any other ‘crisis of legitimation’ affecting other cultural manifestations (even within sf it is easier to teach print fiction than videogames).

A narrative genre (or mode) cannot thrive without adequate academic critical support. Yolanda Molina-Gavilán, to whom I will here refer extensively, notes that often the Spanish supporters of sf manifest in their defensive comments “cierto complejo de inferioridad frente a la producción extranjera (ostensiblemente la norteamericana) ya hoy reconocida por la institución académica, la cual les otorga títulos de posesión de escuelas, edades de oro con grandes obras clásicas, libros de texto y estudios académicos que las pronuncien como tales” (4). As she further notes, “frente a los voluminosos y eruditos tomos de críticos consagrados” such as Darko Suvin, Brian Aldiss, Robert Scholes and a long etcetera, “el estudioso de la ciencia ficción hispana ha de contentarse con breves prólogos a antologías y escuetos capítulos timidamente incluidos en libros dedicados a repasos históricos del género” (23). Although the panorama has changed to some extent since 2002 when her book was published, her assertion that “la reducción de este tipo de literatura a un guetto cultural tiende a provocar defensas apasionadas que más tienen de fanática que de racional e imparcial valorización” (30, original italics) is, arguably, still valid.

This defensiveness connects with the fact that in Spain sf has been studied mostly by members of its very active fandom. Fandom, however, no matter how committed and productive, cannot secure the official legitimation as ‘culture’ of a given manifestation without some kind of ‘official’ academic support—and vice versa. An unfortunate consequence of the traditional rejection of sf by the very conservative Spanish academia is...
that there has been so far little mutually enriching collaboration. Spanish sf fandom, long neglected by patronizing academics, is logically suspicious of any scholar claiming to be on their side. We, the younger, far more open-minded sf academic specialists—some even with deep roots in fandom—are often frustrated to be regarded as elitist interlopers.\textsuperscript{4}

The story of how fandom and academia interact (or fail to interact) in their treatment of sf as their common object of desire deserves a much deeper analysis than I can offer in these pages.\textsuperscript{5} What seems obvious is that in the 1990s, as fandom became consolidated, a new generation entered the Spanish doctoral programs in the Humanities, including many students born in the 1960s to working-class families. This was a result of the educational policies of Felipe González’s socialist governments (1982-1996), which opened up the Spanish universities in the 1980s to working-class young persons. Some of these new-style PhD candidates had connections with fandom; others, like myself, could be labeled ‘lone wolves’.\textsuperscript{6} Whatever the case, we brought collectively with us into the Spanish university a different perception of popular culture, based on our massive consumption as children and teenagers of popular fictions.\textsuperscript{7} Now, in the 2010s, we find ourselves hailed as pioneers in the struggle to secure full cultural status for popular texts. The youngest generation currently in our classrooms need not go through the process of justifying their research choices, as we had to do (or at least, not to us). Since many postgraduate students are also active in fandom, a collective increasingly earning public respect, they will hopefully bring the academic study of sf closer to the standards it has reached in Anglo-American universities. Provided, of course, that the Spanish university can overcome the deep impact of the liberal policies which have been eroding its foundations since the onset of the 2008 world-wide financial crisis and start generating jobs again.

**Trapped by the Institution: Teaching SF within Strict Boundaries**

A comparison of the different situations in which sf is taught may help the reader understand the strict constraints under which we operate in the Spanish university and how they apply in particular to this genre.

Teaching anglophone sf in an anglophone university appears to be no longer problematic, as noted. A stable critical mass has been reached of both students and academics; sf courses can be regularly taught within ‘English’ and other degrees. The entry by Peter Nicholls, “SF in the Classroom” in the *Encyclopedia of Science Fiction* offers a complete summary of the history and the current phase of this process. In the United States, Sam Moskowitz taught the first sf college course back in 1953. Basically, the 1970s saw the consolidation of sf as a widely taught genre, with 250 college courses listed in 1975. “The story is very different outside the USA”, Nicholls writes, with just a few courses in Canada, Australia and Europe, meaning the UK, where he himself started teaching sf in 1969\textsuperscript{7} (an MA in Science Fiction was first offered by Liverpool University in 1994-5). Despite doubts about the standard of the sf criticism generated in American universities, which Nicholls judges “not notably high” (website), he grants that the field is fully consolidated, as attested by the three main academic journals—*Science Fiction Studies*, *Extrapolation*, the British *Foundation*—and also by the many books, handbooks, bibliographies, and anthologies.

The sf college teacher and researcher with the longest experience in the world, is, no doubt, James Gunn, founder of the Gunn Center for the Study of Science Fiction at Kansas University.\textsuperscript{9} Although Gunn’s impression is that “science fiction still may be considered an intruder on the academic scene”, he stresses that “In terms of numbers of courses or frequency of courses offered, SF surely outranks the other categories that shared its pulp-
magazine origins—the detective story and the western, and certainly the occasional course in the gothic or even the romance” (Gunn website). Making non-American sf teachers incurably jealous, Gunn explains that the English Department employing him since 1970 “has always wanted me to teach science fiction as frequently as I wished”. He created as early as 1974 the Intensive English Institute on the Teaching of Science Fiction.

