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INTRODUCTION: BRADBURY AND THE PROBLEMS OF ACADEMIC VISION

Ray Douglas Bradbury was born in Waukegan, IL (a city north of Chicago on Lake Michigan) on August 22, 1920. Leonard Spaulding Bradbury—Ray’s father—was a worker for the city’s Bureau of Power and Light, while mother Esther Moberg Bradbury, a Swedish immigrant, took care of Ray and his older brother Leonard Jr. Unlike his outdoorsman father, Ray spent substantial periods taking in films and perusing books in his local library. After spending a brief stint in the American Southwest (related to his father’s work), the family moved back to Waukegan, and eventually to Los Angeles (where Bradbury spent the rest of his life). Bradbury would experience the city from its lower income neighborhoods, seeing Black, Latino, and Asian neighbors, as well as low-income white residents, struggling with the problems of the time. Barred from military service due to poor eyesight, Bradbury instead spent his early adulthood days selling newspapers on Los Angeles’ street corners. Along the way, Bradbury developed a keen interest in science fiction through his participation in the Los Angeles Science Fiction League (LASFL), and connected to a fascinating collection of future noteworthy persons who created science fiction, fantasy, and comic books that reached across the world.¹

Over the course of his career, Bradbury would come to write well over 600 short stories and create several novels and anthologies. He would become one of the voices that helped Americans understand the problems and issues of the early cold war period. Until now, Bradbury’s contributions have received little but passing interest by intellectual historians. His works are certainly ripe for exploration, as are the rationales for this neglect.

The Problem of Academic Perception

Efforts by historians, particularly those associated with the Society for U.S. Intellectual History (S-USIH), have attempted to identify and investigate the role of science fiction and fantasy in American society, yet even among these scholars, most of these inquiries remain primarily informal. Though serious scholarly inquiry into science fiction and fantasy appear

as a conscious effort in S-USIH’s blog entries, notably including reviews of *Star Wars*, *Star Trek*, *Dr. Who*, and even a post or two mentioning Bradbury, which would indicate a definite interest, there has not been a significant amount of more formal work from the group on these topics. Reviewing the organization’s conference programs reveals that of the nine national conferences, only one panel has focused on questions that are realistically related to the topic (2011’s “Science, Narrative and Intellectual Authority in Cold War America”). There are exceptions, notably Leslie Dale Feldman’s *Spaceships and Politics: The Political Theory of Rod Serling* (2010) and the never-ending cavalcade of Topic X and Philosophy books, which come out year after year—but again, these are (excepting Feldman) not substantial monographs or collections of serious scholarship—despite numerous assertions by group members attesting to the serious subject matter science fiction and fantasy confront. Currently, major journals of intellectual history, including *Modern Intellectual History, Intellectual History Review*, and the *Journal of Global Intellectual History* all neglect Bradbury’s works as topics of discussion.

In 2005, Professor Agatha Taormina reviewed Jonathan Eller and William Touponce’s *Ray Bradbury: The Life of Fiction* (2004) for the journal *Utopian Studies*. In her review Taormina notes, “While the attempt to chronicle Bradbury’s life and work as an author of fiction (Bradbury’s extensive career as a writer of drama for stage, screen, and television is referred to only in passing) is admirable, the discussion is overburdened with jargon-laden critical theory.”2 Such commentary within a review of an academic text is not abnormal, but Taormina’s later commentary is, “Burdening the discussion with constant references to critical theories strikes me as an attempt on the authors’ part to convince the reader that Bradbury deserves recognition over and above his considerable reputation as a writer of literature of

---

the fantastic.” To accept Taormina’s assertion would be to suggest that Bradbury is undeserving of scholarly inquiry beyond examination of his writings fantastic elements.

The objective of this project is not to analyze every work Bradbury produced in his lifetime, nor even the entirety of his work in the postwar period (defined for this research as 1945–1953), as such an undertaking is well beyond the limitations of a thesis, and could drive the production of scholarship over an entire career. Instead, this work answers Taormina’s challenge from a perspective outside of the disciplinary confines of literary studies, using Bradbury as a test case for a new framework for understanding public intellectuals and their roles in society, while laying the groundwork for further intellectual historical research into Bradbury as an intellectual voice of the period and his influence on later figures.

This analysis will rely on two proposed models of intellectualism, one proposed by Antonio Gramsci, and the other proffered by Corey Robin. Gramsci’s formulation of the intellectual marks a dichotomy between organic intellectuals and institutional intellectuals, one which provides analysis of the power relationships between intellectuals and society. Organic intellectuals are those who rise from the masses to speak with an understanding of the world around them. They may, and most often need, to be educated by the elites of their time, but are not from these social classes. Institutional intellectuals derive their authority through their training in universities and their jobs. These intellectuals are elites whose work allows them to shape the way a society speaks about economics, politics, and social concerns—they create the cultural context within which meaning is made. Gramsci chastises the latter group, which he sees as artists, philosophers, men of letters (in his world, specifically males), and journalists for claiming an unearned intellectual superiority. Every individual though, according to Gramsci, has the capacity to “participate in a particular conception of the world, has a con-

scious line of moral conduct, and therefore contributes to sustain a conception of the world or to modify it, that is, to bring into being new modes of thought.”

Ray Bradbury’s role as American intellectual lies between these two groups. Bradbury’s ability to write, publish, and produce material for public consumption provided him a ready institutional platform for expressing his intellectual inclinations. As a member of the dominant demographic group in American politics at the time (white, middle-class, male), Bradbury’s criticism was more likely to avoid suppression both on commercial and political grounds, though this advantage was not absolute (particularly on questions of race). Bradbury’s education and his self-trained, non-traditional literary form (science fiction and fantasy) pushed his independent humanistic critique of American society and politics into the more organic formulation. Additionally, Bradbury’s exclusion from traditional intellectual networks (the societies and social networking available through elite universities and colleges) would skew Bradbury towards the organic category. To use another model that Gramsci has provided, and which was expanded upon by historian T.J. Jackson Lears, Bradbury’s work places him in the role of a cultural figure whose role was to “help define the boundaries of common-sense ‘reality…” During the early cold war period, American capitalist liberalism formed the dominant strand of thought organizing American society. Bradbury spoke a different language, one which did not fit neatly into either completely liberal or completely conservative—and stood in opposition at times to both. When there were confrontations, Bradbury was able to protect himself by asserting his allegiance to the core principals of the dominant group—communism was bad, democracy was good, and independent liberty required an informed populace to maintain itself—while criticizing the excesses that this form of society could produce.


While Gramsci’s analysis is helpful in placing Bradbury within the context of the rest of his society, the work of Corey Robin is particularly useful in understanding why Bradbury is a strong candidate for consideration as a public intellectual. Corey Robin, a Professor of Political Science with CUNY and Brooklyn College, has provided significant analysis on the development and role of public intellectuals in American history. Robin’s constructions for conceptualizing intellectualism are particularly effective in understanding how Bradbury fits into American culture due to an extended period between Bradbury’s primary productive years (the latter 1940s to early 1950s) and the final recognition of his contributions by way of a large critical receptive audience.

One of Robin’s central arguments is that public intellectuals, as most conceive them, must meet certain thresholds to be considered with this label: they have deep knowledge of the society in which they operate, particularly its problems and limitations; they have the necessary judgement to navigate within societal norms and how to bring social consciousness to these issues; and they have the necessary courage to undertake the endeavor of improving their world, even if that undertaking proves challenging and/or dangerous. By mustering these elements (knowledge, judgement, and courage) in a concentrated effort, public intellectuals have the capacity to act as more than generalists speaking to non-academic audiences, but instead serve as “moral voices and political actors.” This combination of talents allows public intellectuals to articulate, and then attempt to advance, their own value system within the forum of ideas by influencing those around them.

6. Robin has provided these discussions in a wide variety of fora, including Al Jazeera America and MSNBC’s Nerding Out, and was the keynote speaker at the 2015 meeting of the Society for U.S. Intellectual History in Washington, D.C. He regularly publishes work on both public intellectualism and contemporary American politics on his blog at http://www.coreyrobin.com.


Beyond the capacity to serve as public intellectuals, Robin has argued for the centrality of the audience to public intellectuals in understanding their work and its impact. Another way to understand this is to state that reception is a critical and necessary component of evaluating public intellectuals. A public response is necessary in addition to competency because these elements delineate a niche for public intellectuals distinct from both isolated specialists (who traditionally write to their academic disciplinary peerage and not to a wider audience and are the subject of Russell Jacoby’s *The Last Intellectuals: American Culture in the Age of Academe* (1987)) and also from the world of conspiracy theorists, crackpots, and delusional prophets. Robin sees public intellectuals as a combination of thinkers and actors who build an audience that is not yet existent and then encourage that audience to take action. Postwar America had plenty of competing voices encouraging people to take decisive action.

Combining Robin and Gramsci’s theories provides the opportunity to produce something of great benefit to the field of intellectual history, a reproducible test for the initial assessment and categorization of public intellectuals which considers these figures from both production and reception perspectives. This framework makes Robin’s criteria the backbone of our understanding and labelling: an individual must have deep knowledge of the society in which they live, must possess significant communicative ability of some form, must have the willingness to express their criticisms of the world around them, and must build a critical receptive audience through their works. A failure for any of these criteria to be present suggests an alternative label may be more appropriate. By then attaching Gramscian theories of public intellectualism and cultural hegemony to these Robinesque criteria, one gains the ability to: propose new intellectuals outside of traditional venues, begin to explain the place

---


of proposed intellectuals in the broader biome of intellectual discourse, and start to examine
the relationships between intellectuals and their built audiences. The conjoining of these
previously ununited theories should prove to be a scalable, reproducible, system for those
wishing to understand the development of public intellectuals and rationalizing questions
of authority (derived and accumulated) regarding intellectuals and audiences. This work will
provide the opportunity to discuss a relatively popular, yet non-traditional public intellectual
within this framework.

What is Ahead?

Chapter 1 will outline the American intellectual situation in which Bradbury was a par-
ticipant as well as relevant resources available to historians wishing to incorporate Bradbury
into their analyses. Chapter 2 examines some of Bradbury’s social commentary in context
with leading intellectual figures both precedent and contemporary, specifically his engage-
ment with topics pursued by Lionel Trilling, Reinhold Niebuhr, and C. Wright Mills. Chapter
3 will discuss the results of his efforts, particularly in the form of later recognition by literary
and cultural elites (particularly the mechanisms used for that recognition); influence on cul-
tural and scientific figures in the later 20th and early 21st centuries; and identify some areas
of interest for further research. At each stage, this work seeks to show that Bradbury worked
as a public intellectual, someone engaged with the concerns of his era, talented enough to
create and communicate with a community of individuals that proved to have a distinct cul-
tural and political perspective, and had the necessary bravery to pursue his objectives in spite
of prevailing cultural and political norms. To that end, let us proceed into the chaotic world
of American postwar intellectualism.
CHAPTER 1: POSSIBILITIES AND PESSIMISMS OF POSTWAR AMERICA

“It was a period faced with great uncertainty — an uncertainty born of the war, which would show in some of our reactions to the problems which shortly arose.”

—John M. Fenton, Editor of the *Gallup Poll*

Following WWI, the world was in disarray. Global depression, ultra-nationalist politics, WWII, and the use of the atomic bomb had fundamentally altered ideas about ethics, economics, society, and statehood. America remained the last dominant power relatively untouched by the physical effects of the war. Intellectuals in the United States had their work cut out for them. In the immediate postwar period, a new kind of intellectual culture dawned, one that responded not only to the global cataclysm of war, but also to America’s position as a global power. This chapter will explore historians’ conceptions of how intellectuals in America understood their role in society, the expansion of new intellectual authority, reactions to that expansion, and how the author Ray Bradbury fit into this intellectual fracas. In doing so, this chapter will outline some of the major sources of contention addressed in later chapters and provide the groundwork necessary to navigate this postwar period of rebuilding and renegotiation.

Two Americas: Beaver Cleaver and the Bomb

The historiography of the early Cold War primarily suggests two competing conceptions of postwar American society. The first is the concept of the victorious and prosperous

Many Americans think of the 1950s as a time when American culture made sense. Some of us can remember why. We had won the war, we were enjoying unprecedented prosperity, and we were surrounded by visible signs of progress.... In many ways, the mid-twentieth century was a time of tremendous optimism. Americans were constantly being reminded that theirs was the best nation on earth. They heard every day that their happiness and contentment would only increase, particularly if they acquired the latest products.... Everyone could remember or had heard of enduring the hardships of the Depression, or could look back to or imagine coming of age in 1943, when boys were sent off to an incredibly grim world war.12

That these assumptions might be incorrect often gets lost in the nostalgia for sock hops, the antics of *I Love Lucy*, and the rise of rock-n-roll, though these too express an important element of truth about the period, an idealistic version of America at the time.

If the optimistic perspective on postwar America could be described as a period of grand expectations (as the title of James T. Patterson’s history of the period suggests), then an opposing understanding of American society at the time could easily be summed up as shattered naivety. In this understanding, the consumerism, optimism, and egalitarianism are swallowed up by a dark and looming “ism.” In the words of intellectual historian Stephen J. Whitfield:

In this era, a specter was haunting America—the specter of Communism. Trying to exorcise it were legislators and judges, union officials and movie studio bosses, policemen and generals, university presidents and corporate executives, clergymen and journalists, Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals.... By introducing ideological politics, Communism became more loathed than organized crime, exacerbating fears that were to distort and enfeeble American culture throughout the late 1940s and the 1950s.13

---

This formulation negates notions of progress and adaptation, instead focusing on irrational overreaches and the reactionary streak within American politics. This formulation however seems to be just as nostalgic as the other model, but simply more pessimistic.

Were Americans the glorious victors basking in a hard won and well-deserved time in the limelight, or were they a terrified, irrational country fighting ideological ghosts? Realistically, in the years following the war America was both and neither. America was in a period of growth and transition. Global events forced Americans to accept that the isolationism of the past was untenable, and American society was grappling with the task of trying to lead without falling into the failures of previous global empires. To meet these goals, Americans had to renegotiate their own values, particularly the limits of the Bill of Rights, while interacting with the outside world in an unprecedented fashion.

In order to make sense of these giant issues, American thinkers split themselves into camps of like-minded individuals. Some did so by reasserting old party loyalties, others formed schools of thought, and some linked together based on their expertise. These groups all undertook projects that helped them comprehend both the problems in the world and what to do about them. The groups were, in effect, forming the hegemonic blocs described by Gramsci and Lears. Intellectuals, in turn, acted as thought leaders, spokespersons, and critical interpreters of society for these blocs. Intellectuals sought to discover widespread solutions to the issues of the day and to communicate these determinations to an uncertain populace. In the words of respected intellectual historian Howard Brick, intellectuals are “individuals noted for scholarly, creative, speculative, or critical work that resonates with literate audiences attuned to key issues of the moment.”¹⁴ Noted conservative intellectual historian George Nash suggests this work goes beyond production in that these individuals

formed “an intellectual movement...one whose objective was not simply to understand the world but to change it, restore it, preserve it.”

What then were these intellectual movements seeking to do? Each was attempting to systematically address problems that they saw in American society. Conservative thinkers attempted to rebuild the Right and define conservative values while preventing the excesses of Nazism and Fascism that had led to atrocities and a world war. According to Nash, the effort to find this set of ideological values is a critical component of the conservative movement:

Conservatism [is] identifiable as resistance to certain forces perceived to be leftist, revolutionary, and profoundly subversive of what conservatives at the time deemed worth cherishing, defending, and perhaps dying for.... So I offer here no compact definition of conservatism. In fact, American conservatives themselves have had no such agreed-upon definition. Instead, the very quest for self-definition has been one of the most notable motifs of their thought since World War II....In 1945 no articulate, coordinated, self-consciously conservative intellectual force existed in the United States. There were, at most, scattered voices of protest, profoundly pessimistic about the future of their country.16

If no definition can be derived for conservatism on the Right, then what can be made of the Left? First, it is important to note an important linguistic break. The terms liberalism and liberals refer to two very different designations. While many see liberalism as the antithesis of conservatism, the more accurate term is radicalism. There are key differences between liberalism and radicalism. Liberalism, as defined by Marsden, “had no precise meaning at the time, in general it meant centrist: one who was neither leftist...nor ‘conservative...’ Whether they were Republican or (more often) Democrat, they could participate in a single national conversation based on a broadly ‘liberal’ consensus.”17 Some liberal thinkers, like Lionel Trilling sought to go further, arguing that, “In the United States at this time [1950] liberalism is not only the dominant but even the sole intellectual tradition. For it is plain fact that nowadays there are no conservative or reactionary ideas in general circula-

Radicalism, on the other hand, insists on replacing whole governing and economic systems in pursuit of a more egalitarian end. In the words of Brick and Phelps:

...radicals have tended to be sustained by the view that a great range of social problems are tied together and must be addressed holistically. Because they do not accept the status quo’s legitimacy, radicals have adopted tactics and strategies considered irregular or beyond the pale...The role of the left has been to point to a future society governed by self-determination and cooperation, pitting it against both the elitism of traditional society with its top-down ranking of humankind and modern ultra-competitive society with its survival-of-the fittest ethics.19

By adopting this class-based understanding of governmental systems, radicals encountered the problem of having to distance themselves from Soviet Communism, a system that at the close of WWII posed not only an ideological threat to the American economic system, but also a military and political threat to the nation. Beyond this problem, radicals faced the daunting task of charting a course without one of the most sympathetic powers on whom those with radical inclinations had come to rely on for breathing room, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.20

All of these groups also grappled with the realities of the postwar world. First, with the United States as the “victor” of World War II, what should its role be in the postwar world, and how could the horrors of both war and genocide be prevented from ever occurring again? Secondly, yet closely tied to the first, now that the United States had developed the most powerful weapon in the history of warfare, what should we do with it and how could

20. Michael Denning argues in The Cultural Front: The Laboring of American Culture in the Twentieth Century (1996) that Rooseveltian Liberalism allowed (whether intended or not) room for radical cultural products and arguments in the form of the Popular Front more than in the Laisse Faire Period before or the later McCarthy Era (128, 266-267, 464). Also, Brick and Phelps argue in Radicals in America discuss that the formal party structures remained independent, but that CPUSA membership and the Popular Front actively supported both many New Deal policies and Roosevelt’s re-election campaigns (22, 27, and 29).
we make sure it was never used against us? Finally, what would and should normal life look like to an entire generation who had participated in the world's most destructive war?

In this way, both the optimistic and pessimistic views of American society are correct. Was postwar America an economically robust hub of consumer pleasantries? Absolutely. Were there legitimate concerns about the spread of Communism within America and the world? Indeed. What both of these simplistic perspectives fail to capture is that each of these elements reinforced the other. Without a thriving domestic life, capitalism would not be an enticing system for expansion and protection. Without Communism’s challenge, American consumerism likely would not have retained its ideological appeal and government support. In this way, American liberalism stood in tension with, but benefitted from, Soviet Communism. The introduction of the atomic bomb exacerbated and raised the stakes of this tension to an unprecedented level.

Science, Religion, Society: A Tripartite Challenge

Another source of tension came from a growing struggle over authority as it related to morality and politics. This tension in part came from the roles that groups played in the War and how they justified their authority in the postwar regime.

