Television: a creative industry?
Who are the TV storytellers?

Máire Messenger Davies,
Centre for Media Research,
University of Ulster

Conference on 'The Work of Stories',

Massachussetts Institute of Technology,

May 6-8th 2005

> 'The "Powers of production" are essentially products of the human
> mind as well as gifts of nature . . . . the measure of the relative
> values of commodities is to be found in the amounts of labour
> incorporated in them' G. D. H. Cole, 1929, Introduction to *Capital*,
> by Karl Marx, Everyman edition, 1946.

This paper raises issues of authorship, value and the nature of creativity in an
industrially mass-produced medium: television. I want to examine the notion of
mass production as applied to TV. Then I want to focus on a particular aspect of
authorship in TV – the role of the writer. In doing so, I will refer to a more usual
current model of television authorship (see, for example, Marc and Thompson,
Prime Time Producers[i]) which proposes that it is the executive 'hyphenate' writer-
producer who is the true 'author' of key television storytelling texts, as in the case
of Joss Weedon, the creator of Buffy the Vampire Slayer. I will use examples
from an ongoing research project that Roberta Pearson of Nottingham University
and I have been working on for the last five years – a study of American
television using *Star Trek* as a case study. I will quote from interview material
mainly drawn from two of the writers we interviewed at Paramount in January
2002, when we were able to interview 25 people working on the series from set
dressers to executive producers. The first writer is Michael Piller, no longer

1

working there at the time of the interviews (January 2002), who worked primarily on *Star Trek: The Next Generation, Deep Space Nine* and some of *Voyager*. The other is Brannon Braga, at the time of our interview with him, a co-executive producer on the most recent (and about to end, in the very week of this conference) Trek TV series, *Enterprise*. Braga, too, is a veteran of the other post 1987 series.

In using their accounts to address our theme of storytelling, I am proposing that their stories – their personal accounts of how they worked – have a value for us as scholars. Not only are they witnesses to the historical conditions of production at the time they were working, but these accounts also give revealing insights into how to read the texts: the stories we see on screen. I also suggest that one possible reason for the relative failure of *Enterprise* (among many others, including a change in the climate of both film and television, in which fantasy has replaced science fiction as a dominant genre), could be partly due to the different ways in which these two writers worked. In his interview, Piller stressed the importance of working co-operatively, as a team leader and negotiator. Braga was, and is, a brilliant individualist – more like a literary auteur, in the literary sense of having a recognisable personal style. A Braga script usually reveals an interest in formal experimentation, and in extreme mental and physical disintegration; because of this he has been called 'The David Cronenberg of Star Trek.'[ii] (It is interesting that it's OK to call Braga the name of a film auteur, but we might also want to ask whether we could legitimately call Cronenberg the Brannon Braga of movies . . .) In their role as writer-producers if not full scale managerial hyphenates, Piller and Braga had to be responsible for other writers as well as themselves, and to collaborate closely with other production departments. In this role, Piller seems to have been more comfortable. However, it may be that the Braga scripts will endure in any future study of the series as televisual text: this of course raises not only the question of authorship but the question of cultural value and permanence.

Who is the author of *Star Trek*?

Just before I came here to MIT for the conference, I was able to interview Herb
Solow, the executive producer at Desilu (the production studio run by Lucille Ball
and her husband Desi Arnaz), who sold *Star Trek:* The Original Series (TOS) to
NBC in 1966 and thus was instrumental in launching the whole phenomenon. For
most people who have heard of *Star Trek*, and that is probably most people,
Gene Roddenberry is the recognisable authorial name. Solow made some
uncomplimentary remarks about Roddenberry's self-promotion and his
exploitation of fans to make himself 'the Great Bird of the Galaxy.' As the author,
with Robert Justman (whom we also interviewed in Hollywood) of a major source
of information about the original series, *Inside Star Trek: The Real Story* (1996),
Solow is a key contributor to a further branch of TV storytelling: the backstage
production narrative. There are a number of alternative versions of how Trek
came to be the phenomenon it was, but in all of them Gene Roddenberry is the
central figure. A major organising narrative of the *Star Trek* myth, if I can call it
that in the proper sense (not in the sense of it being a lie), is a series of different
narrative points of view about the character and actions of Roddenberry. Solow
belittled Roddenberry, as did William Shatner (Captain Kirk). Others we spoke to,
such as Herman Zimmerman, the production designer for the post-TOS series
and films, praised him. But in the story of the story, whether good guy or bad guy,
Roddenberry remains the central protagonist.