The offering of sf courses (either Peninsular or Latin American) in a second-language context in the United States, within degrees in Spanish or Modern Languages, is, in contrast, much more limited. All the same, local Anglo-American specialists in Spanish sf, whether born in the USA or migrated there from Spanish-speaking areas, feel legitimated by the American academic tradition to deal with this genre—a situation very different from that of sf specialists in Spain. This is why the two main volumes on Spanish sf, both originating in PhD dissertations, have been produced by Spanish scholars living in the United States: Yolanda Molina-Gavilán’s *Ciencia Ficción en Español: Una Mitología Moderna ante el Cambio* (2002) and Cristina Sánchez-Conejero’s *Novela y Cine de Ciencia Ficción Española Contemporánea: Una Reflexión sobre la Humanidad* (2009). This does not mean, however, that it is easy for specialists like them to teach sf, and much less in its original language. Molina-Gavilán explained (in personal communication, 27 January 2016) that her intensive Winter term course, ‘Science Fiction from Latin America and Spain’, which she teaches regularly at Eckerd College (Florida), is offered in English because it is open to all students in her college. She uses in it the anthology *Cosmos Latinos: An Anthology of Science Fiction from Latin America and Spain* (2003), which she herself edited and translated with Andrea L. Bell. In contrast, sf occupies only part of the Spanish Literature courses which she teaches in Spanish; she names Rosa Montero’s novel *Lágrimas en la lluvia* and the short stories by Angélica Gorodischer and Daína Chaviano as texts often included in her syllabus.

“Teaching Latin American Science Fiction and Fantasy in English” (2011), an article by Elizabeth Ginway—Associate Professor of Portuguese at the Department of Spanish and Portuguese Studies, University of Florida—offers an interesting complementary view. She refers in this piece to her course ‘Latin American Science Fiction and Fantasy’, which actually includes Spanish, Latin American and Brazilian sf. Her students are majoring mainly in Latin American Studies, Anthropology, Spanish or Portuguese (183) but they do not necessarily read the texts in their original language; logically, this makes this course dependent on the available translations. However, whether she teaches in translation or using the original Portuguese-language texts, it is hard to imagine a similar course in Spain. No (Spanish) Department teaches a monographic undergraduate course on Spanish sf—much less on Portuguese-language sf.

Teaching sf in Spain often means teaching anglophone sf, basically American. Whether in Spanish or English Departments, sf is taught within wider-ranging Literature courses and hardly ever in monographic courses. The main exceptions seem to be David Conte of Universidad Carlos III in Madrid and Pere Gallardo of Universitat Rovira i Virgili in Tarragona. Conte has taught from 2006-7 to 2014-15 a 3-credit course on sf, ‘Problemas de la ciencia ficción’, which he has temporarily abandoned seeking to renew lost energy. As Conte explains (in personal communication, 1 February 2016), all UCIII undergrad students must take 6 credits in the Humanities. His popular 3-credit course consisted of an introduction to the genre, using film and print fiction, focused on the genre’s main issues: its difference from fantasy, the techno-scientific foundation, the political dimension and the renewal of myth. He used exclusively anglophone sf in translation.11 Pere Gallardo, an English Studies specialist, taught the course ‘Narrativa utópica’ (his main area of research) between 1995-6 and 2000-1, both at the Universitat de Lleida and the Universitat Rovira i Virgili; also a variety of seminars, MA and doctoral courses on sf. Prof. Gallardo is currently teaching a regular BA course named ‘Literatura i Societat’, which actually deals with sf, but
has seen his teaching very much limited by the cancelling of the MA and doctoral programs in English Studies at URV. My own new monographic course on sf might only last for one edition, depending on the announced reform by which the four-year Spanish BAs will be reduced to a three-year degree, thus eliminating fourth-year electives.

A peculiar situation affects the teaching of sf in the Departments of Spanish: this tends to depend on specialists in the area of Literary Theory and Comparative Literature, usually associated with, precisely, Spanish Departments. These specialists, however, see no need to limit their teaching to Spanish sf (which explains why Conte uses translations from English in his sf course). Some of them, nonetheless, do try to teach as much Spanish sf as possible, as usual within general Literature or Cultural Studies courses. This is the case of Teresa López Pellisa, a colleague at the Spanish Department of the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, and formerly at UCIII, where she organized the I Congreso Internacional de Literatura Fantástica y Ciencia Ficción (May 2008), an event so far with no continuity. As López Pellisa highlighted in conversation (8 February 2016) the whole area of the fantastic, and not just sf, needs to be promoted in Spain, hence the habitual mixture of genres in academic activities such as conferences, publications, etc. It is also important to understand, I would add, that being a specialist in sf is no guarantee of being able to teach sf: Fernando Ángel Moreno Serrano, of the Universidad Complutense in Madrid, has never taught sf (except for occasional seminars). This also despite being the main Spanish specialist in this genre. This also applies to English Studies. The main teaching task regarding sf in any language and Literature Department in Spain actually consists of tutoring BA, MA and PhD dissertations.

The consolidation of Literary Theory, thus, has allowed Spanish sf specialists to open their courses to translated anglophone sf; the downside is that this area has popularized a theoretical and methodological model at odds with what predominates in anglophone Science Fiction Studies. For reasons that should be further explored, the Spanish model for the study of sf tends to follow Todorov’s theorization of the fantastic in *Introduction à la littérature fantastique* (1970), a volume in which sf is classified, not too helpfully, as a sub-genre of the marvelous (the instrumental marvelous). In contrast, anglophone academia tends to follow Darko Suvin’s classification in *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction* (1979) of sf as not at all fantasy but, famously as “a literary genre whose necessary and sufficient conditions are the presence and interaction of estrangement and cognition, and whose main formal device is an imaginative framework alternative to the author’s empirical environment” (7). Despite this divide, the Spanish specialists in Literary Theory are actively fighting the strong prejudice against the fantastic in Spanish Departments; the disagreements between Spanish specialists in Spanish Literature and in Literary Theory are often certainly profound.