The first group, religious officials, provided the moral justification for entering and conducting the war as they had in various conflicts throughout history. With the revelation of the Holocaust, these efforts took on even more significance with liberal Christianity, Catholicism, and Judaism combining forces to eliminate the morally bankrupt Third Reich. In the words of historian Kevin Schultz, “With enemies such as Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito, the ideal of tolerance was sacrosanct, and during the war years the kind of tolerance that was lionized most was that between Protestants, Catholics and Jews.”21 This tolerant, and reverent, pluralism served as another ideological shield against encroaching atheistic Communism. In the postwar years, religious figures such as Billy Graham and Reinhold Niebuhr sought the salvation of American souls in a world constantly on the brink of Armageddon.

Intellectual historians including Jason W. Stevens, Raymond Haberski, and Kevin Schultz provide useful insight into these and other concepts of the religious militarism adopted by Americans in light of the Cold War.

The second group, scientists and researchers, functionally ended the war. By employing experimentation and research, scientists had improved weaponry, increased productivity, and developed the atomic bomb. Scientists methodically and rationally assessed evidence and developed technology in a way that rendered pre-war notions of military strength obsolete. No longer were battleships, large ground forces, and hardened sites the only keys to military superiority. The atomic bomb, jet powered planes, and the introduction of computers all drastically altered the landscape of warfare. If science could provide such dramatic changes to a tradition as old as war, why not apply these tactics to improving life generally? The predecessors to this line of thought were the first the scientific progressives, who had sought to incorporate experts into the decision-making of the early 20th Century, and part of their progeny, technocrats, supporters of using science to overcome the problems of the 1920s and 1930s. A subset of these technocrats thinkers were the proponents of Technocracy, a failed movement which had sought to apply engineering principles to wider social goals which had developed a formal educational system for educating new recruits.22

Outside of the technocratic movement were physical and social scientists who actively participated in the social life and decision-making of the nation. Common attributes of this group were scientific exploration and materialistic development. If new products and data could be obtained, Communism would wither on the vine while capitalism and democracy (which had subsidized this work) thrived. By focusing on data, one could do away with ide-

22. Eller mentions the group in Becoming Ray Bradbury, as Bradbury encountered this group during his young adulthood, and found the actual operation of the organization to have dark similarities to authoritarianism (33–35). William E. Akin’s Technocracy and the American Dream: The Technocrat Movement, 1900–1941 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977), provides a fascinating overview of the movement’s rise, struggles, and collapse.
ology and other irrational notions they saw as outdated, allowing decision making to become dispassionate, and therefore better. In assessing this push, historian Paul Boyer wrote:

The phrase ‘intelligent action’ is revealing. Underlying the scientists’ movement was a belief in the power of fact to compel assent in the political realm no less than in the laboratory. The movement was also sustained by a prevailing belief, among scientists and nonscientists alike, that a commitment to science almost automatically gave one a global perspective and a unique ethical vantage point. As James Franck put it, scientists were members of ‘a kind of international brotherhood, comparable in many ways to a religious order,’ whose public activities were ‘dictated solely by our social conscience.’

The final group was the dominant political demographic in American society—white, religious, middle and upper-class America. These everyday people had carried out the war in factories and on battlefields. Rather than understanding the horrors of war in the abstract, they lived the terror and aimed to prevent it from ever occurring again. Their interests were in developing and maintaining good lives for themselves and their families, and not wanting to rock the boat racially. The definitions of a good life were up for debate, but the general concepts of consumer goods, accessible education, and independence were not. As time went on, this group fractured generationally, racially, and economically as their particular interests diverged. In the words of historian Elaine Tyler May:

Although all groups contributed to the baby boom, it was the values of the white middle class that shaped the dominant political and economic institutions that affected all Americans. Those who did not conform to them were likely to be marginalized, stigmatized and disadvantaged as a result. These norms represented the ideal toward which upwardly mobile Americans strove, and reflected the standard against which nonconforming individuals were judged. They wanted secure jobs, secure homes, and secure marriages in a secure country. Security would enable them to take advantage of the fruits of prosperity and peace that were, at long last, available.

As a result of this pull between groups, unstable coalitions formed between these competing interests on differing issues. Religious officials and the general public agreed that civic morality was an important check on unrestrained science, scientists and the general public seized the opportunity to employ new technology and methods for evaluating deci-

sions, religious officials and scientists began breaking down notions of racial difference. These coalitions, and activism within groups, began to chip away at notions of authority across the board. In doing so, they created a new site for contesting American political authority.

Who controlled morality? Were atomic weapons a tool for the future or a menace to existence? Who is the “other” in American society and how should they be treated? Was America becoming a leading moral nation or a decadently decaying country? What are the limits of science? Of culture? Postwar America was a land of many questions and many prophets offering solutions. The biggest question of all though was one that caused great consternation. Who should Americans listen to?

Elites vs Non-Elites: The Egghead Problem

*Anti-Intellectualism in American Life* (1963), historian Richard Hofstadter’s groundbreaking analysis of the American intellectual milieu, begins, “Although this book deals mainly with certain aspects of the remoter American past, it was conceived in response to the political and intellectual conditions of the 1950’s.”

Hofstadter continues, laying out what he saw as a pernicious tendency in American discourse:

During that decade the term *anti-intellectualism*, only rarely heard before, became a part of our national vocabulary of self-reccrimination and intra-mural abuse. In the past, American intellectuals were often discouraged or embittered by the national disrespect for the mind, but it is hard to recall a time when large numbers of people outside the intellectual community shared their concern, or when self-criticism on this count took on the character of a nation-wide movement....Now the intellectual, dismissed as an “egghead,” an oddity, would be governed by a party [the Republican Party following the 1952 election] which had little use for or understanding of him, and he would be made the scapegoat for everything from the income tax to the attack on Pearl Harbor.

This assault on intelligence extends beyond fair criticism for Hofstadter and into the realm of willful ignorance and absurdity. He reserves particular animosity for Joseph McCarthy and his followers as promoting a fear of intelligence, and to be fair, a substantial

---

amount of the information McCarthy used to harass and vilify hundreds of persons including leading thinkers was never verified. Stephen J. Whitfield described the factual foundations for McCarthy’s claims as, “the most preposterous concoctions and fantasies blended with a canny sense of what would influence his followers and snare headlines.” With that being said, Hofstadter’s work promotes a very narrow definition of who should be considered an intellectual, even going so far as to state, “The intellectual class, whether or not it enjoys many of the privileges of an elite, is of necessity elite in its manner of thinking and functioning.”

While there are problems within his analysis extending from his constraints on who was an intellectual, Hofstadter is nevertheless correct in identifying a trend of hostility towards thinkers in this period, particularly through a rhetorical association of these intellectuals with Marxist philosophy.

Compared with the intellectual as expert, who must be accepted even when he is feared, the intellectual as ideologist is an object of unqualified suspicion, resentment, and distrust. The expert appears as a threat to dominate or destroy the ordinary individual, but the ideologist is widely believed to have already destroyed a cherished American society. To understand the background of this belief, it is necessary to recall how consistently the intellectual has found himself ranged in politics against the right-wing mind. I am not denying that we have had a number of conservative intellectuals and even a few reactionary ones; but if there is anything that could be called an intellectual establishment in America, this establishment has been, though not profoundly radical (which would be unbecoming of an establishment), on the left side of center. And it has drawn the continuing and implacable resentment of the right, which has always liked to blur the distinction between the moderate progressive and the revolutionary. The real function of the Great Inquisition of the 1950’s was not anything so simply rational as to turn up spies or prevent espionage (for which the police agencies presumably are adequate) or even to expose actual Communists, but to discharge resentments and frustrations, to punish, to satisfy enmities whose roots lay elsewhere than in the Communist issue itself. This is why it showed such a relentless and indiscriminate appetite for victims and why it seemed happier with respectable and powerful targets than the occasional obscure Bolshevik it turned up.

Much of Hofstadter’s work has been challenged by later intellectual historians, but it remains a foundational text in intellectual history, in particular to understandings of intellectualism in American society. Russell Jacoby, Richard Posner, and many other prominent intellectual historians follow Hofstadter’s model, particularly in its designation of who is and is not an intellectual of that period as well as intellectualism’s decline in influence through religiosity and populism. To use a term from historian Jennifer Burns, Hofstadter’s work is a “keystone text,” one upon which an entire field of inquiry is built. Corey Robin has suggested that Russell Jacoby’s *The Last Intellectuals* (1987) is another of these keystones to understanding public intellectualism and was, in fact, “a founding text for my [Robin’s] generation.” Understanding, and defining, the limitations of these texts becomes a tool in discovering new areas for scholarly inquiry.

Hofstadter discounts the work of lawyers, critics, religious officials, and fiction writers. In this way, Hofstadter loses a substantial amount of his potential impact by segregating off one of the fastest growing segments of the American intelligentsia in the early Cold War, the non-elite intellectual. Hofstadter’s elite model suggests that the only individuals capable of accepting the mantle of intellectuals are primarily white, well off males with traditional liberal arts educations and employed primarily as scholars. By imposing these constraints, Hofstadter ignores huge sections of people who contributed to American thought. Intellectual historians Jennifer Burns, Jennifer Rowe, Leslie Dale Feldman, Mary Helen Washington, and dozens more have identified, and provided exploration of, highly talented intellectual voices from outside Hofstadter’s class. These non-elite intellectuals provided salient interrogation of subjects that elites either could not, or would not, confront because of their social standing.

Hofstadter’s construction of intellectualism was distinctly elitist and academic. Bradbury, born four years after Hofstadter, likely shared a similar view on the term. The term

became such a loaded phrase that Bradbury himself became a vocal critic of “intellectual authorship.” While later writers expanded understandings of the concept, Bradbury and Hofstadter’s generation knew intellectuals as white men, with formal (mostly Ivy League) educations and dispassionate written works. In the words of Lionel Trilling,

The literary intellectual...is ignorant of the channels through which opinion flows. He does not, for example, know anything about the existence and the training and the influence of, say, high-school teachers, or ministers, or lawyers, or social workers, the people of the professions whose stock in trade is ideas of some kind. Nor does he have any real awareness of the ideas which pass current among these people, or the form in which they are found acceptable. He is likely to think of ideas, of ‘real’ ideas as being limited to the most highly developed, the most ‘advanced,’ the most esoteric ideas that he himself is capable of absorbing and of finding aesthetic pleasure in.

Such dispassion ran counter to Bradbury’s authorial vision though, as he found emotion and intuition to be the fountains of understanding and good decision-making. This intuition made Bradbury suspicious of all formalized party structures and directly outlined ideological systems. In this way, Bradbury’s perspective echoed that of Irving Babbitt from a generation before, “humanism is not to be identified with this or that body of traditional precepts….The final appeal of the humanist is not to any historical convention, but to intuition.” While Bradbury in the early 1950s was closer to what biographer Sam Weller has called “a steadfast liberal Democrat...,” his own personal commentaries and works reveal a much more complex political background. While Bradbury was indeed interested in the

policies of FDR and the candidacy of Adlai Stevenson in 1952, he was more interested in maintaining the free flow of ideas. In the words of Bradbury scholar William Touponce:

Because of the prominence of this theme [suppression of fantasy and imagination by conformity] in his writings, Bradbury is often considered a liberal. The term ‘liberal democratic humanism’ probably does describe Bradbury’s ideological outlook at the time. But we should beware of easy labels. In the decade after World War II this was no longer an unproblematic intellectual position. Liberal democracies had failed in Europe, giving rise to fascism and communism. At home the whole project of democracy now seemed at risk. Though he would never claim to be an intellectual (or a sociologist), as a writer Bradbury was never quite as naive as some people took him to be.37

Awareness of the political hostility and animosity in the period influenced Bradbury’s perspective on the world surrounding him. Bradbury provided critical commentary on the investigations; suggested to friends that he was “verboten” (thinking himself under suspicion); and had at least one project, a comic adaptation of some of his work, delayed for over a decade for fear of being associated with a subject under Congressional scrutiny, comic books.38 What Bradbury could identify with was the importance of the literate individual who was willing and able to explore the variety of concepts put forth from all sides. These individuals enabled society to push beyond conformity and towards a positive advancement, and as poet and author Archibald Macleish suggested were, “committed to the love of the arts and the great books…”39 When Bradbury’s career began to reach full speed (between 1945 and 1953), the politics of society were moving away from such ideological openness.

Through short fictions and public commentary, Bradbury conceptualized leading ques-

38. Eller, Becoming Ray Bradbury, 268, 242. Also, see Eller, Ray Bradbury Unbound, Chapter 10, specifically pages 63–66 for discussion of Bradbury’s eventual publication of graphic novel adaptations.
tions of his time that were considered the domain of intellectual and political elites and his attempts to address these concerns in very humanistic ways.

If Bradbury does not fit into the Hofstadter model though, what alternative understanding would be more appropriate? Public intellectuals’ role, as suggested by scholar Corey Robin,

...is the literary equivalent of the epic political actor, who sees her writing as a transformative mode of action, a thought-deed in the world. The transformations she seeks may be a far-reaching change of policy, an education of manners and morals, or a renovation of the human estate...Though the public intellectual is a political actor, a performer on stage, what differentiates her from the celebrity or publicity hound is that she is writing for an audience that does not yet exist.40

Bradbury may not have referred to himself as “epic,” but certainly considered himself to have a role. In responding to one critic’s challenge of his work, Bradbury replied, “…I shall work as an independent thinker, voter, and actor. I shall oppose any damnfool thing we do.”41

Robin’s formulation, in its simplest terms, requires a public intellectual have knowledge and the judgment necessary to render an informed opinion in a form that others can understand and appreciate as well as the courage to act on that knowledge and judgement.42 For an individual to be considered an intellectual in a Gramscian sense, requires the ability to communicate with both institutional structures as well as the masses.43 The ability to comprehend the goals of both circles is critical. Only by doing so is an intellectual able to rise from the masses (in the case of the organic intellectual) or to distinguish themselves from their institutional peerage (in the case of the institutional intellectual).44 By combining these characteristics, one can see a public intellectual figure as one who is: well informed, capable

40. Corey Robin, “How Intellectuals Create a Public.”
41. Ray Bradbury to Leslie Edgley, December 28, 1952, the Albright Collection; photocopy in the CRBS.
44. Lears, “The Concept of Cultural Hegemony,” 578.
of creating a distinctive position on societal issues, willing to do so, and capable of developing an audience who is able to assess and build on that legacy. To assess this model’s efficacy with regard to Bradbury requires first seeing what analysis about him exists and its limitations. Put another way, what reasons could be posited for Bradbury’s exclusion from contemporary historiography on postwar intellectualism?

Ray Bradbury: The Anti-Elite Intellectual

Perhaps the first, and most common, rationale for Bradbury’s exclusion is an understanding of Bradbury as one of many “genre” writers who created fiction for a small subset of the American population. So pernicious was this notion in academia that scholar Roger Luckhurst suggested as late as 2010 that researchers focusing on science-fiction continued to seek legitimacy, and as a result had become marginalized from their peers in disciplines such as history, literature, and film studies.45 Interestingly, while the tendency to see sci-fi as a form of low-brow, or cheap, entertainment remained in academic circles, Boyer suggests that the early atomic age was a boon for science-fiction producers.

After August 6, 1945, such stories retrospectively seemed amazingly prophetic, and the status of the genre rose accordingly. As Isaac Asimov later put it, science-fiction writers were ‘salvaged into respectability’ by Hiroshima. Some took lucrative jobs as lecturers, government consultants, or science writers for general publications. Within days of Hiroshima, [John W.] Campbell Jr., editor of Astounding Science Fiction was interviewed by the Wall Street Journal for his thoughts on the bomb. (‘Frankly, I am scared.’) Breaking out of its literary ghetto, science fiction began to appear in mass-circulations magazines like Collier’s and the Saturday Evening Post.46

Boyer attributes this trend almost singularly to the dropping of the atomic bomb, and while the bomb did play a substantive role, the individual authors who participated in this trend also dramatically altered the quality of science fiction being offered to the public.

How do Bradbury and his colleagues fit in American intellectual life? Where does he fit in the landscape or typology of American thinkers? Surprisingly very little historical attention has been paid to Bradbury as a figure of intellectual weight in the period. Bradbury
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does not appear in Rose’s analysis, nor May’s, though he does appear in Paul Boyer’s analysis of the period in the context of science fiction’s fascination with the macabre topic of nuclear annihilation. David Caute in his 2010 *Politics and the Novel During the Cold War* and Richard M. Fried in *The Russians are Coming! The Russians Are Coming: Pageantry and Patriotism in Cold-War America* (1998) both skip Bradbury altogether, as does James T. Patterson in *Grand Expectations: The United States, 1945–1971*. Jennifer Delton in *Rethinking the 1950s: How Anticommunism and the Cold War Made America Liberal* (2013) and George M. Marsden in *The Twilight of the American Enlightenment: The 1950s and the Crisis of Liberal Belief* (2014) both do not incorporate Bradbury into their respective analyses despite his deep public interaction with their topics of discussion. Bradbury is not included in Nash’s history of conservatism, nor Brick and Phelps’ analysis of radicalism, though as will be shown later, Bradbury’s work interacted actively with both segments of the political spectrum. Horowitz’s *Consuming Pleasures: Intellectuals and Popular Culture in the Postwar World* (2012) and Stephen Whitfield’s *The Culture of the Cold War* both skip Bradbury, though they devote a significant period of time to the fictional literature, film, and television aspects of the period. Evan Brier does provide a significant incorporation of Bradbury into his *A Novel Marketplace: Mass Culture, the Book Trade, and Postwar American Fiction* (2010), though his analysis is focused on the competing interests of the National Book Foundation and Bradbury’s work. Despite playing a large role in bringing shows like *The Twilight Zone* to the air, Bradbury only appears in footnotes of analyses like Feldman’s *Spaceships and Politics: The Political Theory of Rod Serling* (2010) and Andrea Carosso’s *Cold War Narratives: American Culture in the 1950s* (2012). Perhaps unsurprisingly (as one of Bradbury’s publishers), Bradbury’s work is discussed in Lester Del Rey’s *The World of Science Fiction, 1926–1976* (1980). Even with this personal connection, though, Bradbury appears as simply a name dropped in the production of magazines, rather than as a subject for discur-
sive inquiry. Isaac Asimov, Robert Heinlein, Fredrick Pohl, and Henry Kuttner (all colleagues of Bradbury’s) meanwhile figure prominently in Del Rey’s retrospective.

This hodge-podge of use needs some form of explanation. While not every figure can be incorporated into each analysis, there are indications why Bradbury has been marginalized in the historiographical discussions about the period during which his worked flourished.

Another component, which likely led to his indiscernible nature in American historiography and mixed relationship with other authors of the period, is a misunderstanding of Bradbury’s work—the assumption that he only wrote science-fiction. His citation for the National Medal of Arts, given in 2004, describes many individuals’ comprehension of Bradbury’s contributions to American letters,

The author of *The Martian Chronicles* and *Fahrenheit 451* [F451], Ray Bradbury is the greatest living American writer of science fiction. His singular achievement in this genre is rooted in the imaginative originality of his works, his gift for language, his insights into the human condition, and his commitment to the freedom of the individual.47

This conception overemphasizes the role of these two particular works, while often minimizing the discussion of the other two dozen books; 600-plus short stories; and multiple stage, film, and television works, which Bradbury was a part of creating. It also neglects Bradbury’s role in advancing fantasy literature. Both of these topics will be further discussed in later chapters.