In the actual making of the series, as distinct from the *accounts* of the making of
the series, it was a different story. One remark Solow made to me was
particularly illuminating in the context of the thesis of this paper. He said: 'If
you're doing a TV series or anything creative, you can't have competition within
the production. You have to have co-operation. Gene promoted himself, not the
show.' [iii]

Mass culture or handcrafting?

Our interviews with individuals raise the question of the contribution of creative production workers to debates about culture and value. The debate about mass culture and its degeneracy initiated by the Frankfurt School in the 1930s, in its focus on consumption and the 'problem' of mass audiences, tends to underestimate a key Marxist component of value – the contributions of labor. Our book – and briefly this paper – attempts to give an account of what Terry Lovell [iv] calls 'the social relations of production' – the ways in which those who make cultural artefacts operate professionally to produce their value. If television *is* to be treated as an economic commodity, any analysis of its use value, of its exchange value, of its absolute value, or of its surplus value (in Marxist terms) has to incorporate the contributions of the workforce. Labor in cultural production not only includes material, physical activity (as in the case of craftworkers and set builders); it also includes less tangible sources of value such as workers' creativity, their judgments about the quality of their work, and that of their fellow-workers. TV storytelling comes to us via mass distribution - that is, TV is a technology which delivers messages into millions of homes simultaneously. But TV storytelling is *not* a form of mass production, whatever else it is. Hand-crafting and traditional forms of labor organization remain crucial determinants of the finished product.[v]

In American episodic television, with its pressurized, industrialized production lines, producing a show a week, the contributions of the regular workforce are central to its successful operation. This pressurized production schedule is a major difference between episodic television and feature film, and has been a source of denigration of the television medium (although it does have similarities to the pre World War II Hollywood studio system). Our research with Hollywood craft workers suggests that industrial pressures should also be seen as a source of value. This is particularly evident in the ingenuity with which creative people, such as Dan Curry, the Visual Effects Producer, respond to time and resource

pressures, leading to memorable images and effects, many of which, as in the case of Curry's design for the Klingon weapon, the ba'atleth, become iconic and a source of the product's surplus cultural and economic value (see endnote 5).

The importance of writers in television: Two key writers

In focusing on the writer, I note the comments of Rick Berman, executive producer of Star Trek who told us in our interview with him in 2002, in answer to our question: what would be the biggest problem that you could imagine in producing Star Trek?:

> The biggest problem that we have is writers. It is very, very
> difficult to write *Star Trek*. You can get writers to come in here
> who are top writers of television, top writers of future films,
> playwrights. And the odds are one in 20 of them will be able to
> write this show. . . We're always getting new writers and most of
> them don't make up.
>
> <div align="right">Rick Berman, Executive Producer, Star Trek [vi]</div>

Television episodic drama running for 26 weeks of the year is a form that devours ideas. A sellable concept for a series is the first, and toughest, form of idea to produce: most fail, as many people, such as James Twitchell, have pointed out.[vii] The originator of the idea of *Star Trek* is still universally acknowledged to be Gene Roddenberry, although he wrote comparatively little of it. Of the 79 episodes of The Original Series, he had 22 story ideas, and only 15 of them were used in the series. [viii] But he was responsible for the ST 'Bible' and Gene's provenance is acknowledged by everyone associated with *Star Trek* who has ever spoken or written about it, including those who are known to have disagreed with him, such as Herb Solow. 'Gene's vision', however this might be defined (and it has been extensively documented in accounts by both production insiders like that of Solow and his colleague Robert Justman, in *Inside Star Trek* [ix] and by

academic critics) continued to shape the way writers worked, and this, we have come to believe, is also a crucial component in writing a successful series: even where the vision may be challenged in the writing process, even where the vision becomes mythologised into something grander than it really was (as Solow told us had happened with Roddenberry's contributions), it is still a necessary ingredient. Michael Piller's comments below give an example of how this writerly negotiation around a contested version of the 'vision' worked in practice.