Translated Anglo-American sf can also be found in the courses offered by Spanish science college teachers. Judging from the papers presented at the ‘Congrèss Internacional de Ciencia i Ficció: L’Exploració Creativa dels Móns Reals i Irreals’, the inevitable conclusion is that, as I wrote in my review of the event, “It is easier, in short, for a Catalan scientist to include sf in his classes to illustrate his or her teaching than for a specialist in Catalan Literature to teach a course on Catalan sf (replace Catalan with Spanish or French and the problem remains the same)” (Martín 2015, 5). A case in point is the course ‘Physics and Science Fiction’ taught by Manuel Moreno and Jordi José, of the Department of Physics and Nuclear Engineering, Facultat d’Informàtica, Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya. As Moreno and José explain (2014), they introduced sf to illustrate a demanding core course in physics at the beginning of the 1990s, imitating the example set by American universities. They were soon overwhelmed by the very positive student response, which led to the development of a fourth-year elective course (1994-2011) and widespread media attention, particularly following the publication of the handbook in 1994. Moreno and José use, as they explain, fragments of sf films and novels, commenting on obvious errors or praising
them for their accurate use of science. As an English Studies specialist, I find this approach—at any educational level—highly reductive, since the cultural and linguistic nuances of the whole text and of the original English version are lost. Sf, besides, is much more than a genre designed to make certain scientific points, and it seems unfair to judge it just by following this criterion.

Finally, a handful of us teaching English Studies in Spain—with Pere Gallardo as the pioneer—have started including sf in BA, MA and doctoral courses, using the texts in their original versions: Ángel Mateos Aparicio, Juan Antonio Suárez, Alberto Lázaro, Juan Antonio Prieto Pablos, myself. Although this is not officially regulated, all English Studies degrees in Spain are taught in English. This means that any Literature course is a composite effort: we need to teach simultaneously language, literary theory and the set texts. As regards specifically sf, although it might seem that the sheer weight of the Anglo-American literary and scholarly tradition would make this choice easy for us, this is not the case for a variety of reasons. Among them I’ll stress the view, until recently absolutely unquestionable, that only canonical anglophone literature should be taught to undergrads. This means that those of us with the research credentials to offer courses beyond canonical Literature have faced an uphill struggle to do so. Sometimes hampered by our own limitations.

In the academic year 2009-10 I was invited by Pere Gallardo to share with him the first MA course on sf in Spain, ‘Ciència-ficció i el Concepte de Canvi’ (a course in English). When we explained to our students that teaching sf in the Spanish university was by no means easy, one of them candidly asked us what exactly was stopping us. I felt a bit foolish, I must confess. This cowardice, however, is partly justified. One thing is announcing that you are going to teach an sf course knowing that this will be received positively (at least with indifference), and quite a different matter making the same announcement in a hostile environment dominated by unsympathetic senior colleagues who may veto it, even when you are already a doctor and a tenured teacher. I myself lost courage also because the students’ reactions to my doctoral course ‘Enemy Alien, Alien Enemy: Wars in Science Fiction and Film’ (2 credits, 2005-2006, within a doctoral program on ‘War Narrative’) were quite tepid. Besides, in my Department 85% of the students are women, a collective among whom sf is far less popular than fantasy and, indeed, realist fiction. This might explain why in the end my sf elective has only attracted a modest 17 students.

There is an additional problem which conditions to a great extent our collective capacity to teach sf. Our study plans are supervised by the Ministry of Education and although some flexibility has been introduced in recent years, once the plans are published in the Boletín Oficial del Estado any modifications are hampered by massive red tape. Teachers are, simply, not free to design their own courses, which is why we tend to use the available labels as creatively as possible. Even when colleagues offer no objection at all to certain courses, there may be simply no room for them under the Government-approved course list. To give an example, I had to use the BOE-sanctioned label ‘Cultural Studies (in English)’ to teach my elective on the Harry Potter series; likewise, I am currently using ‘English Prose’ for my sf course. In contrast, Prof. Domna Pastourmatzi, of the Department of American Literature and Culture of the Aristotle University at Thessaloniki, explains that she has been teaching sf regularly since 1991 because “we have considerable freedom to propose new courses (...). The curriculum is approved annually but as long as the required courses are covered by us, we can offer the electives we propose” (in personal communication, 29 January 2016). This is obviously the most desirable situation; it is, however, currently just a utopia in Spain.

We, scholars working in Spain, tend to teach whatever courses are available and to join research teams not necessarily close to our fields, which explains academic careers that might seem singularly derivative. I have tried to sneak into my teaching, thus, my research on
Gender Studies, Cultural Studies, Gothic, sf, even WWI. The degree restructuring of 2009 gave me some room to introduce the labels ‘Cultural Studies (in English)’ and ‘Gender Studies (in English)’ into our electives list. Although I got my doctoral degree back in 1996, only tenure, which I obtained in 2002, has guaranteed for me a certain freedom of choice. Even so, I decided to get out of the academic closet for good and proclaim myself an sf researcher (which I have always been, one way or another) only in 2011, when my doctoral student Rafael Miranda submitted his PhD dissertation *The Evolution of Cyberpunk into Postcyberpunk: The Role of Cognitive Cyberspaces, Wetware Networks and Nanotechnology in Science Fiction*. This was the occasion that set Pere Gallardo, Ángel Mateos Aparicio and myself thinking about the need to find our peers in the Spanish university. Pere Gallardo organized then the one-day conference ‘Science Fiction: Past, Present and Beyond’ (URV, 16 March 2012), attended by 16 English Studies specialists, not all of them working mainly on sf. We have not repeated the experience so far, simply for lack of energy, too often consumed by the mounting bureaucracy of the Spanish university.

