

Heteroglossia in the Ensemble Programme

By Roberta Pearson

We asked Rick Berman whether *Trek*'s message shows tended to be on the liberal side of the spectrum. "I would say that they do. I think they certainly did with Gene, and I think there's a bit more of a liberal bent. But we've tried to examine issues from both sides."ⁱ Berman's answer underestimates television and *Trek*'s capacity for a remarkably complex engagement with the public sphere; the multiple narrative voices of a series with an ensemble cast enable the presentation of many more than two sides. The ambiguities resulting from this polysemy make it difficult to identify the "truth" within the textual actual world or, by extension, in the real world upon which it comments. Says Marie-Laure Ryan,

Though the text should be regarded as the highest authority in establishing the facts of the fictional world, this authority does not derive from a monolithic power but is distributed – in accordance with Mikhail Bakhtin's idea of dialogism – among a plurality of narrative voices. Since these voices may contradict each other, fictional truths cannot automatically be derived from textual statements.ⁱⁱ

A television programme with an ensemble cast resembles in many respects the novel from which Bakhtin derived his concepts of heteroglossia and the dialogism to which it gives rise. According to Bakhtin

The novel can be defined as a diversity of social speech types ... and a diversity of individual voices, artistically organized.... The novel orchestrates all its themes, the totality of the world of objects and ideas depicted and expressed in it, by means of the social diversity of speech types and by the differing individual voices that flourish under such conditions. Authorial speech, the speeches of narrators, inserted genres, the speech of characters are merely those fundamental compositional unities with whose help heteroglossia can center the novel; each of them permits a multiplicity of social voices and a wide variety of their links and interrelationships....ⁱⁱⁱ

Bakhtin was an important influence upon John Fiske's pioneering application of cultural studies theory to television in the 1987 *Television Cultures*. Fiske has for some become emblematic of a certain strain of cultural studies which has celebrated audience resistance and

the semiotic guerrilla while neglecting ideology and structural determinants. But Fiske's analysis of television texts is a socio-political one, taking up Bakhtin's notion of "the dialogic nature of language, which was a struggle among socio-linguistic points of view..."^{iv} Fiske argues that the polysemy of the television text arises not just in reception but in production, necessitated by the producers' bid for the widest possible audience.

An essential characteristic of television is its polysemy, or multiplicity of meanings. A program provides a potential of meanings which may be realized, or made into actually experienced meanings, by socially situated viewers in the process of reading.... The motivation to exploit the polysemy of the program is social: the polysemy of the text is necessary if it is to be popular amongst viewers who occupy a variety of situations within the social structure.^v

The structural determinants of the marketplace often produce texts incapable of resolving their own ideological contradictions, says Fiske.

As society consists of a structured system of different, unequal, and often conflicting groups, so its popular texts will exhibit a similar structured multiplicity of voices and meanings often in conflict with each other.... The structure of the television text and its ideological role in a capitalist society may well try hard to iron out and resolve the contradictions within it, but, paradoxically, its popularity within that society depends upon its failure to achieve this end successfully.
vi

Horace Newcomb and Paul M. Hirsch expressed a similar view in their article "Television as a Cultural Forum," originally written a few years before Fiske's book.

The conflicts we see in television drama, embedded in familiar and nonthreatening frames, are conflicts ongoing in American social experience and cultural history. In a few cases we might see strong perspectives that argue of the absolute correctness of one point of view or another. But for the most part the rhetoric of television drama is the rhetoric of discussion.... We see statements about the issues and it should be clear that ideological positions can be balanced within the forum by others from a different perspective.^{vii}

If most texts at most times simply reproduce the dominant ideology, then why bother studying television or any popular culture? Our insistence upon acknowledging the polysemic and contradictory nature of many *Trek* episodes celebrates not *Star Trek* but the best of the cultural studies tradition. Our insistence upon the medium-specific ways in which different texts create meaning also celebrates this tradition. As we indicated above, a television show with an ensemble cast orchestrates in novelistic fashion a plurality of voices. Ella Taylor makes this point in reference to *The Mary Tyler Moore Show*.