The importance of writers in television: Two key writers

As Rick Berman pointed out, his biggest problem as the executive producer with overall responsibility for 'everything', was finding writers; this was the one currency, or source of value, that the production could not afford to be without. In literary culture, the writer is a traditionally respected figure, and one which fits an auteurist model of individual creativity – but in Hollywood, this is much less so. Screenwriting, according to William Goldman, 'is shitwork'[x] and Goldman spent much of his celebrated work, *Adventures in the Screen Trade,* vigorously debunking any model of screen-production which elevates individuals to auteurist status – including directors. But he ends his book by ultimately privileging the writer - 'we're the ones who first get to make the movie.'[xi]

Whatever the status of screenwriting in movies, it could be argued that this status is even more lowly in the less culturally-prestigious medium of television. However, because TV writers have to keep writing every day, week in, week out, the relatively leisurely processes of adaptation, destruction and reconstruction of movie screenwriting, as described by Goldman, are less applicable in television. The production line has to be kept going and there is little time for frequent false starts and revisions. In television, the writer, or more accurately in American television, the team of writers, is the crucial and precious, because constantly necessary, source of raw material: the major source of value. I suggest that this

industrialised process of production does not detract from the cultural and aesthetic value of the output; it is, on the contrary, a primary source of it.

Writers speaking

In the rest of this paper I want to draw on interviews with two key *Star Trek* writers, Michael Piller and Brannon Braga, to illustrate this point further. Piller left the series after the third season of *Voyager*. Braga became joint executive producer with Rick Berman on the fifth, and relatively shortlived series, *Star Trek: Enterprise*. Michael Piller now runs his own company, Piller Squared, which produces *The Dead Zone*. He is one of a group of writer/producers whose creative contribution was not only writing some of the outstanding episodes of the TNG series, including the third/fourth season cliffhanger, 'The Best of Both Worlds', which helped to launch TNG into mass popularity, but particularly in re-organizing the way in which the series functioned. Piller, like Berman, recognized the centrality of writers in generating overall quality and consistency for the series, and he set up what seems to have been an effective, if unorthodox, system for making sure he found them. Above all, he went against standard industry practice by accepting unsolicited scripts.

Piller pointed out to us that:

> My fundamental responsibility . . . was to ensure that every story in every script was as good as it could possibly be, every week and it was a full-time job and I worked with a staff of writers – five or six writers at a time on TNG . . . and we hired people and took pitches from independent writers and read material from freelancers and even amateurs, I just needed ideas, I needed to be to be bombarded with ideas for shows, which I would then buy and work with the writers to develop. [xii]

Piller had to deal with a lot of problems on the new series when he took over – problems well-documented in the authorized insider accounts and corroborated by what he told us:

> It was not a nice place to work for the first year. I came in the third episode of the third season and had a very angry and disenchanted writing staff that were all furious with Gene because he wouldn't let them do what they wanted to do. His rules were very strict and he was very adamant about keeping them. And I just felt that it wasn't my job to change the show and battle with Gene. I figured if this franchise had lasted thirty years, Gene must have been doing something right, so rather than be intransigent, I listened, and tried to figure out what it was. And it took a few tries.[xiii]

The following account from Piller enumerates his version of the key ingredients in a successful script: the individual bright idea (in this case from a novice who was to become a star writer of the series, Ron Moore); the importance of consistency to the central vision; the importance of developing and sustaining both the new and the traditional; the painstaking negotiation with colleagues:

> The very first show I developed, there were no scripts in development, and I had to get something ready for the next week and I said I want to see every piece of material there is in this building, anything that's been abandoned and rejected. Someone gave me a script by a young kid about to go into the navy, Ron Moore. It was 'The Bonding' [written by Ronald D. Moore, directed by Winrich Kolbe]. I looked at it and it had a great idea about a kid whose mother was killed on a ship, she was a crew member, and the kid is terribly overwrought with sadness and the aliens, seeing this, basically provide a substitute mother, the image of a mother, just a

replica. . . . I took it to Gene . . . and he said, 'it doesn't work, death is a part of life in the 24th century; no-one grieves when somebody dies, children accept death as a way of life, the kid won't be unhappy that his mother has died.'

And I said to myself ' OK' and I went back to the writers' room and said to the guys what Gene said. And I said, alright, look, that's about the freakiest thing I've ever heard, that a kid's not going to cry when his mother dies but that's what Gene says it is . . So that's what we start with – the freakiest thing you've ever seen, a kid who doesn't cry when his mother dies. . . Troi, who was a very underdeveloped character in the third season – we bring Troi forward and she basically says the only way we can get rid of this replica mother is if the kid absolutely strips away at levels of civilisation and lowers to feel the true emotions that this loss represents. And ultimately that's the way we went and it was a far more interesting story than if the kid was whining for two acts.

That taught me that ultimately Gene had these rules for a purpose and I used to call it 'Roddenberry's box' and I liked the restrictions of the box. A lot of writers didn't but I did. It forced us to be more creative and forced us to find new ways of telling stories . . . and as time went on I became . . . among the writers at least, the defender of the box, so it ultimately turned into Piller's box . . . I take a great deal of pride over helping to direct the show in a way that Gene Roddenberry really cared for. [xiv]

I have left these lengthy quotations as they were transcribed, so that people could read them on the screen for themselves, but also because they are a good illustration of the writers' storytelling styles. Piller, from his own account, and also from those of others, does appear to have been a good team manager, able to

gather and motivate teams of writers, able to go along with the apparent straitjacket of 'the Roddenberry box', and creatively and shrewdly to adapt it to his own authorial ends. The above quote is a well-crafted account of events, with a narrative problem, a sense of suspense, and a moral at the end: it is a good story. Piller was also one of our interviewees who spoke most openly about his own personal feelings about the show and how they had influenced his work on it. With Piller's account of the writing process, explanatory concepts such as 'inspiration' began to seem appropriate as did the insight that the writers' experiences *as writers* were being fed into storylines and character development.

We asked him, as we asked everybody, what he thought his own personal contribution had been: did he have a personal style, a recognizable Piller script? He deflected the question by suggesting that the auteur role didn't belong to writers, it belonged to directors (something our director interviewees were to dispute). But he then went on to describe his own approach to script construction – strongly influenced by the book he believes every writer should read, William Goldman's *Adventures in the Screen Trade*[xv] – and how he worked his own emotional experiences into this.

> It's almost always to find a character, some character with a very
> high personal stake. People remember 'The Best of Both Worlds' and
> say, 'Oh yes – the BORG!' But the truth is that story is really about
> Riker and whether he's big enough to sit in the big chair. If you look
> at that particular story . . . in that third season you can learn a lot
> about me. That story is about 'what have I lost?' . . . He's trying to
> decide whether he should stay on the Enterprise, and that was
> happening to me, deciding whether I was going to leave *Star Trek* or
> not. . . What I brought to that show was an inner life that came
> straight from my own inner experience.[xvi]

Brannon Braga: 'the David Cronenberg of *Star Trek*'