Even so, English Studies specialists can count ourselves lucky. There are no recent reliable figures at a national level but I can use the information corresponding to my own school, the Facultat de Filosofia i Lletres at UAB, as representative of the national Spanish situation. The BA degree in English Studies attracts 80 new students every year; the corresponding degrees in Spanish and Catalan are far less popular, with about 25 and 15 new BA students for 2015-16, respectively. The number of students reaching the third year determines how many electives we are allowed to offer. For English Literature this oscillates between 5 and 7, sufficient to guarantee a variety of approaches from Medieval Literature to sf. In contrast, my colleagues in the Spanish and Catalan Departments face a much more limited situation: the BA in Spanish only offers in the current academic year 4 Literature electives, the BA in Catalan only 3. The Spanish Literature teachers may choose to include some sf in the electives ‘Textos de la Literatura Hispanoamericana’ and ‘Textos de la narrativa española contemporánea’ but it is easy to see that a monographic course on sf is out of the question. The Catalan Department has only one elective devoted to narrative, focused on the 19th century. The students in the three Departments (English, Spanish, Catalan) may also take any of the 8 electives offered by the teachers from the Literary Theory section of the Spanish Department. Since this section includes the main Spanish specialist in the fantastic, David Roas, it is more likely for students of Spanish and Catalan to step out of realist Literature in his course than in any other (though Roas is not specialized in sf). In contrast, the main Catalan specialist in the fantastic, Víctor Martínez Gil, is unlikely to ever teach either fantasy or sf, considering the situation I describe here.

Cristina Sánchez-Concejero complains that “En realidad, los escritores y cineastas de ciencia ficción española nunca han sido reconocidos” (5). She calls for their “aceptación dentro de los cánones y el currículum de enseñanza de las escuelas y universidades” because “la ciencia ficción es el género por antonomasia para tratar cuestiones humanas” (7). I could not agree more. What she misses is not only the restrictive institutional situation of the Spanish university but also an unavoidable fact: local Spanish sf is not culturally as relevant as anglophone sf in Spain. Supposing that one of my colleagues in the Spanish or Catalan Departments decided to teach an sf course this would be necessarily focused on writers of much lower impact in Spain than most anglophone writers. Not even the most recalcitrant English Studies colleagues can dispute the enormous importance of sf in the culture we study. In contrast, my Spanish Literature colleagues must face an important obstacle: “La ciencia ficción ha sido tanto en España como en Latinoamérica un género de importación cuando no de adaptación, tal como lo han sido otros tipos de literatura popular como la detectivesca o de viajes” (Molina-Gavilán 17). Genres, I must add, also absent from the Spanish university generally speaking.
A peculiar consequence of this situation is that the main hub in the Spanish university connected with sf is located at the Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, not in a Humanities centre. The UPC boasts the most extensive collection of sf texts in the Spanish university, besides being home since 1991 to the ‘UPC SF Award’ for works in Catalan, Spanish, English and French, a distinction highly valued in national and international sf circles. All these achievements are due to the presence at UPC of Miquel Barceló García, who has combined his professional dedication to the fields of computer science, aeronautics and nuclear power with a no less professional dedication to editing, translating, writing and popularizing sf. The collection Nova, which he directed for Bruguera/Ediciones B, and his volume Ciencia ficción: Guía de lectura are indispensable contributions to the field of sf in Spain. Although we all need to be grateful for Barceló’s efforts, the fact that a scientist and not a humanist is the main popularizer of sf at a university level in Spain is an indicator of a worrying inability on the side of the Humanities to understand the narrative genre that best represents the debates on the nature of humanity today. Barceló’s exclusive focus on anglophone writers in his very popular guide and his very negative views of Spanish sf (2015:18) also require a committed response from both authors and scholars.

Language and Culture: The Clashing of English and Spanish

I’ll focus next on what Rosi Braidotti calls “cartographic accuracy” (164). As she explains:

Cartographies aim at epistemic and ethical accountability by unveiling the power locations which structure our subject-position. As such, they account for one’s locations in terms of both space (geo-political or ecological dimension) and time (historical and genealogical dimension). This stresses the situated structure of critical theory and it implies the partial or limited nature of all claims to knowledge. These qualifications are crucial to support the critique of both universalism and of liberal individualism. (164)

This passage from Braidotti’s The Posthuman is part of her call to resist the scientific critique of the Humanities by drawing a map of how exactly power is distributed as regards the generation and distribution of knowledge world-wide. In view of the risk that the Humanities may disappear under attack from the scientists, who claim that we lack a universally valid research method, Braidotti urges us to consider “the multi-lingual structure of research and thinking in the Humanities” (157). As she stresses, since “research practice differs considerably in terms of not only geo-graphical but also temporal locations across Europe and beyond” it is not at all fair “to ask this rich and internally differentiated field” to obey uniform rules, as science is supposed to do.

Nevertheless, her proposal to draw the complete cartography of the Humanities ultimately pays little attention to how the ‘multi-lingual’ nature of research actually results in unwieldy linguistic barriers. This is also important for the sciences: my scientist colleagues struggle to publish in English for international impact, and in Spanish and Catalan to keep their own languages alive in the cartography of science. In the Humanities linguistic matters operate differently but have, likewise, a very high impact. A Spanish scientist must be able to read, speak and write in English, which is not the case for a Spanish humanist. Those of us in the Humanities who must use English as corresponds to our field of research, English Studies, find ourselves, therefore, in a very awkward position. As second-language researchers working in non-anglophone geographical areas we are hardly in a position to be at the forefront of research; at the same time, our habit of publishing in English makes us invisible to our local Spanish peers, whose academic careers develop in another linguistic...
area. We do have a serious problem, then, enhanced by our regrettable habit of not citing other Spanish colleagues in our international publications in English, thus contributing to our own invisibility.