Though Mary is the start, the *MTM Show* has no single perspective. She works within an ensemble.... And if the group, the work-family, is of primary importance, so too are its individual members. Far more than in *I Love Lucy* or *The Dick Van Dyke Show*, the viewer's attention and allegiance are shunted from one character to another. The narrative is less linear and the characters decentered, creating a world more relativistic and less clearly demarcated into good and evil.^{viii}

The ensemble casts of workplace sit-coms or dramas provide good conduits for polysemy, the characters initially designed around a series of binary oppositions which aid plot generation. For example in *Frasier*, argues Jonathan Bignell, "Frasier's and his brother Nile's sophistication and relative youth can be contrasted with their father's crudeness and elderliness...."^{ix} A diverse and varied crew has been a *Star Trek* hallmark since TOS, with demographic oppositions of male and female, youth and maturity, human and non-human, and, as many who have written about the show's ideology have pointed out, white and non-white. Emotional oppositions also structure the crew's makeup; Spock's cool logic versus McCoy's warm compassion; Picard's reserve versus Riker's easy charm; Data's rationality versus Worf's hotheadedness; Odo's integrity versus Quark's lack of scruples. Such contrasts are not unique to the television medium; novelistic, theatrical and cinematic characters are also structured around binary oppositions. But the construction of these characters and their binary oppositions across a series of episodes rather than in a one-off text is a defining characteristic of television as opposed to the cinema which occasionally adopts the serial form. This narrative structure brings with it, we would argue, enhanced opportunities for heteroglossia.

Hyper-link films, those with multiple characters and narrative strands, some intersecting and some running parallel, do exhibit what Fiske calls a "structured multiplicity of voices and meanings often in conflict with each other." This multiplicity of voices and meanings can be used for ideological critique, as in *Crash* (Paul Haggis, 2004) or *Syriana* (Stephen Gaghan,

2005), but risks stereotypical characterization and viewer confusion. As *Village Voice* critic J. Hoberman said about *Syriana*, “There are too many points of view and there is too little time to fully develop the key characterizations.”^x *Syriana* gives us a world-weary middle-aged spy (George Clooney), a thrusting young businessman (Matt Damon), the liberal leader of a third world country (Alexander Siddig, a.k.a Julian Bashir in *DS9*), a slick and evil corporate lawyer (Christopher Plummer) and a supporting cast of less well-known names playing equally stereotypical characters. Given the complex and confusing plot, the star system serves to orient the viewer narratively. But, at the same time the star system inevitably throws the well-known actors into higher relief and closes down heteroglossia. A television series has the narrative space to flesh out all the characters; after several episodes all the members of even the largest cast (e.g., *Lost* or *Heroes*) become familiar, making it easier for the writers to stage and the competent viewer to follow debates among them. This familiarity may also make viewers more apt to heed the opinions of even the most unlikeable characters; Quark may be without scruples but we grow fond of him after a season or two. We would argue that the drama series’ ensemble cast offers one of the most effective means for television to engage with the public sphere. We illustrate this point through analysis of two episodes, the second season *TOS* “A Private Little War” and the third season *TNG* “The High Ground.”

“A Private Little War” is one of *TOS*’s most direct engagements with contemporary political debates, the Federation/Klingon confrontation at its heart a very thinly disguised Vietnam War metaphor.^{xi} In the episode, Kirk returns to a primitive planet that he first visited thirteen years ago as a young lieutenant. He discovers an ongoing conflict between the planet’s inhabitants, the villagers and the hill people, the former armed with flintlocks given to them by the Klingons. The Klingons have disturbed a Garden of Eden, which, Kirk argues, would have developed into a remarkably civilized culture if not for their intrusion into planetary politics. This resonates with the contemporary hegemonic rationale for American intervention in Vietnam; Americans were not embroiling themselves in a civil war but fighting Communist outsiders to restore stability. Kirk decides to re-establish the balance of power by giving the hill people their own flintlocks, his strategy clearly linked to the Cold War policy of brinkmanship and assured mutual destruction. McCoy vehemently contests this decision. The exchange between the two characters illustrates television dramas potential for heteroglossia, the humanist doctor opposing the pragmatic captain.