An additional struggle for anyone wishing to work with Bradbury is his propensity to loosely discuss events when being interviewed. As academic biographer, Jonathan Eller, noted:

Anyone seeking to write a literary biography of Ray Bradbury has to deal with the problem of thousands of anecdotes relating to his life and times. His life comes to us surrounded by (or, perhaps, embedded within) a very public body of anecdote. In my view, anecdotes, which are often expressed in interviews, are problematic, because they tend to blur, not so much the dates, but sometimes the sequence of events.48

Thus, the historian wishing to comprehend Bradbury must not only search out nuggets of information from interviews he gave throughout his life, but must take extra special care to validate these statements with documentation and argumentation. In this way, Bradbury’s interviews serve the historian more as signposts than as oral histories.

One unique, and potentially problematic, hurdle for historians wishing to work with Bradbury is in the restrictions related to the voluminous collection of materials he produced and collected. Some organizations have attempted to preserve and make available these materials to the public. Several academic libraries including UCLA and Bowling Green hold Bradbury related materials as well, though access to these items is rigorously controlled. In 1961, Bradbury sat for 21 hours of oral histories as a part of the UCLA Oral History Program. The Center for Ray Bradbury Studies (CRBS) at Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis has the largest collection of Bradbury materials, and is home to collections of correspondence, his office library, numerous Bradbury publications, *The New Ray Bradbury Review* (an academic journal focused on Bradbury), and the operations of *The Collected Works of Ray Bradbury* (a critical edition project of the author’s works). An objective of the Center’s preservation of these materials (particularly his office library), is to help researchers explore the development of Bradbury’s thought, fictions, and commentaries.

While historiographically there is substantial room for research and interpretation, there have been substantive efforts made by several literary researchers and scholars into Bradbury’s work. Author William F. Nolan and journalist Samuel Weller are perhaps the two most recognizable non-academic writers who have devoted considerable attention to Bradbury. Weller served as Bradbury’s authorized biographer, producing *The Bradbury Chronicles*; *The Life of Ray Bradbury* (2005) and a later publication of interviews, *Listen to the Echoes: The Bradbury Interviews* (2010). Nolan, a colleague, friend, and researcher of Bradbury has written or edited at least six separate works related to Bradbury. Two in particular will be of interest to this research. In 2013, not long after Bradbury’s death, Nolan published *Nolan on Bradbury*, which incorporates several earlier pieces on Bradbury written throughout their sixty-year
relationship. In 1975, Nolan published *The Ray Bradbury Companion*, which is an invaluable biographical and bibliographical resource for those interested in studying Bradbury. Nolan’s compendium incorporates a biography, photos, copies of draft and finished works, as well as the most direct chronology of Bradbury’s life through 1973 that is readily available.

Professors David Seed (of Liverpool University), Howard Bloom (of Yale), Don Albright (of the Pratt Institute), and colleagues William F. Touponce and Jonathan R. Eller (of Indiana University) have all produced scholarly books and articles related to Bradbury’s work. Bloom oversaw two works of literary criticism related to Bradbury as a part of his extensive collection of critical reviews, *Ray Bradbury’s Fahrenheit 451* (2003, a part of his *Modern Critical Interpretations* series) and *Ray Bradbury* (2010, *Bloom’s Modern Critical Views* series) — Eller and Touponce contributed to Bloom’s 2010 publication.

Eller, a co-founder and Director of CRBS, has produced numerous articles and publications related to Bradbury. Eller and his colleague, Dr. William Touponce, produced *Ray Bradbury: The Life in Fiction*, a biography and cultural analysis of Bradbury in 2004. This work includes tracing the literary genealogies of many of Bradbury’s largest works and literary analyses of the themes behind them.

In 2011, Eller published *Becoming Ray Bradbury*, a literary biography detailing Bradbury’s life up through the publication of *Fahrenheit 451* (1953). Eller followed this work in 2014 with *Ray Bradbury Unbound*, a sequel that outlines Bradbury’s life and works during the middle portion of his career (roughly 1953–1969). Both of these works highlight Bradbury’s production, methodology, social networks, and reactions to critical responses. These two works, perhaps more than any other, provide an essential biographical foundation for Bradbury research. Each follows Bradbury through his career, introducing his own growth as an author, interactions with players in the world of publishing and film, and the changes in his life as he sought to publish his work.

Also of significant value to those interested in the early cold war period is Bradbury’s own volume (edited by Albright and Eller) titled *Match to Flame: The Fictional Paths to Fabren-
heid 451 (2007), which incorporates many of the stories (including some which were unpub-
lished) that were incorporated into F451 as well as an introduction by Touпонч is and literary
historical analysis by Eller. The same editorial team produced a trade volume of these stories
(though without the introductory materials and several of the more fragmentary pieces) in
2010 titled A Pleasure to Burn: Fahrenheit 451 Stories.

Touponce’s earlier Ray Bradbury and the Poetics of Reverie: Fantasy, Science Fiction, and the
Reader (1984) as well as Seed’s Ray Bradbury (2015) and “The Flight from the Good Life:
Fahrenheit 451 in the Context of Postwar American Dystopias” (1994) are works of literary
analysis which help researchers to understand the artistic and practical world in which Brad-
bury operated.

One interesting contribution to understanding this world comes from Rebecca
Allison Devers in her 2010 dissertation, “The Iron Curtain in the Picture Window: The
Cold War Home in American Fiction and Popular Culture.” Devers analysis leans heavily on
Bradbury’s works at times, particularly The Martian Chronicles and Fahrenheit 451, tying these
fictions to conceptions and valuations of postwar kitchens, living rooms, and fallout shelters.
While her insights prove useful to conceptualizing postwar America, and its social ills, she
falls victim at times to muddling the timeline. Many of her discussions are on point, but fail
to recognize that Bradbury’s texts existed prior to the technology she is discussing, and does
not make note of any of the stories’ previous published versions. Her work is valuable, espe-
cially to understanding the literary period in which Bradbury was working, but historians
should carefully consider its limitations.

Also, while observing the above considerations about the utility of Bradbury’s exist-
ing interviews, researchers should be familiar with Steven Louis Aggelis’ 2003 dissertation,
“Conversations with Ray Bradbury,” which is an edited set of interviews Bradbury gave
between 1948 and 2002, along with a chronology (which while not as exhaustive as Nolan’s,
does provide updates through the end of the twentieth century). Aggelis expanded this work
into a book published by the University Press of Mississippi in 2004, and the dissertation
is available freely online. The dissertation form contains some material not included in the book.

Researchers into Bradbury agree on one point emphatically. Bradbury was a well-read individual. While Hofstadter’s preference may have been for traditional formal education, Bradbury never attended any schooling after his 1938 high-school graduation. Instead, Bradbury informed and trained himself through his constant bookstore reading of The Saturday Review and other major market magazines and his consumption and sale of the Los Angeles Herald and Express, a local paper Bradbury sold “out of a stand at Olympic and Norton...he found that the required salesmanship was similar to the sense of showmanship he had developed in his final year at L.A. High.” Beyond selling the daily afternoon paper, Bradbury spent substantial amounts of time taking in films and perusing books in his local library. His devotion to libraries was well known, and he considered his reading there to be his formal education: “The library’s been the center of my life. I never made it to college... I went to the library every day for three or four days a week for 10 years and I graduated from the library when I was 28.”

While many might discount Bradbury’s credentials out of hand, this self-education was expansive, and might rival that of quite a few of Hofstadter’s idealized elites. In this way, Bradbury fit well into the “middletrow culture” Beth Luey describes in “Leading the Public Gently: Popular Science Books in the 1950s” both as a consumer and producer of books. In this culture, “your audience is intelligent, educated, and in the habit of seeking knowledge from books; give them intelligent, well-written books about emerging subject or new knowledge in important areas, books that offer an intellectual challenge.” Among Bradbury’s “teachers” or influences were modern fantasy and science fiction writers includ-
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Bradbury’s exposure to these discursive ideals and concepts helped him to formulate his own distinct philosophical position within the postwar world—a personal humanism—which emphasized individualism and literacy as fundamental to the preservation of his idealized version of American society. Through his achievements in literature, theatre, film, and television, Bradbury sought to expand the reach of his worldview. His position and his efforts to achieve his professional goals helped to cement Bradbury within American cul-

52. Discussion of Bradbury’s reading habits and selections is available throughout both Eller’s Becoming Ray Bradbury (2011) and Seed’s Ray Bradbury (2015). A large description of Bradbury’s reading habits is also available in William F. Nolan’s “Foreword” to Eller and Touponce’s Ray Bradbury: A Life of Fiction (2004). This list is not intended to be exhaustive, but instead representative.
ture. By understanding the roots of these interests, as well as the avenues Bradbury used to achieve his objectives, intellectual historians can gain a different perspective of the postwar intellectual landscape and Bradbury’s place in the later 20th Century.
CHAPTER 2: BRADBURY’S COLD WAR—ANTI-ELITE INTELLECTUALISM

“And when we say that a man is responsible for himself, we do not only mean that he is responsible for his own individuality, but that he is responsible for all men.”
—John-Paul Sartre

Understanding that, as shown in Chapter 1, Hofstadter’s analysis was overly restrictive, it nonetheless provides the opportunity to examine the prevailing notions of intellectual authority and capacity in the early cold war period. Hofstadter was not interested in merely intelligence as a defining mark of the intellectual, but how it was used and approached. To be an intellectual in his conception required, “disinterested intelligence, generalizing power, free speculation, fresh observation, creative novelty, radical criticism.” Despite being well outside any direct conception of intellectuals Hofstadter considered, Bradbury’s work fits into many of these categories. By applying the lens of science fiction and fantasy, Bradbury was able to comment on his contemporary situation, criticize the flaws that he saw, rationally extend his perspective in speculative fashion, and creatively generalize his commentary in such a way that it was comprehensible to a wider audience. Per Hofstadter, to the intellectual, “The difference is not in the character of the ideas with which he works but in his attitude toward them…. His work was undertaken as a kind of devotional exercise...work done in the service of truth.” These terms are echoed by Eller when describing Bradbury’s insistence on perfection and objective of producing a masterpiece while continuously expanding his intellectual capacity. To Hofstadter, “Behind the intellectual’s feeling of commitment is the belief that in some measure the world should be made responsive to his capacity for rationality, his passion for justice and order…."
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This responsiveness is also a component of Robin’s construct, “though the public intellectual is a political actor, a performer on stage, what differentiates theirs from the celebrity or publicity hound is that she is writing for an audience that does not yet exist....In the act of writing for a public, intellectuals create the public for which they write.” 58 Appropriately enough, Bradbury is often viewed as the vanguard for bringing science fiction into mainstream popularity. 59 In 1952, August Derleth wrote in *English Journal*, “Unquestionably in top place among contemporary American writers of science fiction is Ray Bradbury... Bradbury is the most literate and original writers of his genre.” 60 Bradbury’s prominence at the same time was reinforced by strong reviews of his works from Christopher Isherwood, Fletcher Pratt, and Don Fabun. 61 Rather than the “hard” science fiction of Isaac Asimov, Robert Heinlein, or Arthur C. Clarke, Bradbury built his audience by infusing humanism throughout his fictions. As a result, Bradbury straddles the line between science fiction and fantasy, succeeding in both fields, but often being marginalized in academic discussions of the former. 62

Bradbury’s marginalization from intellectual history seems even stranger considering the status of those publications where his work appeared in the period. *The Nation, Collier’s, The New Yorker, Esquire, and The Reporter* all published fictional works by Bradbury, and several published non-fiction submissions as well. 63 These were not fluff magazines, but instead were forums for the discussion of serious political and social topics. *The Reporter*,
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for example, produced by Fortnightly Publishing Company, was a magazine that published topical issues related to art, politics, foreign policy, world economics, and other issues of the day, in addition to fictional works by noted authors. Contributors to The Reporter were a who’s who of scholars, political elites, and authors from the period. In 1951 alone, McGeorge Bundy (later the National Security Advisor to Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson), Theodore Draper (a noted leftist journalist and historian), S.L.A. Marshall (Brigadier General and Chief U.S. Army Historian), and Lionel Trilling all appeared as writers in the magazine’s pages. Lionel Trilling commented upon this growing field of intellectual discussion and set magazines like The Reporter in contrast to the “Luce” magazines (after conservative owner Henry Luce) such as Sports Illustrated, Fortune, Life, and Time who employed and restrained intellectual writers into conforming to their views.

But at the present time the needs of our society have brought close to the top of the social hierarchy a large class of people of considerable force and complexity of mind. This is to be observed in most of the agencies of our society, in, for example, government finance, industry, journalism. The Luce periodicals have for many years been an established butt of the progressive intellectuals, who hate them for their politics and their pretentiousness. The progressive intellectuals are not entirely wrong in their judgment, yet the fact is that the Luce organizations have always been explicit in their desire for the best possible intellectual talent and have been able, by and large, to satisfy their wish. The use to which this talent is put is not frequently defensible...64

This recognition of intellectual talent is an important component of Trilling’s comments. Luce’s magazines did carry significant influence in the postwar period, and while Trilling might not have agreed with their position, he was forced to admit their sway on the American populace. Lisle Rose recognized this influence in her analysis The Cold War Comes to Main Street: America in 1950 (1999), appropriately calling Luce’s publications “a media empire that... spanned the United States and the world.”65 Bradbury would eventually dabble in the “media
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empire” publications, but his work (other than a letter to the editor) would not show up in Luce's publications until the 1960s. 66

In the period, “serious” intellectuals retained an ivory tower aloofness to magazines such as Luce’s. Dane J. Cash provides a fascinating overview of the politics and pressures these types of magazines put forth in their attempts to sway public and intellectual support for their causes in his 2012 dissertation, “The Forgotten Debate: American Political Opinion Journals and the Korean War, 1950–1953.” 67 They saw the market forces which popular writers saw as challenges to the integrity of their work, forcing a writer to “merely fill an order, and often he will not write at all until he has an order, specifying content, slant, and space limits.” 68 Indirectly reinforcing Hofstadter’s conception of intellectuals as elite thinkers, earlier, Trilling gave voice to the superiority with which “literary thinkers” could assess their contemporaries, particularly those who argued for political thought to take on some ferocity in those times.

The predilection for the powerful, the fierce, the assertive, the personally militant, is very strong in our culture. We find it in the liberal bourgeois admiration of the novels of Thomas Wolfe and Theodore Dreiser. On a lower intellectual level we find it in the long popularity of that curious underground work The Fountainhead. On a higher intellectual level we find it in certain aspects of the work of Yeats and Lawrence. 69

Trilling’s discussion suggests that these prevailing trends come to shape intellectuals’ formulations of writing, while these trends were adopted across what he sees as castes of American intellectualism. The higher levels to which he points are from the established European tradition, while his mention of Rand’s The Fountainhead refers to it as an underground
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work. This particular reference (to Rand) seems to be more related to the philosophical position of the author rather than the status of the work itself. Rand’s novel was a bestseller. Bradbury was amongst those flocking to read her tome. Eller devotes a significant portion of Chapter 14, “On the Shoulders of Giants,” in Becoming Ray Bradbury to discussion of Bradbury’s identification with the Rand’s lead character, Howard Roark, stating, “It was, quite simply, her protagonist’s unwavering belief in his own work, no matter how far it might vary from the mainstream.”

By the time Trilling wrote his assessment, it had been turned into a movie starring Gary Cooper (though critics panned both versions). Rand had come into additional notoriety starting in 1947 for becoming one of the leading advocates for HUAC’s investigations of Hollywood figures. Whitfield suggests that Rand’s (and others’ on the right) work led to a narrowing of acceptable topics for film, and that by 1950, “It was safer to produce films without any political or economic themes or implications at all,” lest one be accused of subverting American values.

To Bradbury, slanting, holding back, or form writing were cardinal sins of his time. He refused to do so, and reacted angrily when there was even the appearance of editorial control of his work. When the board of the California Quarterly, a small literary magazines which included three of his writing colleagues, suggested that one of his stories would not published for being politically unrealistic, Bradbury was incensed.

You say you are for free speech...and yet you want me, a writer, to shift the emphasis in two of my stories, completely changing the philosophical tone. Would you accept that sort of criticism from The Post or Collier’s. Like hell you would. Neither would I. A writer is either free to think and write as he will, no matter whose toes he steps on, or he is a cipher....I insist upon my own thoughts and beliefs and philosophy and I don’t think an editor [h]as any goddam business tinkering with me or anyone else that way.

70. Eller, Becoming Ray Bradbury, 90.
72. Whitfield, The Culture of the Cold War, 131.
73. Eller, Becoming Ray Bradbury, 270–271.
74. Ray Bradbury to Leslie Edgley, December 28, 1952, CRBS.
This is an expression of one of Bradbury’s main foci, individual and authorial independence and ownership. Though many other individuals would make suggestions about how to write or how to “improve” his work, Bradbury retained his assertive position about his independence and ownership, sometimes lashing out and sometimes straining friendships along the way.75

Trilling, Mills, and Bradbury all independently suggested a transition in American letters in the early cold war period towards a more skittish response than before and a move away from authorial independence. Mills’ explanation was that society’s—and intellectuals’—increased capacity for commercial goods had led thinkers to sacrifice their ideological independence.

Busy with the ideological speed-up, the intellectual has readily taken on the responsibilities of the citizen….he has joined the expanding world of those who live off ideas, as administrator, idea-man, and good-will technician. In class, status, and self-image, he has become more solidly middle class, a man at a desk, married, with children, living in a respectable suburb, his career pivoting on the selling of ideas, his life a tight little routine…76

Trilling also noticed this tightening, suggesting that while historically intellect and money had been competing interests, in the postwar period they moved towards confluence.77 Trilling found a more activist capacity within this group than Mills. Rather than blindly marching towards the individual dream of financial reward, Trilling proposed that intellectuals were building their own distinct class. The object of this class was provide expanded social mobility, allowing its members to engage in forms of social “snobbery” and elitism once only held by the wealthy.78

Despite the similarities between Bradbury and Trilling’s condemnations (of consumerism and consensus leading to the marginalization and devaluation of thought), there is no

75. Eller, Becoming Ray Bradbury, 196 and 230. Also see Eller, Ray Bradbury Unbound, 26–30 and 189–190.
76. Mills, White Collar, 156.
record of interaction between the two beyond Bradbury’s having read Trilling’s published work. The simple reality is that Trilling (and many other thinkers) considered himself to be in an entirely different world than producers of mass culture (which science fiction and fantasy could easily be characterized as). Trilling left open the possibility that those works could rise to the status of his area of interest though he did not anticipate this happening, “It is possible that mass culture, if it is not fixed and made static, might become a better thing than it now is...But at the moment I am chiefly interested in the continuation of the traditional culture in the traditional forms.”

Bradbury’s interests were not so particular:

Most intellectuals will not accept the fact that you can sit down and read Gerard Manley Hopkins one minute and the next minute pick up [Thomas Love] Peacock, [George Bernard] Shaw, Ayn Rand, [William Somerset] Maugham, Christopher Moreley, Thomas Wolfe, Buck Rogers, Aldous Huxley, Jules Verne...and read them all and love them equally.