Regarding sf, this invisibility manifests itself at levels hardly ever considered—for instance, handbooks. Choosing the novels and short stories for my new course on sf has been a relatively easy process in comparison to choosing a handbook. I have considered nine volumes, all of them of high quality and well-known in the Anglo-American context. In order of publication, from most recent to older:

- David Seed (ed.), *A Companion to Science Fiction* (2005)

Like Brian Baker, I find that “The exposure to ideas and scholarship about sf is really helpful (to me) (...) when students choose their optional classes” (2015: 7)—this is why selecting an adequate handbook is so crucial. However, I found all these volumes, including Baker’s, too sophisticated for the needs of my second-language students. Not only as regards the academic prose used but also in terms of how the authors rely on a mutually shared cultural background which is actually alien to my students’ own cartography, using Braidotti’s term. My final choice was Hubble and Mousoutzanis’ *The Science Fiction Handbook*, which I found simply more didactic than the rest. Obviously, it makes little business sense for university presses to publish (sf) handbooks addressed to specific markets and language areas; the ideal solution would be for local academics to produce handbooks tailored to their students’ requirements. Yet, my frustration with these otherwise highly accomplished volumes is that they stress the geo-cultural distance between the Anglo-American territory generating sf and the rest which so avidly consumes it, rather than bridge the gap. I had a similar problem with Andy Sawyer and Peter Wright’s *Teaching Science Fiction*. Despite the inclusion of the article by Elizabeth Ginway I have already commented on, the advice offered by the different authors has little application to second-language contexts, beginning with the impossibly long lists of sf texts recommended for classroom use. Logically, this is a problem that extends far beyond sf, yet it is a central part of the cartography that conditions the boundaries within which we teach sf in Spain (and, surely, in many other countries).

Handbooks and anthologies materialize only when a certain field is consolidated enough within the university. There is, then, no equivalent Spanish handbook on sf, although the history of the volumes devoted to sf in Spanish stretches back to 1966. One characteristic of the essays published in Spanish on sf is that although their authors tend to be college-educated and in some cases active academics, they are not trained in ‘Filología’ (the Spanish degrees in language and Literature). It is also difficult to understand the nature of the dialogue linking both sides of the Atlantic. Thus, Molina-Gavilán highlights the pioneering volume by Argentinean author Pablo Cappana, *El sentido de la ciencia ficción* (1966), yet there is no Spanish edition of this volume. Disproving the idea that sf was not of interest for official institutions in Spain, psychologist and psychiatrist Alfonso Álvarez Villar appears to...
be the first Spanish author of an academic text on sf: the 48-page booklet *La ciencia-ficción en nuestro mundo* (also 1966), published by the Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas. The first book-length study on sf published in Spain seems to be, however, *Introducción a la ciencia ficción* by Cuban writer Óscar Hurtado (1971). This was shortly followed by Juan Ignacio Ferreras’s *La novela de ciencia ficción. Interpretación de una novela marginal* (1972). Ferreras, an amazingly dynamic personality was a writer, journalist, college teacher and literary researcher with not one but two doctoral degrees. He did not, however, open up the field of Spanish Literary Studies to sf. The other important volumes produced in the 1970s are Juan José Plans’s *La literatura de ciencia ficción* (1975), and the first landmark study of Spanish sf: Carlos Saiz Cidoncha’s *Historia de la ciencia ficción de España* (1976).

Cidoncha’s *La ciencia ficción como fenómeno de comunicación y cultura de masas en España* (1988, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, program in Ciencias de la Comunicación or Media) is usually credited with being the first Spanish doctoral dissertation on sf. This is incorrect: at least four other researchers precede Cidoncha, though he certainly was the first to deal with Spanish sf. Actually, the first PhD on sf produced in Spain was the work of a specialist in English Studies (then ‘Filología Inglesa’), Ángel Luis Pujante; his dissertation *Realismo y ciencia-ficción en la obra de John Wyndham* was submitted in 1980. Pujante, now a leading Spanish expert on Shakespeare, explained in personal communication (26 January 2016) that his supervisor Javier Coy, a key figure in ‘Filología Inglesa’, did not object to his choice of topic—he was totally indifferent towards sf. Pujante speculates that Coy may have felt comfortable with his intention to prove that John Wyndham wrote a singular kind of sf for which he used “resources, techniques and elements of conventional realist narrative” (e-mail, my translation). This shows how the development of English Studies in Spain, and within them of sf, has been conditioned by local Spanish prejudice against fantasy and by the accompanying defense of realism, rather than by currents already very much alive in Anglo-American Science Fiction Studies (Suvin’s key volume had been published in 1979).

In the blog post “Ciencia ficción en la universidad” (2009) Alfonso Merelo Solá offers a list of 17 PhD dissertations on sf produced in Spain since Pujante’s 1980 pioneer work, though, typically, he forgets the theses produced in English. My own list, to which I have added the dissertations produced between 2009 and 2015, extends to 46 titles (5 in English). 13 of these dissertations originate in Departments of English, 10 in Spanish Departments (6 deal with Spanish sf, the other 4 come from programs in Literary Theory), 5 in Media. A complete surprise came from the realization that 6 theses on sf have been produced in Departments of Architecture. The rest come from a variety of Departments: Sociology (3 theses), Arts (2) and with 1 each: Physical Education (INEF), Slavic Philology, Philosophy, Humanities, Pedagogy, even Civil Engineering. The production of certain dissertations in certain Departments is sometimes difficult to justify. For instance: *La evolución del supervillano en el comic book norteamericano. De Superman a Watchmen* by Miguel Ángel Morán González (2015) originates in the Department of Filología Hispánica y Clásica of the Universidad de León. The figures by decade may seem modest but are proof of the undeniable growth of this research field: 1980s, 5 dissertations; 1990s, 5 dissertations; 2000s, 15 dissertations; 2010-2015, 21 dissertations.