K: We must equalize both sides again.

M: You’re condemning the whole planet to a war that may never end.

K: Do you remember the 20th century brush wars on the Asian continent? Two great powers involved, not unlike the Klingons and ourselves. Neither side felt they could pull out.

M: I remember it well. It went on year after bloody year.

K: But what would you have suggested? That one side arm its friends with an overpowering weapon? Mankind would never have lived to travel space if they had.

No, the only solution is what happened back then. Balance of power. The trickiest dirtiest game of them all but the only one that preserves both sides.

Strictly speaking, this is an example of dialogism rather than heteroglossia. The balance of power in this argument is with the captain, who at least offers a solution, while McCoy, having no solution, can only lament. The inclusion of the cool and rational Spock, exiled to sickbay at the episode's beginning by a shot from one of the villager's muskets, might have resulted in a heteroglossic exchange. One wonders if the scriptwriters deliberately sidelined him to simplify the murky politics of their textual actual world (and of the actual world as well). But even the Captain is seen to have lingering reservations when at episode's end he orders Scotty to make a hundred flintlocks – 'serpents for the Garden of Eden.' As Chris Gregory observes, this is one of the few instances where Kirk's morality is at all questioned.^{xiii} "A Private Little War" offers a limited degree of polysemy, undoubtedly constrained by a contemporary political climate in which the anti-war movement had yet to make a significant impact upon politicians or the public. "The High Ground" is truly heteroglossic in its exploration of the morality of terrorism, the writers, addressing an issue not then high on the political agenda, perhaps less constrained than their *TOS* counterparts. In the episode, the Enterprise delivers medical surprise to Rutia 4, a planet torn by conflict between the Rutians and the Ansata. The Ansata are carrying out continuous attacks on the Rutian populace to persuade the government to give them control of the western continent that they see as rightfully theirs. Seeking to involve the Federation in the conflict, the 'terrorists' and their leader, Finn, kidnap first Dr. Crusher, then Captain Picard and then attempt to blow up the Enterprise. At episode's end, Commander Riker and the head of the Rutian security services, Alexana Devos, rescue the Starfleet personnel. Finn, still hoping for Federation intervention, threatens to kill Picard and Alexana shoots him dead.

In 'Domesticating Terrorism: A Neocolonial Economy of Différance' Kent A. Ono argues that *TNG* in general and 'The High Ground' in particular, unproblematically reproduce dominant hegemony. This argument, like much ideological analysis of *Trek*, ignores textual complexity in favour of theoretical consistency, ignoring the contestation of hegemony that takes place even in fictional worlds.

TNG, as a neo-colonial text, selectively remembers and forgets resistance, protest and oppression. With scientific progress as its *telos*, it faithfully adheres to technological rationality, nationalist

consciousness, and military authority as mechanisms for achieving the ultimate good. Finally, *TNG* assumes all people are equal – but only on the Enterprise, where crewmembers fertilize and sow an absolutely perfect logical ideology. Elsewhere, the supremacy of Federation logic continuously has to be retaught.... Television reproduces paternalistic, neo-colonialist narratives to sustain power relations and to ensure that things are fine, even while social and political exigencies outside of living rooms abound.^{xiii}

Ono begins his deconstruction of the episode at the beginning, with the Captain's log.

The Enterprise has put in at Rutia IV to deliver medical supplies following an outbreak of violent protests. Although non-aligned, the planet has enjoyed a long trading relationship with the Federation. Now, a generation of peace has ended with terrorist attacks by Ansata separatists who are demanding autonomy and self determination for their homeland on the western continent. Recreational shore leave has been prohibited and all away teams have been instructed to beam down armed.