Bradbury had worked diligently throughout the period to build his public through the production of fantasy and science fiction. Along the way, he helped to elevate the social status of these genres to one palatable for a mainstream audience in literature, television, film, and stage. His works spoke through emotional means to the importance of literature, which to Bradbury represented an inherent good as well as serving as an expression of intellectual individuality.

Politics in a Time of Uncertainty: Have You No Sense of Decency Sir?

Bradbury attacked the hostility and fearmongering of Republican strategists in the 1952 presidential election cycle. He did so by purchasing a large advertising block in the trade publication Daily Variety. In this space, Bradbury published a six-paragraph open letter “TO THE REPUBLICAN PARTY [sic]” where he lambasted the tactics of the Republican elec-

81. Eller, Becoming Ray Bradbury, 269.
Bradbury stated, as have several other sources, that this letter was inspired by conservative columnist (and HUAC supporter) Hedda Hopper quoting Gene Fowler on November 8, 1952 in the Los Angeles Times where he stated, “It’s great that Americans have finally won an election.” Interestingly though, Bradbury’s letter is dated November 6, and while he may have backdated it for dramatic purpose (his penchant for altering timelines having been previously noted), there is the strong possibility that the cover story from the November 6 Los Angeles Times titled “What People Think of Election Result” may have had an influence.

That column, which extended over multiple pages, highlights dozens of individuals expressing their optimism over the election of Dwight Eisenhower. Of particular interest are the words of the American Federation of Labor Hollywood Film Council’s (AFL-HFC) President Roy M. Brewer.

While the AFL was ostensibly a labor organization (which historically had been Democratic leaning since FDR’s New Deal), this organization, according to film scholar Eric Hoyt, “forged an alliance with the American Legion in the late 1940s and early 1950s based on a mutual loathing of communism.” Bradbury, a member of the competing, Writers Guild of America, also known at that time as the Screen Writers Guild (SWG), would have been familiar with the pressure for censorship, as seven of the “Hollywood Ten” writers were fellow members and were blacklisted from working on Hollywood productions starting


83. Eller, Becoming Ray Bradbury, 269; “Mr. Bradbury Talks Back,” editorial header to reprint of the letter in The Nation, November 29, 1952. The letter reprint, cited as appearing November 6 by The Nation, is problematic as it can cause significant confusion for historians pursuing the original and for those wishing to understand its creation.


in 1947.\textsuperscript{86} Brewer’s take on the electoral success of the Republican party, “In a democracy, such a decisive expression of the people's will must always be right,” surely would have been troublesome to the majority skeptical Bradbury.\textsuperscript{87} In his letter Bradbury points out that his frustration crosses party lines, “I do not want to hear any more of this claptrap and nonsense from you. I will not welcome it from McCarthy or McCarran, from Mr. Nixon, Donald Jackson, or a man named Sparkman. [sic]”\textsuperscript{88}

McCarthy refers to Joseph McCarthy, a junior Senator from Wisconsin who was infamous for his unfounded attacks on groups within the government for supposed communist infiltration (See Chapter 1). McCarthy was eventually censured by the Senate for the lives he destroyed as a part of his ambitious crusade. Mr. Nixon is then Senator, and future President, Richard M. Nixon. Senator Patrick McCarran (Dem-Nevada), Congressman Donald Jackson (Rep-California), and Senator John Sparkman (Dem-Alabama) were all Congressional political figures in the period. McCarran and Jackson (Bradbury’s Congressman) were both strong anti-communist supporters of Congressional investigations into the loyalty of Americans. McCarran was described by historian Earl Latham as one of the “three principle congressional actors in the agitation over communism, the most vocal and public at least...” along with Congressman Martin Dies (chairman of the committee which became HUAC) and Senator Joseph McCarthy.\textsuperscript{89} Jackson was a member of HUAC, and one of the instigators


\textsuperscript{87} “What People Think of Election Result.” \textit{Los Angeles Times}, November 6, 1952.

\textsuperscript{88} Bradbury, “To The Republican Party.”

\textsuperscript{89} Earl Latham, \textit{The Communist Controversy in Washington: From New Deal to McCarthy} (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966), 358. In discussions of this group, there is often confusion due to the fact that McCarthy’s investigations were completely separate from HUAC which was a House Committee. Also complicating these discussions is Nixon’s quick transition from Congressman (1946–1950, serving on HUAC), to Senator (January 1950–December 1952), to Vice-President (starting January 1953).
seeking to continue the blacklist of the Hollywood Ten. Sparkman was a former Dixiecrat who ran as Adlai Stevenson’s running mate in the 1952 election (the “a man named” appears similar to a promotional comic book titled “A Man Named Stevenson” put out by the Democratic National Committee that year). 

Bradbury’s letter also rebukes Republican campaigners for suggesting that Democrats had endangered the two-party system. As early as the 1950 election, Senator Joseph McCarthy renamed those Democrats who supported the policies of President Harry Truman “Commiecrats.” Throughout the electoral process in the 1952 elections, and despite the fact that both parties openly agreed that Communism did not belong in American society, Republican candidates repeatedly attacked Democrats for supposed complacency on the issue. Republican Senators went so far as to publish “Communism in Government, which detailed ‘the Red Record of Democratic Administrations’” and other Republicans blamed the Democrats for “twenty years of treason.”

By emphasizing the importance of the two-party system, Bradbury echoed the acceptance speech given by Stevenson earlier that year when the candidate disputed the Republican campaign, “Nor am I afraid that the precious two-party system is in danger.”

Rather than name calling, both Bradbury and Stevenson could attempt to take a moral high

---


ground by reducing the inflammatory rhetoric of those wishing to Red-bait Democrats.

Bradbury’s closing encouragement to work together for the good of all also echoes the rhetoric of Stevenson’s speech.

In this period, mass media and consumer spending became significant components of swaying public opinion and political views. Historian Lizbeth Cohen tracks the rise of this trend in her work, *A Consumer’s Republic: The Politics of Consumption in Postwar America* (2008).

In a resolution first hinted at by the federal government when it urged consumers to delay inflationary purchases during the war, and then perpetrated by opinion shapers like *Life* after the war had ended, the new postwar order of mass consumption deemed that the good purchaser devoted to ‘more, newer and better’ was the good citizen….*Fortune* editor William H. Whyte would still proclaim, ‘thrift is now un-American.’ Where ever one looked in the aftermath of war, one found a vision of postwar America where the general good would be best served not by frugality or even moderation, but by individuals pursuing personal wants in a flourishing mass consumption marketplace.95

Government and businesses took full advantage of the increased flow of money following the end of the war. Perhaps the most visible example of America’s advanced industrialism and materialism came later, when then Vice-President Richard Nixon debated with Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev in the middle of a kitchen exhibition at the 1959 American Exhibition in Moscow about the values of modern convenience.96

Mills’ take on the mechanics of public thought were rather dark. For him, political participation among the American populace was, primarily, indifferent and driven by irrational means. A long critic of capitalist ideology, Mills expanded his discussions to challenge mass media. Media and products of the day, rather than being informative and encouraging societal literacy in a way which would benefit the public, act as Marx’s opiates to the masses.97

Commercial jazz, soap opera, pulp fiction, comic strips, the movies set the images, mannerisms, standards, and aims of the urban masses. In one way or another, everyone is equal before these cultural machines; like technology itself, the mass media are nearly universal in their incidence and appeal. They are a kind of common denominator, a kind of scheme for pre-scheduled, mass emotions. We are so submerged in the pictures created by mass media that we no longer really see them, much less the objects they supposedly represent. The truth is, as the media are now organized, they expropriate our vision.98

This expropriation, similar to the function of Orwell’s newspeak and Huxley’s soma, act as a state sponsored form of obfuscation, discouraging the members of society from exploring too deeply the growing flaws in the world around them.99 When asked about similarities in his own works, Bradbury pointed to a different inspiration, Arthur Koestler.100 Koestler’s *Darkness at Noon* (1941) provided a glaring image of the world of Stalin’s purges in the late 1930s including showy public denunciations, sham trials, and executions. To Bradbury, the growing power of the anticommunist crusade looked similar to the witch hunts of yesteryear; it relied on the media prowess of figures such as Hedda Hopper and confluence with government officials such as McCarthy. Both elements, the problem of manipulation of mass media and the use of consumerism to pacify independent thought, factor into Bradbury’s *Fahrenheit 451* (1953) and his 1951 short story “The Pedestrian.” In both works, Bradbury builds worlds where mass media (in the form of television) and consumer goods act as tools for establishing conformity among the populace. Only those individuals not taken in by these distractions retain their independence, and in turn, are exposed by their interest in other non-sanctioned activities.


99. Trilling provides an extended discussion of Orwell’s intentions and intellect in “George Orwell and the Politics of Truth.” In this article, Trilling finds that the “essential point of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is just this, the danger of the ultimate and absolute power which mind can develop when it frees itself from conditions, from the bondage of things and history.” This article appears in *The Moral Obligation to be Intelligent*, and Trilling’s commentary on Orwell’s novel appears on page 270.

100. Eller, *Becoming Ray Bradbury*, 89.
Reading and Knowledge: Thomas Wolfe and Guy Montag

Bradbury’s work, *Fahrenheit 451*, hinges on the concept of consumerist and social concerns killing off independent thought by marginalizing, and then physically destroying, their expression in the form of books. The book’s human antagonist provides one of the most enduring descriptions of anti-intellectualism and anti-individualism in all of American literature.

A book is a loaded gun in the house next door. Burn it. Take the shot from the weapon. Breach man’s mind. Who knows who might be the target of the well-read man? ...You can’t build a house without nails and wood. If you don’t want a house built, hide the nails and wood. If you don’t want a man unhappy politically, don’t give him two sides to a question to worry him; give him one. Better yet, give him none.\(^{101}\)

Throughout *Fahrenheit 451*, Bradbury increasingly equates thought and identity with books, eventually having literate individuals becoming the books that they best identify with in their own detached society.\(^{102}\) Those characters that have failed to identify with some form of book are, at the end of the book, wiped out by the start of an atomic war.\(^{103}\) Thus, Bradbury creates a situation where the failure to read not only impugns the ability of an individual to live a fully individualized and complete life, but opens up the possibility that only those who have cloistered themselves with the knowledge books provide may be sufficiently independent to survive society’s collapse.

Bradbury made the argument linking personhood with authorial work previously. In 1949, Bradbury published “The Mad Wizards of Mars” on the pages of *MacLean’s Magazine* (retitled “The Exiles” for *The Illustrated Man*).\(^{104}\) In the story, Earth’s first expedition approaches Mars carrying an illicit cargo. Their cargo? The last existing copies of great authors from America. All others had been destroyed previously, and when questioned by


\(^{102}\) Eller and Touponce, *The Life of Fiction*, 204.

\(^{103}\) Bradbury, *Fahrenheit 451*, 150–153.

his men about the materials they’re transporting, he indicates that bringing these last vestiges of an old world will allow the crew to cleanse society before they build their new world on Mars. Meanwhile, on Mars, literary “ghosts” are hurriedly discussing the new arrivals. Ambrose Bierce, Edgar Allan Poe, and Mark Twain are all now exiles on Mars along with their creations. These icons of American fiction are remaining in seclusion on Mars, enjoying themselves and lamenting the destruction of their works on Earth. Bierce and Poe discuss killing or stopping the crew of the rocket ship from landing, so as to preserve this last refuge for themselves and their works. These spectres attack the minds and bodies of terrified crew, who have never read these works, killing several of the explorers. Only the captain, who has read these forbidden classics of the dark fantastic, is immune. As soon as the rocket ship lands, the captain builds a fire. He selects a book from the hold, lifts it, and tosses it into the fire. Poe is horrified to watch Bierce burst into flames as the last of his works is seared from history. The bonfire continues throughout the night, and by morning, the new arrivals are on an empty planet.

Through this story, Bradbury is equating the burning of fictional works as the destruction of lives. When Bradbury discusses these topics, he most often phrases the logic of the book burners as “purifiers” of culture. Not long before, the world had heard of the dangers of cultural cleansing both in the purges of early Soviet Russia (through works such as Koestler’s _Darkness at Noon_) and in the terrifying destructive nature of Nazi Germany. Before dismissing these notions, it is important to understand that at the time, the American eugenics movement was still in force, concepts of postmodernism were coming into vogue, and television was quickly eclipsing other forms of entertainment in American homes. Literary scholars have noted the rationality of Bradbury’s critique. One of the sharpest forms of this recognition is in a footnote of Eller and Touponce’s _Life of Fiction_, “The Wizard of Oz was, in fact, removed from public libraries during this period, scapegoated as escapist literature that children ought not to be reading when America was trying to catch up with Russian
advances in space science.\[sic\]...Conformity was the order of the day.”105 Seed describes the story as a satire of this technological progress.106 Joseph Hurtgen, in “Archival Domination in Fahrenheit 451,” argued that Bradbury sees these mechanisms (book burning, the permeation of television, and the pervasiveness of the automobile) as tools the state uses to isolate, breed dependency, and ultimately control the populous by removing sources which require reflection, introspection, and curiosity.107 At the same time, advertising and other forms of “mass culture” analyses were growing in prominence, challenging literature, along with the rise of television and radio programming.108

One of Bradbury’s other interesting images of the importance of literacy, and the necessity of literature as a way of extending the lives of figures, relies on an old sci-fi mechanism to tell the tale. In “Forever and the Earth,” an unsuccessful short-story writer, named Henry William Field, in the future wants to capture the beauty and mystery of travelling from the Earth to Mars. “Space was too big for them, and rockets too swift, and atomic science too instantaneous, he thought. But at least the other writers, while failing, had been published, while he, in his idle wealth, had used years of his life for nothing.”109 Unable to achieve this

108. Dwight Macdonald began writing the essays that would eventually become Against the American Grain in 1952. The most famous of these “Masscult and Midcult,” attacked the creation of what has elsewhere been called Middlebrow Culture. Gallup Polling, founded in 1935, and other public opinion polling with “scientific” backing came into prominence at this time, leading companies to be able to use demographics to make appeals to targeted communities. Gallup himself was on the cover of Time magazine on May 3, 1948, though the entire field of pollsters suffered major setback when incorrectly picking Dewey over Truman in that year's election.
written opus himself, the man hires a group of scientists to develop a time machine. Why? Well of course, to go back in time and retrieve the only person imaginable who could capture the amazing wonder of these events in their intricate beauty, long-dead 20th Century author Thomas Wolfe. To prevent the alteration of time, Wolfe has been fetched from his hospital bed, just moments before his death. Immediately, a doctor delivers a lifesaving concoction that cures Wolfe’s terminal medical condition. This salvation allows Wolfe to be given a mission, to write the perfect novel capturing the mesmerizing wonder that is travelling through space to the planet Mars. Wolfe, amazed at this turn of events, dives into his assignment with enthusiasm. Wolfe’s benefactor shares with him that his reprieve from death is temporary, a condition of the time travel system is that no one can stay longer than eight weeks in the future (about 5 minutes in Wolfe’s own time), lest they risk forever altering history. The scientists return, afraid that the time continuum they have developed will collapse, tossing Wolfe back to his deathly hospital bed. Wolfe’s passion keeps him grounded and working within the future, amazing the experts. Wolfe writes several books frenetically, turning each over to Fielding. He returns to the Earth with thousands of pages written, covering almost all of Fielding’s home. Wolfe is re-infected with pneumonia, and after a short discussion, sent back to his hospital room in 1938. “‘I don’t want to die. So very much I don’t want to die.’”110 Wolfe speaks to his nurses of his greatest work ever, babbling on about Mars and space. The nurses return him to his deathbed, and for years ever onward, mysterious flowers fall from the sky to grace his grave. Ironically, Wolfe’s death is delayed by this act of creating, of capturing, of writing. The implication is that this, his greatest work, allows his work to live on well beyond its creator’s life.

In each of these fictions, Bradbury’s objective was to tie truth to fictions as well as the author’s view that their work constituted a part of their lives. The author, in Bradbury’s mind, had the ability to “escape” death so long as their work continued on after their physical existence. Additionally, this living on enabled them to share the lessons of their own

lives with future generations, thus ensuring the continued growth and success of the human species. This formulation is highly history-centric in that the primary medium through which a newer generation can learn to deal with the problems they face as a society is by looking back to the words of previous generations in the form of books. To fail to do so is dangerous.

Bradbury’s *Martian Chronicles* includes short chapter segues between the traditional story chapters. “The Naming of Names” discusses the proliferation of humans taking control of the Red Planet, and, in turn, their naming of the geographic features of their new home. After the initial waves of pioneering souls who secured the planet, “the sophisticates came in from Earth…they came to study and apply sociological laws; they came with stars and badges and regulations…they began to plan people’s lives and libraries; they began to instruct and push about the very people who had come to Mars to get away from being instructed and ruled and pushed about.” Bradbury provides this introduction before launching into his real examination—the resistance to control of thought and culture.

In “Usher II”—originally published in the April 1950 issue of *Thrilling Wonder Stories* as “Carnival of Madness”—Bradbury forcefully attacks those who would seek to censor literature. Interestingly, Bradbury echoes the arguments of Hofstadter, Trilling, and other intellectuals while critiquing these “sophisticates” of society. While formal intellectuals, including Hofstadter and Trilling, found societal flaw in religiosity and “anti-intellectual” thinking, Bradbury found both groups to be part of the problem, and both subject to punishment for their short-sidedness.

“Usher II” begins by introducing the main character, Mr. William Stendahl, while he is meeting with his architect to retrieve the keys to his new house on Mars. The architect is thoroughly befuddled by the wishes of his wealthy client and his proclivity for expensive, dreary surroundings. This is particularly confusing to the architect because of the legal climate in which the characters live.

They passed a law. Oh, it started very small. In 1950 and ’60 it was a grain of sand. They began controlling books of cartoons and then detective books and, of course, films, one way or another, one group or another, political bias, religious prejudice, union pressures; there was always a minority afraid of something, and a great majority afraid of the dark, afraid of the future, afraid of the past, afraid of the present, afraid of themselves and shadows of themselves.\(^{112}\)

Almost immediately, a government figure named Garrett arrives, an Investigator of Moral Climates. “You know the law [Mr. Stendahl]. Strict to the letter. No books, no houses, nothing to be produced which in any way suggests ghosts, vampires, fairies, or any creature of the imagination.”\(^ {113}\)

Stendahl recalls part of his own history. “I had my little cache. We had our libraries, a few private citizens, until you sent your men around with torches and incinerators and tore my fifty thousand books up and burned them.”\(^ {114}\) He then escorts the official on a tour through the new house, while his guest tut-tuts all of the illicit features. As the tour comes to a close, Stendahl and a companion (an out of work fantasy character actor) use an animatronic ape to kill off Garrett. Then, to avoid suspicion, the two conspirators send an animatronic replicate back to take Garrett’s place and offer a favorable report.

The collaborators turn their attentions towards preparing for a large event. The guests? “What eminent sociologists! What clever psychologists! What tremendously important politicians, bacteriologists, and neurologists! …Eminent, eminent people, one and all, members of the Society for the Prevention of Fantasy…”\(^ {115}\) Stendahl invites his eminent guests into the house for a costume ball. After some hesitance, the guests assent to the wishes of their unique host—who conveniently has befriended all of them within the past year. It is at this moment that the conspirators discover that their victim, Garrett, is in fact a replicate. The real Garrett arrives just in time to experience the party. Stendahl, ever gracious, invites him

\(^{112}\) Bradbury, *The Martian Chronicles*, 134.  
\(^{113}\) Bradbury, *The Martian Chronicles*, 136.  
\(^{114}\) Bradbury, *The Martian Chronicles*, 137.  
\(^{115}\) Bradbury, *The Martian Chronicles*, 141.
in for a drink. As they chat, the screaming starts. Guests appear to be killed in front of the group in macabre ways while they are also seemingly standing by and watching themselves be destroyed. One explains that this duplicity is achieved by yet more animatronic duplicates, while another quips, “How strange, how odd, to watch yourself die.”