In the 1980s, as the first Spanish PhD dissertations on sf appeared, the Hispanists working in English and Spanish outside Spain started producing academic work dealing with our local popular fictions. The best-known example is that of Genaro J. Pérez. His essay “Cultivadores, temas y motivos de la ciencia ficción actual en España” (1984) published in *Romance Notes*, a journal of the University of North Carolina, is possibly the first academic essay on Spanish sf published in the United States. This was followed by the issue edited by
Pérez himself and Janet Pérez on *Hispanic Science-Fiction/Fantasy and the Thriller* for the *Monographic Review* in 1987. These publications established the trend that later allowed Molina-Gavilán to produce her doctoral dissertation on Spanish sf at the Arizona State University, under the enthusiastic supervision of David W. Foster. In contrast, the first doctoral dissertations on Spanish sf produced in Spain required one more decade of academic legitimation (despite the 1990s work produced in other Departments): *Interpretación y apertura de una obra española de ciencia ficción. La Nave de Tomás Salvador* by Óscar Casado Díaz and *La ciencia ficción en España (1950-2000)* by Fernando Ángel Moreno Serrano, both submitted in 2005. By 2002, Molina-Gavilán, let’s recall this, had already published her dissertation as the indispensable academic monograph *Ciencia Ficción en Español: Una Mitología Moderna ante el Cambio*.

Whereas in the Anglo-American world academic publication on anglophone and Spanish-language sf is fully consolidated, in Spain we still depend on the work of publishing houses addressing a general readership. They certainly produce remarkable work, like the volume *La ciencia ficción española* (2002), coordinated for Robel by Fernando Martínez de la Hidalga. However, the book-length academic studies informed by current trends in literary theory are missing, with the exception of Fernando Ángel Moreno’s *Teoría de la Literatura de ciencia ficción. Poética y retórica de lo prospectivo* (2010). Molina-Gavilán’s observation, already quoted, that most research on Spanish sf appears in prologues, particularly of anthologies, has been once more recently validated by the long study preceding the short stories in Moreno and Julián Díez’s anthology *Historia y antología de la ciencia ficción española* (9-117).34 This valuable volume is, nonetheless, also symptomatic of a situation which needs to be urgently corrected by closer networking between the so far separate (linguistic) fields in Spanish academia: none of the Spanish specialists in sf working in English Studies are included in a bibliography otherwise abundant in academic work originally in English or translated from this language. This is not at all an intended slight, as I am sure, but, rather, a worrying sign of the disconnection between the different language areas. Paradoxically, both the bibliography and the study by Moreno and Díez stress the enormous dependence of Spanish sf from the Anglo-American tradition, with only roughly half their essay devoted specifically to Spanish sf (65-117).

Also paradoxically, the growth of sf in the Anglo-American context may complicate the study of Spanish sf in Spain. I’ll quote once more Molina-Gavilán:

> Considerar las obras escritas en conjunto, en un mismo idioma, es un esfuerzo consciente por evitar la tradicional división entre ‘literatura peninsular’ y ‘literatura latinoamericana’ que las instituciones académicas vienen imponiendo durante años, división que ni las editoriales ni los lectores están realizando en nuestros días con tanto ahínco. (2)

She nevertheless grants that each author is conditioned by their national background and agrees that there is, for instance, a distinctive Argentinean school of sf. From a US point of view it makes perfect sense to try to see all Latin American production—even including Brazil—as a culturally cohesive manifestation, extending to Spain and Portugal in Europe. This is the spirit behind the foundation of the journal *Alambique* in 2013, “a peer-reviewed, open-access journal devoted to scholarly research and criticism in the fields of science fiction and fantasy originally composed in Spanish or Portuguese”, as editors Miguel Ángel Fernández Delgado and Juan Carlos Toledano Redondo declare. Indeed, *Alambique* is a breath of fresh air for the academics working on Latin American sf who do not wish to publish necessarily in English. Yet, we still need locally in Spain an academic journal that
addresses this void. *Hélice: Reflexiones críticas sobre ficción especulativa*, founded in 2006 by the Asociación Cultural Xatafi, and first edited by Julián Díez, declares that:

Nuestra intención es abrir un hueco en castellano para la crítica seria y rigurosa en la literatura fantástica y la ficción especulativa; un tratamiento que ponga de manifiesto la calidad de la narrativa del género pero que no tema en señalar sus defectos, a fin de poder contribuir a su mejora, lejos de la autocomplacencia. Queremos plantear una forma de crítica literaria digna con los textos, con los lectores y con los propios críticos, de la cual podamos sentirnos orgullosos. (‘Nosotros’: website)

I am myself extremely proud to have contributed two articles to *Hélice* (Martín 2009, 2015(b)) and, thus, to bridging the gap between academia and the common sf reader. Yet, *Hélice* is neither an academic publication nor a journal specialized in Spanish sf, and it might take many years for that kind of journal to appear, despite having no competitor. *Brumal: Revista de investigación sobre lo fantástico*, founded by David Roas in 2013, announces specifically the exclusion of sf, fantasy and any genre in which the conflict caused by “la coexistencia siempre problemática de lo posible y lo imposible en un mundo semejante al real” does not happen.35 Beyond the Todorov/Suvin divide which I mentioned earlier and of which *Brumal* is a clear example, and the lack of sufficient Spanish specialists on Spanish sf, it is important to note that the Spanish university cannot compete in resources with the much better funded American university. The recent announcement of the new ‘Latin American Science Fiction Research Grant’ by the University of South Florida Humanities Institute and the USF Libraries to “to support the use of the Libraries unique Latin American Science Fiction collections”,36 though modest ($2000), has no Spanish equivalent (to explore, for instance the UPC collection or the Biblioteca Nacional de España) and it is unlikely to have it in the near future.