Brannon Braga, unlike Piller, was a writer-producer still working on the television series, in this case, *Enterprise*, at the time we interviewed him. He had also graduated to the role of co-executive producer, alongside Rick Berman. He had moved from being 'the bad boy' of the scriptwriting team, the 'David Cronenberg' who liked to explore mental and physical disintegration, as Reeves-Stevens described him[xvii], to having major executive responsibility. Braga wrote some of the more experimental episodes of the series, specializing in stories in which characters are pushed to the limit, such as 'Frame of Mind', from the sixth season of TNG, in which the usually stolid Commander Riker (Jonathan Frakes) is subjected to a series of mind-breaking experiences where neither he, nor we, know exactly what is 'real' and what is delusion. [xviii] The episode examines this question by framing the story of Riker's disintegration within a theatre set; it begins with the Commander rehearsing a part in a play directed by Dr. Beverly Crusher. At the end of the story, after Riker has recovered and 'reality' is restored, Riker smashes the set. Thomas Richards, in his book about ST's 'myth and legend',[xix] describes 'Frame of Mind' as one of many examples of the series' fundamental thematic mistrust of 'story'. We prefer to interpret episodes like this as examples of the series' persistent reflexiveness. 'Frame of Mind' (like Pirandello's *Six Characters in Search of an Author*) is a reflection on the nature of performance and pretence; it is one of many episodes in which the *Star Trek* writers reflect dramatically on the often disturbing nature – 'the struggling and fighting' as another writer, Ron Moore, put it - of their own work.[xx]

In our interview with him, we began by asking Braga the same question we had asked Michael Piller: how would anyone know what a Brannon Braga script is? His answer revealed how his role had changed from being the 'bad boy' writer, to being a man with major responsibility for the whole product:

I don't know . . . I could have answered this question a few years ago, when I was doing certain kinds of episodes. . . the more high concept, science-fictiony episodes, or the offbeat darker episodes. On Next Generation and in early Voyager, I did a lot of dreams and screwing around with reality. I did virtually all of the time travel episodes. But now . . . I've written so many episodes, more than any of the writers, I don't know what are mine. I don't even know what I'm doing. . . I've done everything . . . And with *Enterprise* I'm trying to do something completely different. I'm trying to do a show that isn't grounded in high concept science fiction, that is more grounded in the characters.[xxi]

Braga's take on the process of production reveals the writer's eye and ear, and a certain impatience with the kinds of decisions which are handed down from on high – decisions which he told us he did not feel he had much influence over (surprisingly, given his co-executive position).

We have two production meetings on every script with all the department heads, and we discuss it scene by scene by scene – it's very tedious . . . The schedule is that the scripts are usually written right up to the last minute, like I'm writing a show right now . . . [We] start shooting on Tuesday, and I'm half way done, so I'll get this one done and get on with the next and it's been that way for 20 in a row. . . We have six more to do. It's quite a lot. . . There's 7-8 days for shooting which is ludicrously short for a show of this magnitude, and then we have quite a long post-production time. . . for editing and visual effects and sound effects, they'll have anywhere from four to eight weeks to get that done. We have a very big lead time, because they need a lot of time for the effects. . .
When they [the actors] rehearse it, they're rehearsing it right before the scene is shot. It's intensely high pressure. It's nonstop.[xxii]

Braga pointed out the extra pressures under which *Star Trek* production workers operate, compared to other sorts of series television:

> We can't go out into Los Angeles and shoot on location in restaurants and in the streets. We have to create brand new worlds every single week. And our episodes are, I think, much more ambitious than most television in terms of their production value. And we have a shorter shooting schedule than a lot of shows, nine days. And we do 26 episodes, whereas most shows do 22, and that extra four, are a killer.[xxiii]

Enterprise, in contrast to TOS, with its $33,000 per episode budget, and TNG with its $1.2 rising to 2 million budget, had a budget of around $3 million per episode, which could still, according to Braga, be a problem, but, he said gloomily, as he had to leave us for yet another meeting: 'My number one enemy is that calendar right there, which I stare at.'[xxiv]

Braga's account was rather like one of his scripts: sounding like a man about to explode (although, as others told us, he usually sounds like that, apparently), with disjointed phrases, emphasizing stress, tension and the pressure which he and his colleagues were under. It was evidently different from Piller's way of talking, quoted above. Of course they were interviewed under different conditions – Piller recollecting his time on *Star Trek* in the relative tranquility of his new production offices at Piller Squared, Braga right in the thick of a tight schedule, still at Paramount. Nevertheless, these accounts can be compared and corroborated with other interview material produced by these and their fellow writers, which exists in the public domain. There have been many fan conversations and journalistic interviews with ST creatives on both official and unofficial websites, and in magazines, and, as we have said, we believe that

these kinds of discourses can provide revealing insights into the texts produced by these writers' labors – i.e. what we see on the screen.