Ono asserts that “although the act of carrying goods may appear to be a neutral act in relation to a ‘non-aligned nation,’ the text’s ideological position of Picard is not. Picard authorizes a specific version of historical relations even as he makes his log entry.”^{xiv} For Ono, Picard acts throughout the episode and, indeed throughout all of *TNG*, as the bearer of Federation (and American) patriarchy and imperialism, the imposer of monoglossia. Picard is “at the helm of patriarchy, ... at the center of television’s voice of authority....”^{xv} This reading ignores the heteroglossic potential of the ensemble cast; as we argued in Chapter Seven, Picard must be the hero and moral center of all of the *TNG* films, but not all the television episodes cast him in this role. In “The High Ground,” Picard is not the hero (there isn’t one, which is rather the point). His resentment at the Ansata’s kidnapping of Doctor Crusher and their threats to his ship clearly affect his judgment. Picard’s exchanges with crewmates, inflected by the competent viewer’s knowledge of the characters’ construction (psychological traits, interactions with others and biography), undermine his interpretive authority. Exchanges between other characters, most notably Crusher/Finn and Riker/Alexana, add to a heteroglossic chorus in which some voices challenge and others support the hegemonic rejection of violent terrorist tactics as irrational and unjustifiable.

The following dialogue between Picard and Data sets up the episode's central problematic: is violence ever a suitable means to a political end?

D. Sir, I am finding it difficult to understand many aspects of Ansata conduct. Much of their behavioral norm would be defined by my program as unnecessary and unacceptable.

P. By my program as well, Data.

D. But if that is so, Captain, why are their methods so often successful? I have been reviewing the history of armed rebellion and it appears that terrorism is an effective way to promote political change.

P. Yes it can be, but I have never subscribed to the theory that political power flows from the barrel of a gun.

D. Yet there are numerous examples when it was successful: the independence of the Mexican state from Spain, the Irish unification of 2024, and the Kensey rebellion.

P. Yes, I am aware of them.

D. Then would it be accurate to say that terrorism is acceptable when all options for peaceful settlement have been foreclosed?

P. Data, these are questions that mankind has been struggling with throughout history. Your confusion is only human.

Ono asserts that Picard simply discounts Data's difficult questions. "Picard, through characteristic frustration with Data's obsession with rationality, dismisses Data's potentially narrative-threatening logic and reminds him of his honorary 'human' status. Picard adjudicates rationality."^{xvi} Even a non-competent viewer might question Ono's interpretation of this exchange. Stating that "these are questions that mankind has been struggling with throughout history" hardly constitutes dismissal. A competent viewer would interpret the exchange through knowledge of the characters' previous relationship. Ono is correct to say that Picard had previously expressed "frustration with Data's obsession with rationality," although such frustration was often played to comic effect. But implying that reminding Data of his honorary human status constitutes a veiled threat overlooks a major element of the characters' backstory. It was Picard who, in the classic second season episode "Measure of a Man," took Starfleet to court to establish Data's honorary humanity, or at least his legal recognition as a free and self-determining sentient being. A competent viewer knows that, while Picard occasionally finds Data frustrating, it is the captain to whom the android looks as his tutor in the humanities and humanity. In this context, Picard's reminding Data of his honorary human status is not a warning against, but rather an affirmation of Data's "narrative-threatening logic."

Ono asserts that Picard also suppresses “narrative-threatening logic” in his dialogues with Dr. Crusher. When Picard is captured and imprisoned with Crusher, she apologizes for refusing his order to abandon a victim of an Ansata attack and beam back to the ship, her disobedience leading directly to her capture.