The Inspector begins to realize that these are recreations of deaths from works of fiction. Stendahl compliments his guest on his understanding and invites him to tour another room, asking if he has ever heard of “The Amontillado.” The now drunk Garrett admits that he has not, and he continues playing along with his host’s instructions, even allowing himself to be secured in a room.

‘You’ve locked me in chains!’
‘So I have.’
‘What are you going to do?’
‘Leave you here.’
… ‘Where’s my duplicate? Don’t we see him killed?’
‘There is no duplicate.’
‘But the others!’
‘The others are dead. The ones you saw killed were the real people.’

Stendahl then sets to closing in the Inspector brick by brick. As he reaches the final one, Stendahl takes the time to illuminate his would be prosecutor; “do you know why I have done this to you? Because you burned Mr. Poe’s books without really reading them. You took other people’s advice that they needed burning. Otherwise you would have realized what I was going to do to you when we came down here a moment ago. Ignorance is fatal, Mr. Garrett.”

Stendahl seals in Garrett for good, fleeing to an awaiting helicopter as the house collapses. As they take flight, Stendahl’s accomplice reads aloud the closing of Poe’s “The Fall of the House of Usher.

Seed suggests that “Of the Mars Stories, ‘Usher II’ engages most directly with the enforcement of literary censorship.” Eller and Touponce refer to the story as “a thematic hybrid combining Mars as refuge with institutional attempts to control literature and therefore, Bradbury implies, human thought.” Both rationalize that Bradbury’s tale, despite its far off setting and over the top theatrics was a critique pointed squarely at the dangers of societal censorship. While Bradbury later pulled the story from the *Martian Chronicles*, both “Usher II” and “The Naming of Names” identify categories of people responsible for the censorship, and in this case, it is the elites and scientists of society who are to blame for the growing neuroses within the populace. When trying to ascertain if Bradbury’s assessment is correct, it is useful to note that at the time there were serious questions regarding the latitude authors were given in publishing and disseminating their works. Some, especially comics, paperback books, and fantasy were being challenged based on their impact on the moral standing of American citizens.

These challenges were made by individuals such as psychiatrist Fredrick Wertham, who published a series of essays that eventually led to the publication of his 1954 book, *Seduction of the Innocent*, which attacked comic books as breeding juvenile delinquency and sexualized abnormalities. These attacks were so successful that they led to bans of comics in some cities and formal United States Senate committee investigations in 1950 and 1954 (when the issue of comics came before the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency). Beyond that, the membership of the American Library Association, feeling pressure from investigators and officials, passed resolutions regarding the rights of library patrons and the question of loyalty oaths for librarians. These controversies occurred in relation to both US based libraries and abroad. The journal *Libraries and Culture* has published several articles

that are of interest on this subject. Louise S. Robins provides a helpful timeline of events in her 1995 article “After Brave Words, Silence: American Librarianship Responds to Cold War Loyalty Programs, 1947–1957,” which appeared in Volume 30, Number 4. Two articles appear in Volume 36, Number 1 in Winter 2001 that cover the issue of library independence from both domestic and international perspectives. Domestic librarians and questions about the appropriateness of international literature appear in Christine Jenkins’ “International Harmony: Threat or Menace? U.S. Youth Services Librarians and Cold War Censorship, 1946–1955.” Robins analyses the role of librarians abroad in the U.S. Department of State’s Overseas Libraries with regard to preventing ideological cleansings of libraries in “The Overseas Libraries Controversy and the Freedom to Read: U.S. Librarians and Publishers Confront Joseph McCarthy.” Due to fear, literature, in its various forms, became suspect as a potential site for subversion or degeneration of the American populace in the eyes of social and political groups. Americans, in the minds of some, were flirting with dangerous ideas, ideas that might lead to delinquency, degeneracy, and disloyalty. Normalcy and conformity were needed to provide national unity and strength, both were under attack. Normalcy and conformity... no matter the cost.

Normalcy in the Home: Jim Anderson or Fredrick Loren?

Elaine Tyler May suggests, “Vast numbers of American women and men during the early years of the cold war—more than ever before or since—got married, moved to the suburbs, and had babies. If they felt frustrated with their lot, the women were likely to turn to tranquilizers, and the men to Playboy magazine, for escape.”122 Bradbury noticed the dark side of this trend, and wrote about it in 1950 when one of his protagonists in “Long After Midnight” contemplates his marriage.

Why are we strangers in the same house? That was the first time he had begun to think about the world and how it was made, and his job, all of it.

And then he realized what it was. They were never together. There was always something between. A radio, a television set, a car, a plane, nervous exhaustion, a mad rushing, or, simply a little pheno-barbitol. They didn’t know each other. They knew things. They knew inventions. They had both applauded while science had built a beautiful glass structure, a fine glittering wonder, so precise and mechanical and wonderful that it was glorious, and, too late, discovered that it was a glass wall, through which they could not shout, through which they gestured empty pantomime silently, never touching, never hearing, never seeing really, never smelling or tasting one another.123

“Long After Midnight,” was a preliminary stage in the development of F451, this segment was published in the February 1951 issue of Galaxy as “The Fireman” (the preliminary draft finally reached print in Bradbury’s Match to Flame: The Fictional Paths to Fahrenheit 451 (2006)). It was not the first time that Bradbury had discussed the dark nature of contemporary marriages, in 1947, Bradbury published a short story “The Next in Line” where a husband, bored of his wife, allows a road trip through Texas and Mexico to slowly kill his wife.124

Other Bradbury stories look at the problems of family dynamics and neuroses between children and parents, siblings, and homes themselves. The problems and pessimisms of the cold war period, magnified in questions of science, religion, and society, crawled into the idyllic homes remembered in programs like Leave it to Beaver and The Andy Griffith Show revealing some of the uncertainty of the time.

Two stories in particular highlight the potential for darker familial relations within contemporary homes. In “The Smiling People,” a man, Mr. Greppin, returns home from work to see his family at the dinner table all smiling. Each member of the family sits smiling around the dinner table, while the main character continues his walk, constantly reminding the reader how nice the silence is, “Weighing the silence with the remarkable instruments of pitch and balance in his small ears, he nodded with satisfaction that the silence was so unified
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and finished.”125 The man wanders about the home, criticizing each member of the family for their faults quite harshly while insisting that he will shortly be married. The longer the story goes along, the more sinister it becomes as he delves into his memory, “He raised the knife a number of times like a magician’s wand. And, in a short interval—behold! They were all smiling.”126 Greppin is taunted by the sound of the rain, and then by its striking on a piece of glasswork in the attic. The noise alerts the neighbors who call the police. The police, after being refused by Mr. Greppin, break down the door to find the family around the dinner table. Apologizing at first for intrusion, the police become aware of what they’ve come upon:

The sudden halting of the police was such that their movement shook the room. The movement catapulted the bodies of Aunt Rose and Uncle Dimity straight away to the carpet, where they lay, their throats severed in a half moon from ear to ear—which caused them, like the children seated at the table, to have what was the horrid illusion of a smile under their chins, ragged smiles that welcomed in the late arrivals and told them everything with a simple grimace…. [sic]127

In his pursuit of silence and peace, Mr. Greppin provided the sounds which alerted the authorities to his grisly crime. Without his obsession over quiet, Greppin may well have escaped the consequences of his actions.

Bradbury also criticized the role of parents, psychology, and technology in the lives of children. One of the best examples of this is in his story “The Veldt” which was originally titled “The World the Children Made.”128 In this tale, Bradbury introduces a family who live in a highly automated home where children may play in a nursery that projects different images and sounds onto the walls based on the imaginations of the children at play. The intended purpose is to allow children to imaginatively play the games that many children do

while in the comfort of their homes. The parents of these children become troubled at the particular images which seem to be being projected more often, namely of an African plain in which lions are feasting upon the carcasses of their kills. The images have become so real that the savannah is described as being hot, and almost palpable. The parents consult with a psychologist who chastises them for abdicating their parenting responsibilities to an automated system and for spoiling their children. He suggests that the children be removed from this environment and encouraged to play at other games. The father decides to go further, pulling the plug on the entire nursery system and deciding that the family will seek out a home without all of the technological interference. As a result, the children revolt, crying and screaming until the mother convinces the father to grant a final, momentary, reprieve during which they may play. The children then call to their parents from the nursery. Once rushing in to find out what is the matter, the children slam the door, locking their parents inside. The parents hear a snarl behind them. The psychologist returns and is told that the parents are in the nursery. As he enters, he sees a bloodied scarf laying on the floor, and the door slams shut behind him.

These children, like the murderous psychopath of “The Smiling People,” reflect the dangerous inclinations Bradbury saw growing within the American population. Bradbury was hitting on a topic that confounded psychologists, sociologists, and even philosophers; in a world where every convenience is available, neuroses abound. Seed suggests that “The Veldt” in particular “satirizes the consumerist ethic of the automated house, which displaces the parents from any active functions in the household.”129 When the connections between individuals are subsumed by decadence (technological, moral, or elsewise), society begins to break down, releasing humanity’s darker side. By the 1950s, Congress certainly had growing concerns with the state of America’s mental, moral, and civil health as their investigatory reach blossomed to include: paperback novels as pornographic materials (Gathings Committee, 1952); comic books as corrupting America’s youth (Kefauver and Hendrickson Commit-
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mittees, 1950-1955); organized crime in all realms of society (Kefauver Committee, 1950-
1951); homosexuals as susceptible to Communist sympathizing (Hoey Committee, 1950);
and, most infamously, to accusations of Communist sympathizers in the military (Army-Mc-
Carthy Hearings, 1954). 130

Morality and Authority: Who Knows Best?

Many of the leading groups within American society did not wish to look too deeply at
the darker corners of where their policies and goals could take Americans (particularly in
the conflation of religiosity, intolerance, politics, and eventually—in the case of the Ethel
and Julius Rosenberg as well as those lost in Korea—death). Faith leaders were dealing with
new challenges from scientific, ideological, and intellectual authorities. Some religious figures,
however, attempted to assert their place as authorities with renewed vigor. Priests, Rabbis,
and pastors, interested in maintaining the unity between American sects, banded together
and tried to publicize the importance of American faith and freedom via the Ad Council and
other outreach organizations. Historian Kevin Schultz tracks these developments during the
1940s and 1950s as a part of a conscious effort by Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish leaders
of the faith brought together in 1927 under the auspices of the National Conference of
Christians and Jews (NCCJ) in Chapter 3: “Tri-Faith America in the Early Cold War” of Tri-
Faith America: How Catholics and Jews Held Postwar America to Its Protestant Promise. These insti-
tutions tied American religious faith to patriotism and saw both as a bulwark against com-
munism. In the words of historian Stephen J. Whitfield, “church membership and a highly
favorable attitude towards religion became forms of affirming ‘the American way of life’
during the Cold War, especially since the Soviet Union and its allies officially subscribed to
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a theism.” As individuals’ fears of communism and the atomic bomb grew, they swarmed to churches, synagogues, and cathedrals.

In the words of Gallup Poll Editor John M. Fenton,

One of our chief grievances was a belief that Communist Russia had embarked on a policy of systematically destroying the Christian religion wherever she could. In this regard, the cold war has had some aspects of a holy war. Religion is a serious business in America—over half of all Americans are in church on a typical Sunday. An overwhelming 95 per cent of the people say they believe in a Diety of some nature...three out of four Americans in 1947 believed that the Communists would destroy the Christian religion if they could emphasizes one of the more deep-seated fears of Russia.

President Truman signed into law the National Day of Prayer, and spoke about the necessity of Christian morality to prevent catastrophe. Both Adlai Stevenson and Dwight Eisenhower invoked religious themes throughout their campaigns in 1952, and Eisenhower signed Congressional acts adding “one nation under God” as a part of the Pledge of Allegiance and “In God We Trust” as the nation’s motto. Billy Graham, perhaps the most prolific preacher of the period, attacked liberal policies and politicians as soft on communism (much to the benefit of figures such as McCarthy) while Reinhold Niebuhr, one of the most prominent religious intellectuals of the period, challenged Graham’s rhetoric as “demagogic.” Both Schultz and Whitfield note the ongoing ideological conflicts between religious figures supporting liberalism (supported by Niebuhr) and anti-communism (promoted by Graham) were playing out on the pages of the Luce magazines; national newspapers; and intellectual magazines such as American Mercury, The New Republic, and Commonweal. These political disputes presented a challenge to the religious consensus and efforts which had been
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used to support national unity through the Great Depression and World War II. Bradbury saw these disputes as a part of the problem with McCarthyism and its proponents, and cited these as part of the reason for writing his “Letter to the Republican Party” when talking to biographer Sam Weller, “I was sick and tired of all the terrible things being said back and forth, the Communist talk, the anti-Catholic talk, the anti-Jewish talk, that everybody was spouting. I had to say something.”

Bradbury’s own religious views appear haphazardly throughout the interviews and are skeptical of both religious thought and influence. When Bradbury did discuss God, he did so through the safety of a science-fiction framework. By the time Bradbury reached legal adulthood in 1938, his writer’s notes indicate that Bradbury had broken from the Baptist faith of his family. A 1951 article from the New York Times quotes Bradbury as saying:

Supposing there are people out there [in space]...How will this jibe with Christianity or Judaism? Supposing there was no original sin? No Adam and Eve? Do they have a soul? Suppose in Mars a creature looks like a dog but is twice as intelligent as a man? These religions will have to do some quick stepping...We might just close our eyes to all the differences and convert the heathen Martian. We’d probably say it was another case of God’s wonders.

In fact, Bradbury had been thinking about this exact scenario previously. While the story was pulled from the American original release of *The Martian Chronicles*, Bradbury directly conceptualized this problem in the UK edition of *The Martian Chronicles* (titled *The Silver Locusts*) and in the U.S. release of *The Illustrated Man* in his story, “The Fire Balloons.” In the story, a group of priests known as the Episcopal Fathers seeks out any living beings...

on Mars to correct them of their sin. Over the course of their travels, the group is sent to examine one of the races of Mars, floating orbs of blue flame that are, in fact, sentient beings. Upon building a temple in a fashion he feels the Martians could understand, his fellow priests criticize him for not designing his temple in the manner they are used to seeing. At this point, the Martians reveal themselves to have shed their bodies (and material desires) and thus escaped from sin. Each Martian is “a temple unto himself and we need no place wherein to clean himself.”

Niebuhr, Graham, and other religious leaders at the time were using the precepts of Christianity and Judaism as a unifying nationalistic force. To be American meant to be religious, not simply for the salvation of souls, but also as a way of instilling the necessary moral fiber into American society to stave off “Godless Communism.” While other elements got wrapped up in this nationalism (such as consumerism) religiosity was a major cultural and social tool for maintaining a social order. To Niebuhr and other religious leaders of the time, people with similar religious proclivities to Bradbury (those who were skeptical of “traditional” religious notions and authorities) were not only offensive; they were dangerous to the revivalism of American religious thought.

If religious relativism is the natural expression of the romantic doctrine of individuality with its premium upon uniqueness and variety as such, its worship of the unique race and nation is an inevitable effort to reduce the pretension and absurdity of this polytheism, an effort which leads tragically to the complete annihilation of the idea of individuality in personal terms. An individual cannot bear to make himself the centre of meaning without qualification. Inevitably he must seek support from something greater and more inclusive than himself….because it is not possible to appreciate and preserve particularity and uniqueness, whether individual or national, without bringing it into relation with, and subordination to, an ultimate centre and source of meaning or allowing the particular and unique value to become itself an imperialistic centre of ultimate meaning.

Niebuhr continues on to suggest that this rampant tendency to maintain “uniqueness” was the impetus behind nationalistic and fascist destruction in Germany.\(^{143}\) This is not in any way the sort of system which Bradbury was advocating, instead seeing uniqueness as an indicator of individuality and liberty. Interestingly, Niebuhr finds that almost every form of individualism eventually is subsumed into some form of collective.\(^{144}\) Again, Bradbury’s perspective was that individualism was the best defense against the sublimations of collectivism—what we would now call groupthink. The singular exception Niebuhr provides is that of the Nietzschean, who is unrestrained by social groups and faces only the limitation of their own capacity.\(^{145}\)

A thesis of Eller and Touponce’s book, *Ray Bradbury: The Life of Fiction*, is that Nietzschean thematic and arguments underline much of Bradbury’s work (as mentioned in Chapter 1). Yet the independent streak of religious relativists, atheism, and nihilism was not the only force present that posed a challenge to religious thought and control.

During this period of the Cold War, thinkers and scientists too began to challenge religious authority over morality and decision-making. Prominent thinkers including John Dewey, Joseph Wood Krutch, Walter Lippmann, Sidney Hook, and Lionel Trilling all attempted to formulate secular defenses of liberalism, human freedom, individual rights, and capitalism with varying degrees of success.\(^{146}\)

Bradbury also criticized the notion that secular authorities had the capacity to comprehend religious truths. In his story, “The Man,” Bradbury describes a situation where a group of explorers land in a town on another planet and are told of a mysterious man with miraculous powers.\(^{147}\) Hart, a ship’s captain, lands on a planet with his men and is offended that they are not greeted by the locals. In fact, the locals barely notice the new arrivals. When one
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of his companion’s suggests that maybe the locals simply want peace and quiet, the captain admits that this isn’t the case on Earth anymore, “‘Not since Darwin, eh? Not since everything went by the board, everything we used to believe in, eh? Divine power and all that.’” Captain Hart confronts one of the locals, he is told that while there would formerly have been a large celebration for the visitors from Earth, instead a mysterious visitor arrived the day before and fundamentally altered their perceptions (Seed describes the figure as “qua-simessianic”). When asked to describe the man, he receives mixed signals.

“What did this man—this stranger—look like?”
“There would be hard to say,” said the mayor, smiling a little.
“Why would it?”
“Opinions might differ slightly.”
“I’d like your opinion, sir, anyway,” said the captain. ‘Record this,’ he snapped to Martin over his shoulder. The lieutenant pressed the button of a hand recorder.
“Well,” said the mayor of the city, ‘he was a very gentle and kind man. He was of a great and knowing intelligence.’
“Yes—yes, I know, I know.” The captain waved his fingers. ‘Generalizations. I want something specific. What did he look like?’
“I don’t believe that is important,” replied the mayor.

The Captain, incensed by what he thinks are the machinations of his fellow Captains, flies into a rage, suggesting that the “Man” must be one of his fellow Earthmen conning the natives. Instead, another Earth ship arrives, bringing with it news that the other ships were caught in a storm in space and that one of the other Captains has died on the journey. It is after this revelation that Captain Hart calls his men back to the ship to follow after the Man and prove him a charlatan. His first officer, with a significant contingent of his crew, refuse. In the end, a native summarizes the spectacle; “‘And he’ll go on, planet after planet, seeking and seeking, and always he will be an hour late….And he will go on and on, thinking to find the very thing which he left behind here, on this planet.’ [sic]”
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Thus, Bradbury suggests that the epitome of authority and judgement in this time period—a civil, scientific, and military commander—fails to grasp truths put right in front of him, in large part due to his full-hearted acceptance of science as the only form of truth. Bradbury also shows the vanity and human flaws within these groups as humans. What though of non-human morality? Could machines be able to set aside the subjective flaws of mankind to provide impartial, and thereby more “right” answers?