Finally, the choice of representative texts through anthologies in English is also having an impact on how Spanish sf is understood by Anglo-American academia. The best-known anthology, Bell and Molina-Gavilán’s *Cosmos Latinos: An Anthology of Science Fiction from Latin America and Spain,*37 is organized, the editors explain, following the principle that “except for anglophone SF, the greatest influence on Spanish and Latin American SF comes from within” (2). This may be correct, though the word ‘within’ needs to be questioned: the dialogue among sf writers in Argentina, Cuba, Mexico, Brazil and Spain may not be as intense as the dialogue among sf writers in each country. The same applies to fandom. The assertion that “Many of the fan organizations, writers’ groups, and publications have long been international, as many speakers of Portuguese can read Spanish and viceversa” (3) is simply not true, at least as regards the linguistic prowess of Spanish readers.

The editors of *Cosmos Latinos* chose to represent Spanish sf with 4 stories out of the 26 collected in the volume: Nilo María Fabra’s “On the Planet Mars” (1890); Miguel de Unamuno’s “Mechanopolis” (1913); Elía Barceló’s “First Time” (1994) and Ricard de la Casa and Pedro Jorge Romero’s “The Day We Went through the Transition” (1998). Interestingly, de la Casa and Romero’s story also appears, together with José Antonio Cotrina’s “Between the Line”, in the anthology edited in 2007 by James Morrow and Kathryn Morrow for *Science Fiction Writers of America, The SFWA European Hall of Fame: Sixteen Contemporary Masterpieces of Science Fiction from the Continent* (excluding British SF...). The grouping of Spanish sf with the European rather than with the Latin American literatures offers, I believe, an alternative perspective worth considering. In this volume the main focus falls not on linguistic homogeneity but on geo-cultural cohesion.38 Again, it is obvious that the language barriers and the lack of translations make interaction among the different European sf traditions extremely complicated, yet at the same time European sf readers and
authors are more likely to interact in events such as Eurocon than in Worldcon. It is yet to be seen, in any case, whether Moreno and Díez’s anthology\(^3\), or the monographic issue on Spanish SF that I am currently editing with Fernando Moreno for Science Fiction Studies (Summer 2017), can send the message that Spanish sf exists on its own right beyond the Latin American and the European perspectives.\(^4\) Without an English translation this seems certainly difficult to achieve.

**Conclusions: So Far, so Good...**

The inevitable conclusion is that although the presence of sf in the Spanish university is stronger than it used to be just two decades ago, it is not yet strong enough. If it were strong enough we would have in Spain a considerable number of book-length studies published by Spanish academics from a variety of disciplines (some even in English), a specialized academic journal, an academic association, academic careers in sf consolidated beyond doctoral dissertations, college courses taught regularly... To this I need to add an urgent growth of networking across language divisions at a national, European and global level. I hope this sounds like a program for the near future rather than as a list of grievances.

As the situation is now, we depend both academically and as regards the production of Spanish sf itself on trends determined by the Anglo-American context and, particularly, by the United States. Given the constrains under which Spanish academia operates, our chronic lack of resources and the conservatism of the senior figures (now retiring), we need to be thankful that American and British academia has helped us to advance in the still unsolved ‘crisis of legitimation’ of sf in Spain. We run the risk, however, of letting others speak for us (particularly US scholars) unless we make the collective effort of taking the reins of our own representation as sf academics (and writers)\(^41\) in the world. In this sense, the English Studies specialists working in Spain can be particularly useful, as we can bridge different academic traditions given our (compulsory) command of English. I believe that Spanish academics are generally too circumscribed by a limited knowledge of English, a problem they need to solve soon. Those of us in English Studies need to start acting as academics placed, following Braidotti, in specific cartographies and not as second-tier or aspiring members of Anglo-American academia. Besides, all of us in Spain need, collectively, to start quoting each other in our academic work and thus publicize internationally what we do locally.

All this, I believe, will greatly benefit sf in Spain and help to break the boundaries limiting today our task as sf teachers and researchers.

**Notes**

1. This is an elective course open to third and fourth-year students of the BA in English Studies at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, taught in English. See the syllabus at [http://ddd.uab.cat/record/134042](http://ddd.uab.cat/record/134042).
2. Molina-Gavilán does praise nevertheless the work of Spanish-language sf specialists Pablo Cappana, Elvio Gandolfo (from Argentina); Domingo Santos, Marcial Souto, Carlos Saiz Cidoncha (Spain); Gabriel Trujillo Muñoz (México) and Bernard Goorden (Belgium).
4. See on this issue the round table “Presentación de Historia y antología de la ciencia ficción española”, (bookshop Gigamesh, 25 April 2015) with Alejo Cuervo, Juanma Santiago, Fernando Ángel Moreno, Julián Díez and myself (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=swr3Qioxe_0). For an excellent overview of Spanish fandom from the inside see Juanma Santiago’s article “Yo sobreviví a las guerras del fandom (Incluso a las que provoqué)” (2014). Lola Robles has no doubt done more for sf than any other woman in Spain, combining fandom and her own sf production (see her blog at [http://masficcionqueciencia.com/tag/lola-robles/](http://masficcionqueciencia.com/tag/lola-robles/)).
During my teenage years, when I started reading sf, fandom was totally dominated by young men. I just never had a (male) friend nor a boyfriend interested in the genre; this, and my shyness, may explain why I did not join any fan organization. I find myself, nonetheless, in a happy relationship of mutual respect with fandom—which I attribute in part to my being a woman in a world of men, now with an increasing female presence.