C. I’m sorry. If only I’d gone back to the ship.

P. I should have beamed you up.

C. You wouldn’t dare.

P. Oh yes, I would and should.

C. Without my permission?

P. If you don’t follow orders.

C. If you’d give reasonable orders I’d obey.

P. Doctor, I’ll be the judge of what is reasonable.

Taken in isolation, Picard’s last line, could, as Ono argues, be seen as an imposition of male rationality on female irrationality. The line takes on a different meaning in the context of the previous construction of the two characters: their psychological traits/habitual behaviours (Crusher has a fiery temper; Picard has difficulty dealing with emotion); biographies (Crusher, the wife of Picard’s deceased best friend, knew him prior to her posting to the Enterprise) and interactions with others (sexual tension underlay the Picard/Crusher relationship from season one). An earlier scene in this episode references Crusher’s legendary temper. Picard, considering whether to transport Crusher back to the Enterprise, looks at Riker, who says, “I don’t want to be in the transporter room to greet her.” Picard doesn’t beam her up, presumably because he too doesn’t want to confront an angry Crusher. Kent Ono may see the doctor as a docile female automatically acquiescing to patriarchal will but Jean-Luc Picard does not.

To the competent viewer the “no, you wouldn’t; yes, I would!” dispute reproduced above may read as an argument between very close old friends or even a lover’s spat. In this light, Picard’s use of Crusher’s official title and his “I’ll be the judge” seem more a frustrated man’s desperate claim than a captain’s affirmation of the chain of command, an interpretation given credence by Patrick Stewart’s acting. After proclaiming that he’ll judge what’s reasonable, Picard glances around the chamber that holds them captive, clearly realising the silliness of the argument in their current predicament. The personal subtext surfaces in the next scene between the two, retrospectively legitimizing our reading. Picard, considering escape plans, asks Beverly whether she has gained Finn’s confidence. She shows him the sketches which Finn has drawn of her. Picard says, “Indeed you have and more. This might prove to be an advantage to us.” This intimation of romance seems to remind Crusher of her vexed relationship with Picard since, instead of discussing escape plans, she says, “Jean-Luc, there

are some things I want to tell you in case we don't get out of this." To the dismay of P/C shippers everywhere, the rescuers get them out of it before she tells him anything.

Crusher's privileged relationship with Picard allows her to question his interpretive authority, as she does when rejecting his hegemonic labelling of Finn and the Ansata as violently irrational. Crusher tells Picard that the Ansatas' inter-dimensional shift transporter is disrupting their DNA structure and slowly killing them.

P. They're mad.

C. I don't know any more. The difference between a mad man and a committed man willing to die for a cause – it's all become blurred over the last few days.

P. Beverly, I don't have to remind you of the psychological impact of being a hostage.

C. I know. I understand that. But their leader, Finn, is not what you'd expect.

P. No, he's certainly not what I'd expect. Without cause or reason, Finn and his little band of outlaws have attacked my ship.

C. But he did have reasons – the medical supplies, the arrests. If we really examined our role in this...

P. Beverly, you are arguing for a man who may have murdered your son.

Ono's analysis tellingly omits the crucial two lines in which Crusher, by intimating that Finn is rational and "we" are at fault, disputes not only Picard's authority but that of the entire Federation. We would agree with Ono that here Picard does indeed attempt to close down the argument through his harsh response, but we would also suggest that its very harshness, in contrast with Picard's customary sensitivity, reflects his overly partisan view of the situation.

Crusher's dialogues with the Ansata leader adds another voice to the episode's heteroglossia, with Finn making a strong case against the Federation's, and by implication, the United States', claims to the moral high ground.

C. How can you have such a casual attitude toward killing?

F. I take my killing very seriously, Doctor. You are an idealist.

C. I live in an ideal culture. There's no need for your kind of violence; we've proven that.

F. Your origins on Earth are from the American continent, are they not?

C. North America

F. Yes, I've read your history books. This is a war for independence, and I'm no different than your own George Washington.

C. Washington was a military general, not a terrorist.

F. The difference between generals and terrorists, Doctor, is only the difference between winners and losers. You win, you're called a general; you lose...

C. You are killing innocent people. Can't you see the immorality of what you're doing, or have you killed so much you've become blind to it?

F. How much innocent blood has been spilled for the cause of freedom in the history of your Federation, Doctor? How many good and noble societies have bombed civilians in war, have wiped out whole cities, and now that you enjoy the comfort that has come from their battles, their killings, you frown on my immorality? I'm willing to die for my freedom, Doctor. And in the finest tradition of your own great civilization, I'm willing to kill for it.