Enter another tale of technological moral ambiguity, “The Pedestrian.” “The Pedestrian” is one of Bradbury’s most reprinted stories, but it first appeared on August 7, 1951 in the pages of *The Reporter* magazine. In June of the same year, the magazine had published a profile of Bradbury. In the first half of the second millennium A.D., the protagonist steps outside at eight o’clock in the evening one November night to take a walk, “what Mr. Leonard Mead most dearly loved to do.”

Mead, a single man, is a bit of an oddity, walking along “sidewalks [that] had been vanishing under flowers and grass. In ten years of walking by night or day, for thousands of miles, he had not met a person walking, not one in all that time.” As he walks along, Mead muses about the programs his neighbors are consuming “on Channel 4, Channel 7, Channel 9?... Eight-thirty P.M. Time for a dozen assorted murders? A quiz? A revue? A comedian falling off the stage?” As he comes close to his home, Mead is stopped by a roving police car, the last police car “in a city of three million....”

‘Business or profession?’ [said the police car]
‘I guess you’d call me a writer.’
‘No profession,’ said the police car, as if talking to itself. The light held him fixed, like a museum specimen, needle thrust through his chest.
‘You might say that,’ said Mr. Mead. He hadn’t written in years. Magazines and books didn’t sell any more. Everything went on in the tomblike houses at night now, he thought, continuing his fancy. The tombs, ill-lit by television light, where the people sat like the dead, the gray or multicolored lights touching their faces, but never really touching them…. ‘Just walking Mr. Mead?’
‘Yes.’
‘But you haven’t explained for what purpose.’
‘I explained; for air, and to see, and just to walk.’
‘Have you done this often?’
‘Every night for years.’

After questioning Mead for some time about his intentions of being out at such a late hour, the car pops open the back door, saying “Get in.” After climbing into the back of the car, which Mead now realizes is automated, it cruises past his home. “‘Where are you taking me?’... ‘To the Psychiatric Center for Research on Regressive Tendencies.’”159 At the close of the story, all is once again quiet on the now completely empty streets.

In this story, authority to determine guilt or innocence has been abrogated by humanity and is instead left in the hands of technology. The police car examines Mead’s motives for participating in what is then an antiquated activity. Society in the story has moved to the point that televisions now dominate evening activities, and those who are not participating in this way are suspect. Interestingly, the story was in part inspired by two of Bradbury’s own run-ins with police, when he and friends were interrogated while out walking in the evening.

“In 1940, Bradbury was questioned in Pershing Square by police during a late-night walk with Henry Hasse, and a similar incident with another friend occurred along Wilshire Boulevard sometime in 1949.”160 If these nighttime strolls were suspect, what would be next? Eller describes the pedestrian as a “threshold or indicator species of urban dwellers—if the rights
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of the pedestrian were threatened, it would be an early indicator that basic freedoms were at risk.”\^{161} By incorporating together models such as Koestler’s *Darkness at Noon* (1941) and David Keller’s “The Revolt of the Pedestrians” (1928), along with his recent real-world experiences, Bradbury’s vision turned darker as he “envisioned his solitary pedestrian, considered a dangerous deviant in a culture where virtual reality entertainments had replaced evening walks…” and eventually led him to the characterizations on which *Fahrenheit 451* was built.\^{162} This deviancy was a central component of other works, as it served to separate people into acceptance and otherness. Otherness was a burgeoning social issue at the time, most often expressed along racial and ethnic lines.

The Other In Society: Ricky Ricardo, Jackie Robinson, or Bigger Thomas?

Bradbury, as discussed in the introduction, grew up in close proximity to a plethora of different cultures in the Los Angeles area. As a result, Bradbury was able to see firsthand the chaos caused by racial strife when it came to segregated places near his home.\^{163} When it came to the question of race in American society, Bradbury is one of several intellectuals capable of providing commentary during the period on questions of race. Bradbury was interested in improving relationships between groups by emphasizing the humanity of people treated as “others.” Three stories in particular emphasize this humanizing tendency.

In 1945, Bradbury published “The Big Black and White Game” in *American Mercury*.\^{164} In the story, the white guests of a grand Wisconsin lakeshore hotel play the black staff of the hotel in an annual baseball game as a part of a festival in the afternoon preceding an evening Cakewalk Jamboree. The story is told from the perspective of an observant and intuitive boy who is watching the game from the “Whites only” side of the stands with his mother.
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As the players enter the field, the differences between the two teams become readily apparent. The staff team enters the field and begins stretching and moving about freely, being described as “graceful and mellow.”165 The boy’s mother comments on the freedom and happiness that the team exhibits, stating “Look at them prance, you’d think they thought they were going to win the game from our men.”166 When their opponents enter the field, the image is quite different. “The white men worked at their running as they worked at everything. You felt embarrassed for them because they were alive too much in the wrong way….the white men were crammed, shoved, and belted into their outfits.”167

When the game begins, the inexperience and lackluster athleticism of the White team is soon apparent. The Black team takes an early 7-0 lead. The White team and fans begin grumbling about recent perceived slights by the staff.

“Those Negroes are too big for their britches….All the past week at the hotel…the hotel service has been simply terrible. Those maids don’t talk about a thing save the Cakewalk Jamboree, and whenever you want ice water it takes them half an hour to fetch it, they’re so busy sewing’….The lady next to my mother cried out suddenly and fanned herself furiously with her newspaper. ‘Land, I just thought! Wouldn’t it be awful if they won the game? They might, you know. They might do it.’”168

One of the Black team’s players, the first baseman known as Big Poe, notices the lopsided game. Despite having hit the first home run of the game, Poe begins to throw his at-bats. By the fifth inning, Big Poe had given up three outs by deliberately striking out. One particularly virulent player from the White team, Jimmie Cosner, then goes after Big Poe. Knowing that he will be out at first base, the player slides cleats first into Big Poe, tearing open the black player’s leg. When the umpire calls the offender out and attempts to throw him out of the game for the violent action, the cheater shouts back “‘I’m safe. I’m stayin’
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right here, by God! No nigger put me out!”169 Rather than let the umpire continue, Big Poe tells everyone that he was safe. After a short disagreement with both the umpire, and a doctor, the game continues with Big Poe and the offender still in the game. The violent player attempts to steal second. “Big Poe leaned forward, sighted toward second base, drew back his mighty right hand, and hurled that white baseball straight down along the line until it reached Jimmie Cosner’s head.”170 As chaos ensues, the Black team leaves the field, Big Poe having to push his way through a group of white men. That night, the narrator sneaks out of his home to find that the Cakewalk Jamboree is continuing in all sorts of festivity. Only the staff people are there, without a care in the world.

Bradbury’s narrative of a black athletic team outperforming their white counterparts occurred before the modern civil rights era and reached publication two years before Jackie Robinson broke the color barrier in Major League Baseball. Bradbury confronts the situation by exposing the slights and outright attacks on black men and women in a situation that is supposed to be the epitome of Americana, a baseball game. These attacks come in ways that show just how unjustifiable they really are. When the white player’s impotence becomes apparent, these injustices turn physical. Rather than retaliate, the black player waits, seeking retribution at a more favorable moment. The notion that non-whites might eventually have the opportunity to have retribution for the slights they faced appears elsewhere in Bradbury’s writing.

In 1951, “The Other Foot” appeared in The Illustrated Man.171 In this story, a group of African American refugees establish a colony on Mars. Twenty years go by and no new settlers come from the Earth. When a new rocket of white refugees is seen in the night sky, the residents take the opportunity to establish their rules. Quickly, signs and rules resembling a reverse Jim Crow are put in place (Seed refers to this as a “racial inversion”).172 Businesses
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are marked “no whites” and sections at the back of trolleys are marked for whites. New colonists arrive to find an angry mob carrying ropes and weapons, ready to exact violent retribution for their previous oppression. The leader of the new refugees emerges from the rocket to speak to the mob. He explains that a third world war broke out right after the last refugees left and has destroyed almost all of the Earth, preventing more people from coming. This batch of refugees wants the Martian colonists to return and bring more new inhabitants to the red planet. The residents question the new arrivees about their hometowns and landmarks from their old lives.

Those houses where the cold men rocked, with glasses of drink in their hands, guns leaned against the porch newels, sniffing the autumn airs and considering death. Gone, all gone; gone and never coming back. Now, for certain, all of that civilization ripped into confetti and strewn at their feet. Nothing, nothing of it left to hate—not an empty brass gun shell, or a twisted hemp, or a tree, or even a hill of it to hate. Nothing but some alien people in a rocket, people who might shine his shoes and ride in the back of trolleys or sit far up in midnight theatres…

The rope, released, fell and coiled upon itself along the ground.

They ran through the streets of their town and tore down the new signs so quickly made, and painted out the fresh yellow signs on streetcars, and they cut down the ropes in the theatre balconies, and unloaded their guns and stacked their ropes away…

...‘Seems like for the first time today I really see the white man—I really see him clear.’

Seed assesses the story by stating that, “to the young the landing will be a spectacle; to older colonists it will offer a chance for racial revenge through reverse segregation.” Bradbury was considering the darker outcomes of the shifting world of postwar America. When it came to the future, “Bradbury chose to reflect on the very real possibility that retribution would play a significant role in coming changes…”
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Bradbury's concern for others extended beyond the worries of revenge, though. One story, which stands out, is “I See You Never,” which reached publication in 1947 on the pages of *The New Yorker* magazine. In this story, a white landlord is sitting down with her family to a steak dinner. There is a knock on the door. Mrs. O’Brien opens it to see two police officers and her tenant, Mr. Ramirez. Ramirez, an immigrant from Mexico, has been detained for overstaying his work visa. As such, Ramirez is being deported. The police have allowed him to return in order to retrieve his belongings and to return his keys. O’Brien tells the young man that she appreciates his being a good tenant. Ramirez chokes out appreciation for her, his love of being in America, as his eyes plead for her help. O’Brien’s family calls for her to return to the dinner table.

‘I’m sorry Mr. Ramirez,’ she said. ‘I wish there was something I could do.’

‘Mrs. O’Brien!’ he cried suddenly, tears rolling out from under his eyelids. He reached out his hands and took her hand fervently, shaking it, wringing it, holding to it. ‘Mrs. O’Brien, I see you never, I see you never!’

… ‘Hurry up, Mom,’ said one of the sons. ‘It’ll be cold.’... ‘What’s wrong, Ma?’ asked her son. ‘I just realized, said Mrs. O’Brien—she put her hand to her face—‘I’ll never see Mr. Ramirez again.’

In each of these stories, Bradbury portrays the “others” in his fictions as well-rounded characters. He explores the complex range of human emotions both in his “others” and in their white fictional counterparts when these groups interact. These characters are at times happy, sad, angry, fearful, longing, moroseful, and judgmental. They are flawed and encounter problems because of those flaws. Each emotion stands in tension with the others, and it is through these emotions that deeper conflicts and truths about society emerge.

When one looks to other intellectual writers of the period, particularly Richard Wright’s *Native Son* (1940), a different formulation for understanding the relationship between black America and white America is at play: one of class division through fear, confusion, and


suppression of ideas. Wright, one of the foremost African American intellectuals of the period, chooses as the focal point of his novel a young black man in Chicago named Bigger Thomas (in most discussions, this character is referenced as simply “Bigger,” so that nomenclature will appear here). Bigger expresses anger towards others in the novel as a function of survival, brought about by confusion and fear related to his role in society, namely how he should interact with whites. This confusion and fear are raised significantly when interacting with one of his new employers, Mary Dalton—the naive daughter of a successful white man—and Jan Erlone, a Communist who wants equality between the races. While the two whites are gleefully “helping” Bigger by forcing him to interact and drink with them, Bigger is terrified (having been taught both that interacting with whites and associating with Communists was dangerous); by the end of the night Bigger accidentally kills Mary while trying to protect himself. Panicking, Bigger mutilates and burns Mary’s body, and proceeds to set up Erlone for the crime, going so far as to concoct a ransom note. After conscripting his girlfriend into the crimes, Mary’s body is discovered, and Bigger flees. While trying to escape, Bigger, seeing his girlfriend now as a liability, kills her and dumps the body. When the authorities eventually capture Bigger, it is only after they have had lynch mobs roaming throughout black communities and his capture has become a public spectacle.

Wright chooses to use Boris Max, a Communist lawyer who has developed a relationship with Bigger, giving a closing statement as a philosophical mouthpiece in his novel. Readers familiar with the work of Ayn Rand will recognize this as the same technique employed when Hank Reardon is on trial in her later novel *Atlas Shrugged* (1957) or, for an older perspective, Plato using Socrates as a mouthpiece in his works. Max takes the time to talk to Bigger before the trial, and builds a rapport with Bigger by describing his place in society as a Communist Jew. Max convinces Bigger to plead guilty, as he has already given a signed confession to the crimes (excepting that of raping Mary), and then to throw himself on the mercy of the court. The prosecutor insists that this is an attempt by the defense to present an insanity defense, and proceeds to call every witness (including several reporters) he had
intended to call during trial during the sentencing phase, keeping the spectacle going. Max insists that his client is neither insane nor innocent, but an individual severely damaged by the society around him who acted only as a means of survival (thus mitigating the perniciousness of his crime and making him an acceptable candidate for life imprisonment).

In this way, Wright is suggesting that while they should still be held accountable for their actions, black Americans have structural hurdles to their development and fulfillment which predispose them to committing acts which are irrational, spontaneous, and against their best interests. This is an economic and cultural structural argument. Bradbury’s more humanistic impulse is to accept the proposition that there is a structural flaw in racism, but that the outcomes of that structure are personal, conscious, and retributive. Both accept culpability in the actions of individuals, but Bradbury’s rationale gives black America greater personhood in those decisions. Rather than violence resulting from cultural dissonance and confusion, it arises out of a righteous feeling of being wronged in very palpable and personal ways.

James Baldwin, one of Wright’s contemporaries and a noted black public intellectual in his own right, sharply criticized Wright’s work in his own *Notes of a Native Son* (1957) for being stereotypical and belittling of the intelligence, comprehension, complexity, and independence of black Americans. Baldwin attacks the notion that Bigger is a realistic portrayal of black America in part because he is so symbolically structured and choreographed to match up to white perceptions of black manhood.

One may say that the Negro in America does not really exist except in the darkness of our minds. This is why his history and his progress, his relationship to all other Americans, has been kept in the social arena. He is a social and not a personal or human problem; to think of him is to think of statistics, slums, rapes, injustices, remote violence; it is to be confronted with an endless cataloguing of losses, gains, skirmishes; it is to feel virtuous, outraged, helpless, as though his continuing status among us were somehow analogous to disease—cancer, perhaps, or tuberculosis—which must be checked, even though it cannot be cured.178

Rather than having any ability to alter his state, or to even comprehend altering his state, Baldwin sees Bigger as a proxy by which all flaws of black masculinity can be attached. The innocence he might garner by his background are negated by his nonexistent consciousness to his social situation or opportunities to change it. It is in this way that Bigger can be adopted as a Christ like character despite his flaws; Baldwin castigates Wright for not understanding that there are flaws in black America, just as in white, which preclude either from truly taking a moral high ground, “we [those of good will who are not full of hate and greed] will set our faces against them [those of ill intent, hatred, and greed] and join hands and walk together into that dazzling future when there will be no white or black. This is the dream of all liberal men, a dream not at all dishonorable, but nevertheless, a dream.”  

Baldwin concludes that the only way to actually arrive at this future (of colorblindness) is by destroying any personality and difference which gives black personhood meaning. As suggested earlier, to Bradbury, the differences and personalities being allowed to be expressed are tied intricately to his concept of personhood. If forced to conform, one creates an impediment that devalues and challenges individual personhood. Bradbury’s conclusion similarly places the burden of overcoming hate on black persons, relying on their morality to mitigate their baser impulses should they come to power. For Baldwin and Bradbury, it is up to the individual to decide what recourse to take by connecting with their neighbors as human beings, not for society to impersonally impose it.

Eller explains that this relationship with people of color had a long history in Bradbury’s life, stating that the source material for “The Big Black and White Game” was an “exhibition he had witnessed at one of Lake Delivan’s summer resorts in 1932….” “I See You Never” was inspired by his experience of having maintained a writing office in his early 20s just west of downtown Los Angeles with many Mexican-American, Chinese, Filipino, and other groups while seeing their struggles. From these early memories, Bradbury was
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exposed to a large variety of people throughout the Los Angeles area. Eller explains that other than his baseball reminiscent story, Bradbury’s work on race had trouble reaching print, as publishers were shying away from this type of material, “These stories, far more strident in tone than ‘The Big Black and White Game,’ were virtually unmarketable in the mainstream literary culture of the postwar years…Bradbury would only be able to publish such stories in intellectual or avant-garde magazines, where circulation and readership did not necessarily reflect mainstream biases.”182 Those biases were growing, and began to pitch in favor of science as the solution to societal problems.

Science: Drs. Einstein and Frankenstein, I Presume?

Bradbury saw technological and scientific knowledge as tools for advancing society, rather than systems useful to defining it. By the close of the war, scientists had developed the world’s most destructive weapon, the atomic bomb, and they felt compelled to use their knowledge of how it worked to guide society in its use. While the awesome power unleashed by splitting the atom provided some political figures the opportunity to entertain fantastical notions about its utility, scientists and other researchers urged caution and downplayed the realistic possibility of harnessing this new technology.183

182. Eller, Becoming Ray Bradbury, 235–236.
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When social scientists and physicists came forward as public intellectuals in the later war and early postwar years, Bradbury maintained his skepticism. This was possible, in part, because Bradbury and other science-fiction writers had been discussing the possibilities and pitfalls of these new advances long before they became realities, President Truman’s announcement in August 1945 came as no surprise to the writers and readers of science fiction. The reaction of Ray Bradbury, riding a bus in Los Angeles, was typical: ‘I saw the headline, brought on the bus by a stranger and thought: Yes, of course, so it’s here! I knew it would come, for I had read about it and thought about it for years.’ H.G. Wells had predicted an atomic bomb in 1914, and in the 1920s and 1930s stories involving atomic weapons had appeared frequently in science-fiction magazines. In March 1944, for instance, *Astounding Science Fiction* published a story that described the construction of an atomic bomb so accurately that both the author and the editor, John W. Campbell, Jr., received visits from War Department officials.\(^{184}\)

Bradbury would have been familiar with works similar to these as he was one of *Astounding*’s contributing authors in this period (having sold them “Eat, Drink, and be Wary” in July 1942 as well as “Doodad” and “And Watch the Fountains” in September 1943).\(^{185}\)

Another element of Bradbury’s skepticism was his own devotion to reading a wide range of sources available to him, including the social sciences. “The more I read, the more I realized we can’t help one another. The way you help yourself is by working every day of your life—no matter what your work is…”\(^{186}\)

Bradbury began to take notice of some of the issues associated with the burgeoning fields of science that his contemporaries were in other fields. Trilling pointed out the essential issue with scientists communicating with the public after Alfred Kinsey’s publication of *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (1948). “With this public, science is the authority. It has been trained to accept heedlessly ‘what science says,’ which it conceives to be a unitary utterance. To this public nothing is more valuable, more preciously ‘scientific,’ and more finally
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convincing than raw data without conclusions....” 187 Bertrand Russell, a British philosopher and social critic, pointed out the fundamental flaw in many scientists didn’t want the public to take into account more bluntly, “those who refuse that false ‘recognition of facts’ which fails to recognize that facts are often bad.” 188 By continuously seeing the evolving nature of scientific progress, Bradbury conceptualized the necessity of continuously taking in new sources of information as a counterpoint to blind faith.