Alejo Cuervo opened his bookshop Gigamesh—specializing in sf, fantasy and gothic—in Barcelona in 1985. This was crucial for our informal training as readers: many Literature students like myself combined the conservative reading lists of the diverse ‘Filologías’ with a personal reading program in these genres. For students, like me, of ‘Filología Inglesa’ Gigamesh offered in addition an extensive selection of affordable paperbacks in English. Today, the new Gigamesh still offers an astonishing range of books in English, which even shames Amazon.

Ian Watson, unaware of Nicholls’ course, started teaching sf in 1970 in the School of History of Art and Complementary Studies of the City of Birmingham Polytechnic, then not yet a university. In personal communication (2 February 2016), he explained that he earned the lectureship by arguing that “The students are the artists and designers of the future, so they ought to be sensitized to the range of possible futures awaiting them”. As he adds, “I taught what I was reading and writing for the novels and stories which I was starting to write, and everyone seemed happy”.

See <http://www.sfcenter.ku.edu/>.

To be fair, Prof. Ángel Luis Pujante claims that he was the first to include sf in a doctoral course in 1970 in the University of Barcelona. However, he was not a literature teacher but a writer and his course was more focused on the science content. In 1975, he taught sf before other teachers, and his course was not included in official schedules. Moreover, his course was quite short, and unlike other teachers, he did not offer a third course. In 1976, he was the first to teach a large course on sf in the Spain’s History of Art and Humanities course, and he was the first to include sf in an official course.


In contrast, 35 registered for my Harry Potter course, also attended by 10 auditors, which made it the most popular elective of the year 2013-14.

For details of Prof. Pastourmatzi’s experience teaching sf see Tamas (2015) and her own article “Researching and Teaching Science Fiction in Greece” (2004).


For the UPC award, see: <http://www.upc.edu/cienciaficcio/home/home.php>. For the UPC award, see: <http://www.upc.edu/cienciaficcio/prem_ipe/catala/presentacio.php>. UAB has an excellent sf collection of 773 volumes donated by Xavier Úcar, a professor at the Department of Social and Systematic Pedagogy. Unfortunately this is kept in a basement inaccessible to readers, which means that only those specifically seeking a title will ask to borrow it. Incidentally, the collection consists mostly of translations from English. See: <http://www.uab.cat/web/biblioteca-d-humanitats/col-leccions-especials-1345649027924.html>


The few exceptions are Arkadi and Boris Strugatsky’s *Trudno byt bogom* (1964) and *Píknik na obochinie* (1972), and Stanislas Lem’s *Solaris* (1961). Spanish sf is mentioned mainly in relation to magazines and anthologies (2015: 426-7).

27 The case of Darko Suvin, born in Croatia in 1934, proves the point. Suvin became a crucial figure in Science Fiction Studies only after migrating to Canada in 1967 (he was a professor at McGill University, Montreal, from 1968 to 1999). It is extremely unlikely that Suvin would have had the same impact had he pursued his academic career in Croatia and in his native language. See the entry at the *Encyclopedia of Science Fiction*.

28 This may have to do with a concern that in order to demonstrate the adequacy of our research we must stress that we are in dialogue with the main international names.

29 I have not read yet the volume edited by Ritch Calvin, Doug Davis, Karen Hellekson and Craig Jacobsen, *SF 101: A Guide to Teaching and Studying Science Fiction* (2014) but the approach does not seem to be more inclusive geographically—the use of the number ‘101’ meaning basic is unknown outside anglophone areas.

30 Later revised as *El mundo de la ciencia ficción, sentido e historia* (1992) and *Ciencia ficción, utopía y mercado* (2007). Cappana was employed by diverse Argentinean universities, teaching in them an early version of Cultural Studies (‘Integración Cultural’), law and philosophy. See <http://web.archive.org/web/20040303221551/>.


34 This anthology seems to be the most recent example of a trend started by Luis Núñez Ladévéze’s substantial essay (9-183) included in the anthology which he edited in 1976 *Utopía y realidad: La ciencia ficción en España*. See <http://www.tercerafundacion.net/biblioteca/ver/ficha/5632>.


36 October 2015. The Tampa Library at the University of South Florida started in the 1970s a collection focused on mass-market publications, which, together with a Special Collections of materials illustrating the history of sf and fantasy as genres, reaches now thousands of volume—including 9,000 dime novels (paraphrased from http://www.lib.usf.edu/special-collections/research-awards/).

37 Bell and Molina-Gavilán name as their first predecessor Óscar Acosta’s *Primera antología de la ciencia ficción Latinoamericana* published in Argentina in 1970. I have been unable to determine whether Bernard Goorden, A.E. Van Vogt and Domingo Santos’s volume *Lo mejor de la ciencia ficción Latinoamericana* (1982) did have an English translation published by Simon and Schuster as some internet sources suggest.

38 The languages represented are French (2 stories), Russian (2 stories), Italian, Czech, Finnish, Polish, Spanish (2 stories), Greek, Romanian, German, Portuguese, Dutch and Danish. See the contents at <http://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/toc/ecip0711/2007007318.html>.

39 See the extensive review by Illarregui (2014).

40 Mariano Villarreal, editor of the *Terra Nova* SF and fantasy anthology series, now in its third volume, has published the first volume in translation into English. See Villarreal (2013).

41 For the writer’s view, see Zinos-Amaro (2015).
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