Long term familiarity with Crusher might tend to make viewers side with her and the Federation against Finn, but the script works to make the Ansata leader at worst an ambiguous and at best a sympathetic character. Picard and Alexana characterize him simply as a violent terrorist, but his conversations with Crusher reveal his positive aspects and his motivations. Finn first appears after Crusher's capture, offering her a plate of food. She remains silent and refuses the plate. Finn leaves, claiming "Doesn't matter to me. You want to be hungry, be hungry." In their next scene, he again offers her food. Crusher maintains her silence and Finn remarks "This isn't the best way to meet new people is it?" He unshackles her. "What's the point of not eating? Do I look like it's bothering me? Okay, it's bothering me." He hands her the plate and says "Come on." This time she accepts. When she apprehensively tells him that she has a son whom her death would orphan, he assures her that she'll see him again. "I see no reason to kill you," a statement which directly contradicts Picard's and Alexana's view of him as irrational. Later he shows her the sketchbook in which he's been drawing pictures of her. At the end of a particularly fraught conversation in which she accuses him of controlling her and others by fear, he gives her the sketchbook by way of apology, saying that he doesn't want her to fear him. The writers never let us forget that Finn is perfectly capable of killing Crusher, Picard and the entire Enterprise crew for his cause because to do otherwise would sacrifice dramatic tension. But to further enhance dramatic tension, the writers construct a charming and attractive character who shows concern for both Crusher and the dying colleagues whom he's brought her to attend. They also supply him with both rational and emotional motivation for his violent actions. He wants to blow up the Enterprise because "we've been shouting for seventy years and no one's paid attention. Destroy a Federation flagship and someone will listen." Most tellingly, he reveals to Crusher that he had a thirteen year old son who died in detention.

Dead or threatened children link Crusher and Finn with Alexana, the Rutian security chief, whose concern for Rutia's murdered innocents motivates her repressive tactics. Her conversations with Riker counterpoint Finn's conversations with Crusher; her articulations

of the hegemonic view of terrorism counterbalance Finn's contestation of that hegemony, while the gradual revelation of her personal feelings humanizes her, although not, we would argue, as fully as the Ansata leader. By contrast with Finn, who's humanized from the start, Alexana first appears as an inflexible ideologue. In a meeting with Picard and Riker soon after Crusher's kidnapping, she tells them, "These are not people we're dealing with here; they're animals, fanatics who kill without remorse or conscience, who think nothing of murdering innocent people." When Picard wonders why they captured Crusher rather than killing her, Alexana responds, "Don't ask me to explain them. I can't." In her next scene, she tells Riker, who's charged with liaising with Ansata security, that before becoming security chief she'd considered herself a moderate. He asks what changed her mind. She says:

The event that really opened my eyes took place only a few days after my arrival. A terrorist bomb destroyed a shuttle bus. Sixty school children. There were no survivors. The Ansata claimed that it was a mistake. That their intended target was a police transport. As if that made everything alright. That day I vowed that I would put an end to terrorism in this city and I will.

In a later scene in the central square, Riker and Alexana watch the security forces rounding up Ansata suspects. Alexana tells Riker that her assassinated predecessor had operated even more repressively. "Suspects would be brought into police headquarters and would vanish. I put a stop to that." The inflexible ideologue, it turns out, has some regard for human rights. She also, like Finn, has good reasons for her actions. Seeing a young child arrested, Riker asks, "You mean to tell me that little boy is a threat?" She tells him that it was a teen-ager who blew up the school bus. "In a world where children blow up children, everyone's a threat." Her penultimate scene reveals that she is, in her own way, just as much a victim as Finn.

She tells Riker, "I want to go home, back to my own country, to leave behind the roundups, the interrogations, the bodies lying in the streets, to be able to walk without the bodyguards. That's what I want."