Along the way, Bradbury compared these new sources of information to those he had already consumed. This continuous synthesis allowed him to comprehend fiction, science, and other works as sources of shared experience all dealing with similar themes and problems.

One significant source of confusion related to Bradbury’s thoughts on scientific authority came from something the author had no control over. The month after Bradbury made his declaration about science-fiction being a sociological study, an overzealous junior editor with Bantam decided to speak for Bradbury and,

...had apparently fabricated a Bradbury quotation to close the publisher’s editorial note, framed by the anonymous assertion that ‘Bradbury doesn’t care for science’: ‘I don’t like what science is doing to the world. I think science is a good thing to escape from.’ Bradbury was able to get the entire closing section of this note removed from the second printing, and Bantam editors were careful to steer readers and critics in a completely different direction with the paperback edition of The Illustrated Man: ‘He is not, as he has often been misquoted, against science, but rather against the mis-use of science by fools.’ 189

Two stories point to different aspects of this concern for the misuse of science, both appear in the pages of The Golden Apples of the Sun. The first story is “Embroidery” and
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deals with the helpless nature of society in dealing with nuclear testing.\textsuperscript{190} In this story, three women sit around in a group working on needlework. There are hints that they are all nervous. One woman notices an error with her stitch work and in the process of removing the flaw completely eliminates a man who was stitched on the embroidery. The women discuss their hesitancy to begin working on tasks such as preparing dinner. Finally, the reader is clued in on what is the cause of this anxiety.

‘Is it supposed to happen at five o’clock?’
‘Yes.’
‘And they’re not sure what it’ll do to anything, really, when it happens?’
‘No, not sure.’
‘Why didn’t we stop them before it got this far and this big?’... ‘My, how we’ll laugh to think we were frightened by an old experiment!’\textsuperscript{191}

As five o’clock passes, the tension seems to lessen. One of the women rises to begin preparing dinner. The others continue their work, even when their eyes are filled with a flash. Their hands continue stitching even as they are enveloped and burned away by nuclear fire.

Another story contemplates the acceptance of nuclear war as a survivable possibility in the minds of civil authorities. “The Garbage Collector” brings the stark horror of what comes after an atomic war to the forefront.\textsuperscript{192} Bradbury explores the psychological trauma of a civil servant who realizes the role he has been ordered to fill in the event of an atomic bombing. Rather than attending to his normal duties, the garbage collector is to follow instructions provided via a newly installed radio in his truck. After telling his wife, who assumes this a joke, the unnamed everyman takes time to think through his new assignment. This character then begins to contemplate the dark reality of the task. How should the mutilated corpses be placed?

\textsuperscript{191} Bradbury, “Embroidery,” 118.
...in the truck lengthwise or endwise, with heads on the right or feet on the right? Men and women together or separated? Children in one truck or mixed together with men and women? Dogs in special trucks, or just let them lay? Wondering how many bodies one garbage truck can hold.193

While the editors of *The California Quarterly*—to who Bradbury unsuccessfully submitted this tale (see earlier response letter to *CQ* Editor Leslie Edgley)—might have dismissed these concepts as absurd “lies,” the question had been asked. In fact, “the *Los Angeles Times* had published a statement by the mayor announcing that in the event of an atomic war, the bodies would be picked up by the city’s garbage trucks.”194 While this revelation might startle some, many solutions, some pragmatic and others less so, were proposed to handle the practical issues of picking up after such a war.

Some of these solutions were based on unrealistic assumptions about the realities of nuclear destruction. Historian Dee Garrison points out, “a 1950 *Collier’s* piece even found ‘really hopeful’ evidence that a family could emerge from an air raid shelter within 300 feet of ground zero with realistic expectations of continuing normal life only temporarily disrupted by nuclear war.”195

Some businesses even got into the swing of civil defense and figured out a creative way to both help the schools in their communities while making a buck. They began selling student identification tags that could be “conveniently” tied to students for assembling as a part of civil defense preparation activities. While students came to associate these items with the Duck and Cover songs of characters including Bert the Turtle, advertisers speaking to administrators and parents were careful in their advertising language. Almost all failed to mention the other utility of these tags, that they “could be used to identify the dead and

disfigured bodies [of children] following an attack.” 196 Not only were these assumptions false, but Bradbury pointed out just how dangerous unrestrained power could be. What if society could go back and make corrections though? What if the ultimate of science fictional devices became a reality?

In “A Sound of Thunder,” Bradbury describes a future in which time travel becomes possible. 197 The main characters discuss the outcome of a recent presidential election, with all apparently happy at the outcome. The operators of the business, Time Safari Inc., explain to their customers that they will be led back by a guide who will help them to their prey, a dinosaur that is close to death. The proprietors of this venture must be incredibly careful not to alter anything including the local flora and fauna (which they achieve through an anti-gravity path on which their customers walk). The head guide, Travis, explains that any failure to obey his orders or their policies will result in substantial fines.

The adventure seekers arrive in the past, and are taken into position where they can take their shot at a pre-tagged dinosaur (selected for its minimal impact on the future). Eckels, a late addition to this safari, is terrified when finally confronted by the monster they are there to slay. After being told that he cannot back out, Eckels panics and runs off the path and through the forest. After the others kill their prey, Travis, disgusted, threatens to strand Eckels, then assigns him the demeaning task of recovering their used bullets. Upon returning to their time, the group notices that there are changes to their world, including the outcome of the Presidential election. After finding a smashed butterfly on the sole of Eckels’ shoe, Eckels begins pleading that it’s just a butterfly; Travis turns his rifle on the other man; “There was a sound of thunder.” 198

Bradbury was troubled by this situation, where individuals in national security or physics—or simply with access to money—were experimenting with things that could end or fundamentally alter human life. To him, scientists and soldiers were toying with the continued existence of society by tinkering with things that were well beyond their control. Society, rather than rejecting this challenge to their lives, had begrudgingly ceded control to the authorities. To Bradbury, lack of restraint in this manner was foolhardy and dangerous. This mimicked a concept that one of Bradbury’s “literary instructors,” W. Somerset Maugham had described in Of Human Bondage (1917), “Society stood on one side, an organism with its own laws of growth and self-preservation, while the individual stood on the other.”

Maugham’s construct described three weapons in society’s assault on the individual: conscience, law, and public opinion. In the 1950s religion, science, and politics all contributed to their own understandings of conscience and law, but public opinion remained an unwieldy and fickle component, one that Bradbury was forced to contend with.

Bradbury and His World: What Does It All Mean?

Bradbury’s political inclinations were complex and relied on elements from both Democratic and Republican objectives. Bradbury was an ardent anti-communist and anti-Stalinist, but also was against the excesses of the anti-communist crusade. Bradbury promoted the importance of individualism and humanism to the American experiment. His view was that individualism could be hindered by collectivism, anti-communist fearmongering, racism, and religious intolerance. His humanism emphasized that literature was the source of knowledge and morality to which society should cling, not militarism or religiosity. Both humanity and individuals were facing crises caused by growing consumerism, militarism, unchecked scientific advancement, and unrestrained technological development.

Sometimes these efforts were hazardous in a public venue. Bradbury’s literary agent, in responding to the “Letter to the Republican Party,” suggested, while agreeing with the
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sentiment, “It was, of course, an emotional outburst and these things are generally better left unsaid and unpublished.”201

Bradbury continued pushing against both communism and the crusade waged by anti-communists. Rather than seeing these as competing forces without mutual interests, Bradbury allowed himself to be a truly independent voice. In this way, Bradbury fit into Marsden’s conception of the liberal, one who could discuss political topics while emphasizing that the American system’s underlying structure was fundamentally non-negotiable and sound.202 Furthermore, Bradbury met sociologist C. Wright Mills’ standard of the liberal objective, “once given the rights, the individual would naturally become politically alerted and act on his political interests.203 Marsden explains that a literary and societal convention helped further this concept.

Mid-twentieth-century commentators, unless they belonged to a peculiar party or sect, could speak as though they represented an outlook that, at least so far as fundamental assumptions were concerned, every educated person should share....Such conventions of discourse in fact helped to create the illusion that it was still possible to create a national consensus, despite residual sectarian differences.204

Bradbury was one of these “commentators,” though of a small subset (fantasy and sci-fi authors). While his political inclinations come through in Bradbury’s works, his emphasis on the importance of skeptical rationality over ideology marks him as not a neutral, but certainly open, observer and commentator.

Bradbury stated to one interviewer in 1951 “Science fiction is really sociological studies of the future, things that the writer believes are going to happen by putting two and two
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together...Science fiction is a logical or mathematical projection of reality.”205 To achieve these studies, Bradbury emphasized a common sense approach of assessing these situations, these horrors, through what his own perspective would have been. For example, “…a citizen from another world would have the same reaction an earthling would have landing on Mars—to get away before somebody got panicky and killed him.”206 Indeed, the postwar world was one where many people were getting “panicky.” As Niebuhr put it, “we are drawn into an historic situation in which the paradise of our domestic security is suspended in a hell of global insecurity….”207

Some of Bradbury’s more polemic fictional works are satires relying on a unique mix of allusion, empathy, and self-reflection in his readership to understand its deeper political inclinations.208 Rather than simply present grotesqueries directly, as was the trend in horror and many pulp productions, Bradbury relied on his readers to see the disturbing calm with which his characters faced a deeply flawed world. In this way, the characters have become anesthetized not only to the problems of their society, but also to their own culpability in letting it come to exist. To the humanist, as Archibald MacLeish observed, “Fascism is only another name for the sickness and desperation which overcome a society when it loses its sense of responsibility for its own life and surrenders its will to a tyrant; it, and it alone has invented.”209 Countries such as Italy, Russia, and Germany were recent reminders of the ability of society to slip into fascism when led by demagogy and uncertainty. By fashioning his characters in this way, Bradbury relied on the emotionality of his writing to allow
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readers to empathize with the characters, and consider deeply the possibility that these characters were not completely different from themselves. This dark tendency was an important marker of the particular period according to Trilling, “A proper sense of evil is surely an attribute of a great writer, and nowadays we have been drawn to make it almost a touchstone of greatness… in part by our desire that literature should be in accord with reality as we now know it.”

Eller describes Bradbury’s goal as “one of protecting mankind from the future, not predicting it.” With Bradbury’s intention being to “protect” rather than “predict” futures, his best option is to peer around the corner and point out the flaws of possible futures to his audience in a way that they could rationalize. Bradbury acted out Robin’s necessity for knowledge, judgement, and courage by adapting his rhetorical and literary skills to confronting injustices where he saw them, and where he saw the potential for them. His “sociological studies,” provided his audience the chance to grapple with the problems of postwar America by looking at them through fictional lenses. The audience that came from those efforts is the subject of the final chapter.
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CHAPTER 3: THE GOLDEN APPLES OF HIS LABOR—BRADBURY’S FUTURE PUBLICS

“A generation later these isolated voices had become a chorus, a significant intellectual and political movement which, had an opportunity to share the nation’s destiny.”

-George H. Nash

As discussed in the Introduction, and mentioned in Chapter 2, Robin’s formulation of intellectualism requires the development of an audience for an individual to be considered a public intellectual. This distinguishing characteristic serves the function of separating public intellectuals from specialists, technicians, and devotees who express a high level of knowledge and passion, but lack the mechanisms and/or saliency necessary to pass their ideas onto others who can build upon their works. This audience can be similar to a Gramscian institutional intellectual in that it comes from a preconceived, convenient, and structural group (as with the New York Intellectuals and others who benefit from the social networks of academia or publishing circles); the audience can be a direct response to a particular event; and/or this audience—similar to Gramsci’s organic intellectual—can be curated by the intellectual himself or herself through a sustained effort. According to Robin, these audiences are not passive receivers of an intellectual’s work, but instead “The intellectual writes a text, but the audience makes the text what it is. It not only makes the text a public act; it interprets the text, gives it life. Not just life in the here and now, but, with any luck, throughout time.”

In the case of Bradbury, there was a significant amount of work and time necessary for his audience to reach a critical mass that would be capable of responding and adopting Bradbury’s works. Unlike readily identifiable intellectuals of his period (like Mills, Niebuhr, and Trilling), Bradbury’s social network did not extend into the circles of intellectuals; his early venues for publication were not recognized as places for serious social criticism; and many who were reading his works were not yet of age to contribute to the discussion of social issues.
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Instead, Bradbury in the postwar period was interacting with authors of science fiction and fantasy; publishing in venues that were willing to pay him; and being read by young adults and children. His published books were captivating an audience and being well received, but had not coalesced into acknowledged social commentary. This is not to imply that Bradbury failed to recognize that he was doing more than sharing stories. In applying for a Guggenheim Fellowship (in the 1949 cycle), Bradbury described some of his effort, “…I hope [to] contribute something of worth in the field of social satire…I hope to turn a sharp light upon civilization today, where it has been, and where it is going.”

Ironically, Bradbury’s early 1950s breakout with *The Martian Chronicles*, *The Illustrated Man*, and *Fahrenheit 451* first led to broad intellectual recognition in Great Britain and among the British exiles in Hollywood; these included Christopher Isherwood, Aldous Huxley, Gerald Heard, Stephen Spender, W.H. Auden, Graham Greene, Angus Wilson, and Kingsley Amis. In America, readers who formed Bradbury’s audience would eventually congeal into an impressive swath of critical and influential voices later on in the 20th and early 21st century.

**Bradbury as an Influencer**

Bradbury’s most publicly recognizable contribution to American society was in helping to establish science-fiction and fantasy as genres of fiction palatable to mainstream audiences, studios, and publishers. This shift in perspective brought talented artists to the fore in American letters and film, many of whom cite Bradbury within their own works in deference to his earlier fictions.

Stephen King, one of the most prolific popular authors in the late 20th and early 21st centuries, regularly references Bradbury’s work as a source of inspiration and influence within his own work. King, who has been recognized by many of the same elite organizations as Bradbury for his corpus of work, credits Bradbury’s laying a foundation for the popu-
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larization of science fiction, fantasy, and horror genres. In a now oft quoted passage, King quipped, “without Ray Bradbury there is no Stephen King.” These words are no mere compliment, as King has included a swath of allusions and references to Bradbury’s works throughout his published works. Noteworthy examples include references and allusions to Bradbury directly in Different Seasons (1982), The Dead Zone (1979), and Revival (2014). King devotes a large period of time to discussing Bradbury’s influence and thematics in Danse Macabre (1981) as well, “Bradbury lives and works alone in his own country, and his remarkable, iconoclastic style has never been successfully imitated,” and King, in particular, is complimentary of Bradbury’s early work, “His [Bradbury’s] best work from the beginning, has been his fantasy… and his best fantasy has been his horror stories. As previously mentioned, the best of the early Bradbury was collected in the marvelous Arkham House collection Dark Carnival. No easily obtainable edition of this work, the Dubliners of American fantasy fiction, is available.” King published a simple, but profound, response to the news of Bradbury’s passing in 2012, “Ray Bradbury wrote three great novels and three hundred great stories. One of the latter was called ‘A Sound of Thunder.’ The sound I hear today is the thunder of a giant’s footsteps fading away. But the novels and stories remain, in all their resonance and strange beauty.”

Author Neil Gaiman—best known for his novel American Gods (2001) and the comic book series Sandman (1989–1996)—likewise frequently expressed appreciation for Bradbury’s work. Gaiman penned a long memorial essay and published it to his blog at the time of Bradbury’s death. Bradbury’s profound influence on Gaiman lasted well beyond childhood. So much about Ray’s writing was important to me, so much of it helped form me. I read all I could. Finding a Bradbury book was an occasion of excitement, never of disappointment. But I never thought of emulating it. I never consciously wanted to copy him. Although I discovered, re-reading Bradbury as an adult, that I had, almost beat for beat, copied one of Ray’s

stories as a very young man, that it had crept deeply enough into my mind in childhood that, writing what I thought was my own story, I wrote it again.\textsuperscript{219}


Noted children’s horror author R.L. Stine named Bradbury as his favorite author of all time in an interview with NPR in 2013, saying of Bradbury’s book \textit{Dandelion Wine} (1957), “every page is beautiful.”\textsuperscript{220} In 2015, Stine told an interviewer for the book review section of the \textit{New York Times}, “I’m still amazed by the range of his imagination and the beauty of his prose….I read it once a year to remind myself of what good writing is like.”\textsuperscript{221} When Bradbury died, Stine tweeted, “Meeting Ray Bradbury was one of the most exciting moments of my life. He has always been a hero of mine.”\textsuperscript{222}

Authors were not alone in this appreciation. Singer Sir Elton John wrote his 1972 song “Rocket Man” in homage to a Ray Bradbury story.\textsuperscript{223} Documentary filmmaker Morgan Spurlock joked about setting fire to his office book collection in remembrance of Bradbury when the author’s death was announced.\textsuperscript{224}
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Steven Spielberg, one of the most financially successful directors of the latter 20th and early 21st centuries, was also a Bradbury aficionado. In 2008, Spielberg, and Academy Award Winning Actor Tom Hanks, honored Bradbury at the Ojai-Ventura International Film Festival via a video that introduced him as a recipient of the Lifetime Achievement Award. This was not Spielberg’s only tribute to Bradbury. One of Spielberg’s films, Close Encounters of the Third Kind (1977), was largely inspired by an earlier film, It Came from Outer Space (1953), an adaptation of a Bradbury short story. After hearing of Bradbury’s death, Spielberg released a written statement on the elder’s influence, “He was my muse for the better part of my sci-fi career…In the world of science fiction and fantasy imagination he is immortal.”

Conservative intellectual Russell Kirk discussed Bradbury as a part of a 1969 work Enemies of Permanent Things. The Russell Kirk Center for Cultural Renewal posthumously republished a portion of Kirk’s commentary under the headline “‘Warm with Generous Impulse’: Ray Bradbury, In Memorium” The published comments outline the technological and literary perspective of Bradbury, whom Kirk described as a friend. Bradbury’s place was not only to comment on the advanced machineries of his time, but also to serve as a cultural bulwark to those who would be careless in adopting new technology and ideas.

The real world is the world the permanent things, which often are discerned more clearly in the fictional dead cities of Mars or the fictional carousel of Cooger and Dark than in our own little private slice of evanescent experience. And—what is a wondrous thing in itself—the new generation of...