The episode ends on an unresolved chord, albeit one that resonates with *Trek's* guiding humanism, rather than, as Ono implies, imposing monoglossia on the heteroglossic chorus. After Alexana shoots Finn dead, a young boy, with whom Beverly has previously bonded, aims a phaser at Alexana. Beverly says to him, "No more killing." After a tense moment, he lowers his weapon. Alexana reads his actions from her hegemonic perspective. "Already another one to take his place. It never ends." Riker responds, "He could have killed you. He didn't. Maybe the end begins with one boy putting down his gun." Ono asserts that "By

the end of the episode, the ideal viewer forgets Finn's death and the colonialist system responsible for it."^{xvii} Difference has been articulated and eliminated. We would argue that the viewer, particularly the *Trek*-competent viewer has perhaps, like Data, been moved to ponder the morality and effectiveness of terrorism. Speculation about viewers aside, it is demonstrably the case that that one former colonialist power did not think that an episode referencing the Irish reunification of 2024 effectively suppressed difference. The BBC reported that "Due to what no doubt many people will still consider to be sensitive content, the episode has never been shown on terrestrial TV in UK or in the Republic of Ireland and initial airings on Sky One were edited." But it was shown at the Belfast Cathedral Quarter Arts Festival in 2007. Sean Kelly, director of the Festival, said that "many people will see the funny side of an occasion on which the powers that be decided to censor an episode of a popular science-fiction series because of what was happening politically at the time."^{xviii} To return to speculating about viewers, we wonder whether those people, particularly sensitive to the issue, also appreciated the exploration of the morality of terrorism in "The High Ground."

ⁱ Berman interview

ⁱⁱ Marie-Laure Ryan, *Possible Worlds in Recent Literary Theory*, *Style* 25:4 Winter 1992, p. 533

ⁱⁱⁱ M.M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* Austin UT press 1981, p. 273.

^{iv} M.M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* Austin UT press 1981, p. 273.

^v John Fiske, *Television Culture* (New York: Methuen, 1987), pp. 15-16.

^{vi} Fiske, p. 90.

^{vii} Horace Newcomb and Paul M. Hirsch, *Television as a Cultural Forum*
In Horace Newcomb, ed., *Television: The Critical View* (Sixth Edition), Oxford: Oxford university press, 2000, p. 566.

^{viii} Ella Taylor, *Prime Time Families* (University of Californai, 1989), p. 126.

^{ix} Jonathan Bignell, *An Introduction to Television Studies* (London: Routledge, 2004), p. 92. Bignell briefly discusses *TNG* characters on this and the preceding page.

^x **Spy Game**

Traffic writer's slick oil thriller oozes with intrigue but crams too much into its drum

by **J. Hoberman**

November 22nd, 2005 12:24 PM

^{xi} For more on *TOS*'s cold war context, see **Film & History**, Vol. XXIV, No's. 1-2, 1994 pp.

From the New Frontier to the Final Frontier:

Star Trek From Kennedy To Gorbachev

Rick Worland

For more on the Vietnam context and "A Private Little War" in particular see **Film & History**, Vol. XXIV, No's. 1-2, 1994, pp.

^{xii} Gregory, p. 166. As Gregory points out (p. 169), *Star Trek* continued this debate in the first season *TNG* episode, "Too Short a Season," in which Kirk-alike Admiral Jameson had engineered a similar 'solution' on another planet which resulted in a

half century of bloody conflict. Star Trek heteroglossia occurs not just in individual episodes but across episodes and even across the different series, a point overlooked by those performing ideological analysis of a single episode.

^{xiii} Kent A. Ono, *Domesticating Terrorism: A Neocolonial Economy of Différance* in Taylor Harrison, Sarah Projansky, Kent A. Ono, and Elyce Rae Helford, *Enterprise Zones: Critical Positions on Star Trek* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1996), p. 159.

^{xiv} P. 162.

^{xv} P. 170.

^{xvi} 166

^{xvii} P. 174.

^{xviii} Johnny Caldwell, "Star Trek Predicts a United Ireland," 14 April, 2007, www.bbc.co.uk, accessed 7 July, 2007.