Americans are not blind to the truth of the fabulists, for Bradbury is their favorite author.\textsuperscript{228}

Renowned science fiction author Ben Bova dedicated his 1986 book, \textit{The Prometheans}, to Bradbury, describing Bradbury as, “a Promethean if ever there was one.”\textsuperscript{229} When writing his Grand Tour Series, Bova turned to a group of notable authors to describe his conception of Mars for his 1992 novel, \textit{Mars}; these included “Edgar Rice Burroughs, Stanley G. Weinbaum, and most especially Ray Bradbury.”\textsuperscript{230}

\textbf{Scientific Recognition}

“Brilliant science fiction can ignite scientific ambition,” wrote author and astronomer David Brin to start his memorial essay in honor of Ray Bradbury in the journal \textit{Nature}.\textsuperscript{231} Bradbury’s fictions did tell futuristic stories, but the technology was “simply marvelous conveyances that deliver the characters to a frontier where awe mixes with terror and unquenchable hope.”\textsuperscript{232} In his essay, Brin captures the flavor of what so many other Bradbury fans recognize, that space and the future are wondrous possibilities not because of the machineries that they will produce, but because of the people who will be there.\textsuperscript{233}

In the words of scientist and public figure Bill Nye, “His stories were cautionary, warning us of the dangers of a government unchecked….Ray’s stories have stood the test of
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Along the way, Bradbury’s fictions served to inspire generations to enter the study of science, particularly astronomy and its related fields.

One of the foremost advocates for scientific exploration into space during the twentieth-century was Carl Sagan. Sagan, an astrophysicist, author, and astronomer, helped to bring scientific advancement to the public during the period. Bradbury’s Martian Chronicles and other works influenced Sagan, and the scientist described them as part of “a rare few science-fiction novels [which] combine extraordinarily well a deep human sensitivity with a standard science-fiction theme.” In Sagan’s biography, Carl Sagan: A Life, author Keay Davidson expands upon this insight by speaking with one of Sagan’s early neighbors, “Jerome Luks recalls Sagan as ‘a good neighbor, a good buddy, very outgoing. [He was] a Ray Bradbury freak. He couldn’t get enough of him [sic].’” Later, one of Sagan’s critics attacked his perspective and optimism about Mars, “He implied that Sagan’s Mars fantasies were linked to his childhood, to the pulp literature he had never fully outgrown.” Sagan and other scientists’ images of Mars were radically changed in November 1971 when NASA’s Mariner 9 began taking detailed images of the planet for the first time.

On November 12, 1971, Caltech’s Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL) brought together Sagan, Bruce Murray (who would become director of the JPL and also a cofounder of the Planetary Society), Arthur C. Clarke (a noted science-fiction author in his own right), Walter Sullivan (then Science Editor for the New York Times), and Bradbury to discuss the significance of Mariner 9’s mission on humanity and American society. Their discussions, and a follow up in 1972, were published as a book titled Mars and the Mind of Man (1973), along


with a foreword by Bradbury. Sagan discussed the influence of Edgar Rice Burroughs on his early understanding of Mars and on his optimism that life at one point may have existed on the planet. Sullivan then introduced Bradbury as “one of the two foremost science fiction writers.” Bradbury, in his characteristically offhand style, replied “Very frankly, I don’t know what in hell I’m doing here. I’m the least scientific of all the men on this platform today.”

Reflecting on the results of the Mariner 9 mission, Sagan, Murray, and Clarke all suggested that the optimism about life on Mars expressed by Bradbury and Burroughs seemed misplaced. Bradbury, however, retained his optimism about the possibility of new knowledge. “It is the duty of the sciences to break down the barriers between families of knowledge every few years so that we resight, realign, re-experience, the miraculous-strange and recombine its components into new families.” Sullivan commented on the next steps associated with this accumulation of knowledge with regard to Mars, suggesting that one of the critical efforts would be to land an unmanned exploration on the surface. That dream became reality in 1976 with the successful landing of the Mars Viking mission. On that occasion, Bradbury, along with Jacques Cousteau, James Michener, Dr. Philip Morrison, and Norman Cousins, were pulled together in a panel to address the question of “Why Man Explores?”

Further missions have continued to expand scientific knowledge of the planet, and Bradbury remained closely associated and supportive of these projects. In 2009, Bradbury made his final trip to the Joint Propulsion Laboratory to celebrate Mars Rovers Spirit and Oppor-
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While there, Bradbury was allowed to drive a simulated version of the rovers and experience the “wonderment” of knowing that something he helped inspire was on another planet. As a result of his continued support and inspiration, Bradbury was posthumously honored by having the landing site of NASA’s Curiosity Rover named after him. When announcing the decision to name the landing site, NASA scientist Michael Myer stated, “This was not a difficult choice for the science team….Many of us and millions of other readers were inspired in our lives by stories Ray Bradbury wrote to dream of the possibility of life on Mars.” Bradbury had received another interplanetary homage from leading scientists in the American space program; in 1971, the crew of Apollo 15 named a crater on the moon after his book *Dandelion Wine.* In 1992, the University of Arizona Spacewatch Program discovered an asteroid that is now recognized by the International Astronomical Union’s Minor Planet Center as 9766 Bradbury.

In 2013, Gloria McMillan, a researcher with the University of Arizona, released an edited volume of commentaries on Bradbury titled *Orbiting Ray Bradbury’s Mars: Biographical, Anthropological, Literary, Scientific, and Other Perspectives.* In this work, several researchers describe the influence Bradbury had on various parts of American society; some of the most poignant however are from scientists who contributed. Peter Smith, the lead scientist on NASA’s Phoenix mission (which landed on the North Pole of Mars in 2008), stated

I could feel his [Bradbury’s] arm around my shoulder leading me into alien landscapes never imagined. There the future was as real as the past. These journeys became an obsession and allowed me to explore unknowable worlds from my armchair. The greatest adventures were those where the trail of fantasy crossed the highway of reality. I have lived life on this crossroads.... These possibilities emerge from the stories that thrilled me as a youth...250

Smith was not alone in this generation of NASA-affiliated scientists. By the mid-1970s, Bradbury’s Martian Chronicles were being assigned as course readings in Air Force coursework, particularly as it related to the ethics of space travel and exploration. David Acklam, a former engineer with the U.S. Air Force and Raytheon, remembered his experiences with Bradbury during his education after it was discovered that earlier landers had unintentionally transmitted living bacteria to the Moon.

Our classroom discussions mainly concentrated on the perception of life. How could NASA recognize life forms that may be unlike anything that has ever been considered? What if there is some type of life existing in a different dimension? Could there be life that exists but is shifted in time from our time detection capabilities? Could there be life that possessed mental capabilities far different than ours? Could there be something like the Martian life described by Bradbury?...However, what if there were some type of life that was too small to detect with our existing technology in the landing zone? What possible destruction could the Lander cause to this unknown life? Would the rocket engines literally fry this unknown life? Could the landing pads simply crush this life? Could this life even be an alien Martian civilization? 251

Bradbury’s work permeated throughout education well beyond the Air Force’s instruction. Charles L. Dugan, Jr., a scientist with the Kitt Peak National Observatory and Project ASTRO, indicates that Bradbury’s fictions were a part of his elementary school education, helping to foster his imagination and future career interests.252 Christopher P. McKay, a senior scientist with NASA’s AMES Research Center, echoes these sentiments. To us as young students interested in life on Mars, The Martian Chronicles spoke of the human desire to explore, to see, to name, and to make homes. It also spoke of the inevitable loss, the possibility of mistake, and the very human nature of everything we do. The Martian Chronicles is not a book about

rockets and how they work or how Mars operates as a planet. To us, students interested in Mars, it was about how humans explore and how Mars beckons us to explore.253

That exploration has continued after Bradbury’s death, and his legacy continues to have an impact on the space program. In 2008, Bradbury’s words found a permanent home on Mars, when the text of The Martian Chronicles, along with works from Edgar Rice Burroughs and H.G. Wells, arrived in DVD form on the back of the Phoenix lander.254 Jon Lomberg, the director of the project told Smithsonian’s Air & Space Magazine about the project in 2015.

‘It’s a collection of science fiction that inspired people to build a space-craft to go to Mars,’ says Lomberg. ‘It’s not necessarily the most scientifically accurate look at Mars, but it’s sci-fi that got people interested in Mars in the first place.’255

That interest sparked billions of dollars of investment in the space program, and created an entire industry that regularly advances the boundaries of human knowledge. Bradbury’s work did not do so single-handedly, but it did provide a formative conception of space and humanity for many who participate in its exploration. More importantly, Bradbury’s work continuously warns of the dangers of being careless with this science, beckoning onward exploration with serious consideration of the ethical responsibility these endeavors require. McMillan suggests that Bradbury serves an interesting role, “perhaps more than any other science fiction or mainstream American writer, [Bradbury] has bridged the gulf between art and science, those two squabbling domains of academics.”256

So ingrained in this process of meshing art and science that when the EPCOT Center at Walt Disney World needed to design their iconic Spaceship Earth exhibition, they turned

---

to Bradbury to help them imagine the future. Each year, millions of visitors explore this landmark, and though the interior exhibition has since changed, the exterior and its overall mission of encouraging people to look to the future continues.

Literary Recognition

While there was popular support, scientific appreciation, and financial success from Bradbury’s works, critical and academic consideration was largely absent until later in the twentieth century. Bradbury eventually garnered accolades for his work, but these forms of recognition were most commonly associated with his entire body of work and outside efforts (in philanthropy and advocacy for literacy), and not necessarily with his fictional products as such. These recognitions combined though make Bradbury’s career one of the most noteworthy of 20th-century American authors.

Near mid-century, Bradbury was published in a handful of noteworthy awards anthologies for short stories. His story “The Big Black and White Game” (discussed in Chapter 2) was included in Best American Short Stories of 1945. In 1947, “Homecoming” (discussed in Chapter 2) was published in the O. Henry Memorial Prize Stories. Bradbury would repeat in both publications in 1948, when “I See You Never” appeared in Best American Short Stories and “Powerhouse” took 3rd prize O. Henry honors.

Later, animated adaptations of Bradbury stories received nominations and awards in film. In 1963, an animated version of Bradbury’s story “Icarus Montgolfier Wright” was nominated for an Academy Award for Best Animated Short Subject. In 1994, a TV movie adaptation of Bradbury’s The Halloween Tree was nominated for an Emmy award for “Out-
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standing Animated Children’s Program.” Bradbury individually won the Emmy for “Outstanding Writing in an Animated Program” for his work on the project.260

Much of Bradbury’s recognition has come in the form of lifetime achievement awards and honors. As Jonathan Eller has suggested, “National and international literary honors have come more frequently in his twilight years, and in spite of the variety of these honors the award juries all speak with one voice in acclaiming his significance as a modern truth seeker.”261

In 1977, Bradbury was given a World Fantasy Award for Life Achievement at the annual World Fantasy Convention.262 At the 1980 World Science Fiction Convention, Bradbury was named Gandalf Grand Master of Fantasy.263

In 1988, Bradbury was named a Grand Master by the Science Fiction and Fantasy Writers of America (SFWA) at their annual Nebula Awards ceremony. Bradbury’s three-page citation describes why he was selected.

Almost from the beginning Bradbury’s work explored areas of writing outside of science fiction, as shown in such collections and novels as Dandelion Wine, Something Wicked This Way Comes, and The Illustrated Man. After the 1950s he wrote little that was purely science fiction. Nevertheless for generations of Americans, who were learning the pleasures of reading from the flood of schoolbook texts which nearly unanimously included Bradbury stories, he represented their first encounter with science fiction “He is a unique voice, in science fiction and in the world, and he is indeed a Grand Master.”264
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The Horror Writer’s Association agreed, and in 1988 awarded him their Bram Stoker Award for Lifetime Achievement. In 1992, SFWA gave its first ever Ray Bradbury Award for Outstanding Dramatic Presentation (replacing, in 2009, the Nebula Award for Best Script). In 1999, Bradbury was inducted into the Science Fiction and Fantasy Hall of Fame.

In On November 15, 2000, the National Book Foundation (NBF) honored Bradbury naming him the winner of their Distinguished Contribution to American Letters Award and stating,

Mr. Bradbury’s life work has proclaimed the incalculable value of reading; the perils of censorship; and the vital importance of building a better, more beautiful future for ourselves and our children through self-knowledge, education, and creative, life-affirming attentiveness and risk-taking.

Bradbury was introduced at the ceremony by comedian Steve Martin. Martin’s introduction praised Bradbury’s fiction and outside works. In particular, he commented on the lasting impact of Bradbury’s work.

...how can we even begin to count all of the ways in which Ray Bradbury has etched his indelible impressions upon the American literary landscape? There are few modern authors who can claim such a wide and varied province for their work, spanning from the secret inner-worlds of childhood dreams, to the magic realism of everyday life, to the infinite expanses of outer space.


While Martin’s comments are appropriate for their place, historian Evan Brier, in his work *A Novel Marketplace: Mass Culture, The Book Trade, and Postwar American Fiction* (2009), has suggested that the NBF and its National Book Awards (NBA) program had a strange relationship with Bradbury unlike any of their other nominees.

As early as 1950, Ray Bradbury was credited with the feat of making literature of science fiction…[When NBF] awarded Bradbury the Medal for Distinguished Contribution to American Letters, its version of a lifetime achievement award, it was not for accomplishing this feat. In fact, as the NBF’s announcement of the award attested, the honor had little to do with the perceived artistry of Bradbury’s literary output.\(^{270}\)

Brier continues his examination by suggesting that Bradbury’s award had more to do with his promotions of literacy than the quality of his writing. Brier is careful to point out that NBF has never given a National Book Award for Fiction to a work of science fiction. Brier goes on to suggest that NBF and others came to promote *Fahrenheit 451* not for its literary qualities, but instead for its ability to convince the public of the importance of literacy, specifically in the form of books. Thus, Brier suggests that publishers and the NBF have turned a novel, and author, that champions the importance of literature as a bulwark against mass culture, into a form of advertisement for their financial gain.\(^{271}\) Brier’s work is compelling, and troubling, when considering NBF’s award and the reasoning behind it.

In 2002, Bradbury’s star was added to the Hollywood Walk of Fame. At the ceremony, Los Angeles Mayor James Hahn kicked off his “One Book, One City L.A.” citywide reading initiative. The program encouraged citizens to participate in reading and discussing *Fahrenheit 451* during the month of April 2002.\(^{272}\) Starting in 2006, the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) selected Bradbury’s novel as one of their featured books for their NEA Big Read Program.\(^{273}\)


In 2004, Bradbury was called to the White House, where President George W. Bush presented him with the National Medal of Arts, the highest honor the United States has for contributions to the Arts. Bradbury, according to the citation, was honored “for his incomparable contributions to American fiction as one of its great storytellers who, through his explorations of science and space, has illuminated the human condition.”

On May 6, 2005, Bradbury, along with television producer Merv Griffin and actress Anjelica Huston, received an honorary Doctorate of Laws from the National University of Ireland, Galway. This was the first time that the University had conferred such an honor outside of Ireland. At the event, NUI Galway President, Dr. Iognáid Ó Muircheartaigh said, “We are very proud to honour these individuals who have made significant artistic and humanitarian contributions, and who have achieved fame the world over. With this honour, we pay tribute to the great tradition of the creative arts at the heart of Los Angeles. And we share in that heritage by awarding them the highest honour that the University can bestow.”

Bradbury, over his lifetime, received several honorary degrees, from Woodbury College (who as an institution also named an annual creativity award after him). Other honoring institutions include Whittier College (1979) and Columbia College Chicago (2009).

Bradbury’s international recognitions continued in 2007, when the French Minister of Culture declared him a Commandeur (Commander) of France’s Ordre des Arts et des Lettres (Order of Arts and Letters). Commander the highest level of their national award.


recognizing contributions to the arts and literature. Bradbury told *Time* magazine that he considered it, “the greatest award I ever got.”

That same year, Bradbury was awarded a Pulitzer Prize Special Citation for “his distinguished, prolific and deeply influential career as an unmatched author of science fiction and fantasy.” Not long after Bradbury’s death, President Barack Obama released a statement describing Bradbury as an author whose “gift for storytelling reshaped our culture and expanded our world.” In December of that year, the city of Los Angeles renamed an intersection near the Los Angeles Central Library to Ray Bradbury Square, with a memorial sign referring to him as “Author-Angeleno.”

These forms of recognition echo what Robin suggested by an audience “making a text what it is.” Without the audience that eventually developed to appreciate Bradbury coalescing, and without this group taking on the role of Gramsci’s hegemonic bloc, it is unlikely that Bradbury would have ever received these recognitions. Indeed, while the work Bradbury produced is the product for which he is recognized, his sustained efforts to build believers in his social criticisms, and those believers adopting and adapting his worldview, are the reason that he received these awards and commendations.
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Bradbury and American Intellectual Culture

Through this chain of influence, Bradbury is linked to a large portion of American society, science, literature, film, and politics. Bradbury’s work, influenced by authors and scholars who preceded him, told later generations about the pessimisms and opportunities of midcentury. This lineage deserves greater scholarly attention, as well as its intersections with other creators of American culture. To do so will require a substantial effort, well beyond the confines of this, and more than likely any single, work.

Bradbury exists as one of many mid-century thinkers who through their writing explored the problems, values, and concerns of American society in the postwar world. Bradbury did so as an outsider to the circles of influence in which most “intellectuals” operated, at times even criticizing writers who saw themselves as intellectual. As such, historians exploring 20th century intellectualism, other than anecdotally, have not seriously considered him and have neglected his humanistic commentary on postwar America. As has been shown in this work, there is a significant amount of valuable insight into American culture and morality to be gained by interacting with Bradbury’s thinking. This particular analysis only looks at a small portion of Bradbury’s substantial production; there are untold numbers of potential avenues for exploring the complexity and volume of his work. Literary scholars like David Seed and Jonathan Eller have provided valuable contributions to that work, but Bradbury as an intellectual figure could benefit from historians’ attention in particular. As one of the most prolific American authors of the 20th century, Bradbury certainly provided plenty of material to start from.

Chapter 1 maintains that postwar America was a period rife for intellectual dispute, discussion, and crises of confidence. Numerous historians have described the period as one of prosperity, opportunity, conflict, and confusion. As understandings of these issues expand, historians should look to how everyday people confronted these realities, as well for new possible public voices of the time, particularly those whose work intersects with the diverse range of issues facing Americans at that time. Chapter 2 explored how Ray Bradbury
confronted several of these problems within his fictional constructions and how his perspective at times supplements, reinforces, and challenges both prevailing trends and proposals by other intellectuals of this period. As previously mentioned in this chapter, those constructions influenced how later authors, filmmakers, scientists, and policymakers saw American society and the roles of different groups within it. This influence will continue to become more diffuse as new generations encounter and make meaning from Bradbury’s work. Certainly, these works are still ripe for interpretation, exploration, and scholarly inquiry into their literary, historical, and intellectual contents and impact.

Bradbury’s works, written, produced, and philanthropic, all spoke to the importance of gaining knowledge through reading and the centrality of libraries to maintaining the American experiment. One of the most direct, and poignant, statements of Bradbury’s influence came in the week following his death from the United States Conference of Mayors Annual Meeting. The organization adopted a resolution acknowledging “...Ray Bradbury’s status as one of the world’s most influential authors and that this nation as well as the entire world shall honor Ray by continuing to read his many literary works, thereby ensuring that he will live forever in the minds of those that do.”282 If this happens, perhaps Bradbury will achieve a form of the time travelling he imagined. In the days before his death, Bradbury’s final published piece, about his love of Mars and its influence, appeared in *The New Yorker* magazine. Its title? “Take Me Home.”283
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