From our Paramount interviews generally, a picture of television production emerged which was both individually creative and communally co-operative. Television production is, paradoxically in such a competitive capitalistic industry, almost a model of socialistic interdependence – not least in its reliance on the co-operation of trade unions. Furthermore, and interestingly from the point of view of this conference's theme of storytelling, team interdependence is a constant theme in the stories told in the show: the survival of the various Enterprises always depends on the crew working together and the standard plotline for many episodes is that of survival being put at risk by either somebody breaking ranks and letting down the team, or by outside interventions and accidents which threaten the completion of the ongoing mission. As mentioned, a frequent mechanism for introducing these tensions is a breakdown in the integrity of the series' regular characters, and we can speculate, as Michael Piller pointed out, that the stories told in *Star Trek* often reflected what was going on in the writers' own lives. Braga's account illustrates the point that the central and most pressurised activity of all TV writers' lives are the weekly meetings in which the team has to produce scripts or not have a show to transmit – to put it another way, 'six minutes to systems failure'.

I want to end by referring specifically to *Star Trek: Voyager*, interestingly, with its woman captain and several female senior officers, the most consistently co-operative in its storytelling of all the series. There were behind-the-scenes problems with its production, some of which resulted in Piller's departure. Many storylines in VOY sound like a desperate appeal for everybody to get along. Whether this is the case or not, repeatedly, these storylines illustrate the way in which the reconciliation of individualism with team interdependence is translated into narrative. An example is the episode 'One', in which Seven of Nine, the rescued Borg drone (a human girl, who had been assimilated into the menacing,

high-tech cyber-collective known as The Borg), is learning to socialise. Then, due to an anomaly which affects everybody but herself and the holographic doctor, she finds she has to keep the ship going on her own. Classically, the story generates a threat to the integrity of the individual's selfhood, in this character's case, fragile at the best of times. Seven, in a panic at being isolated, begins to hallucinate and to believe that she can only function as a Borg drone, not as an effective, individual crew member. The reconciliation of the two imperatives: to be an individual and at the same time a team player, is the thematic spine of the story's events. Inevitably, of course, Seven does rescue the ship, and survives her ordeal – and her crewmates, who have not always trusted her, are duly grateful.

The recurring theme of the reconciliation of the rights of individuals with the needs of the collective was put particularly succinctly by Captain Janeway in a third season *Voyager* cliff-hanger, 'Week of Hell' (which at times felt like a particularly problematic writers' meeting):

> 'The moment we split apart we lose the ability to pool our talents . . .
> One ship, one family.'[xxv]

Or to put it another way, – from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs.

---

[i] David Marc and Robert J. Thompson, 1992, *Prime Time Producers*, Boston: Little Brown
[ii] Judith and Garfield Reeves-Stevens, 1997, *Star Trek The Next Generation: The Continuing Mission*, New York: Pocket Books, p. 158
[iii] Telephone interview with Herb Solow, MMD, 25th April 2005
[iv] Terry Lovell, 1983, *Pictures of Reality: Aesthetics, Politics and Pleasure*, London: BFI
[v] This was evident from our interviews with craft workers such as Dan Curry, Visual Effects Producer on the series, who told us:
'One of the things that's fed into *Star Trek* is my years of living in Asia, especially with Klingon architecture and culture. For one episode, I needed to come up with a sword for [the Klingon character] Whorf [this turned out to be the 'ba'atleth'] and I went to Rick and the other producers, and said, hey, why don't you come up with something that's totally unique, never been seen before, and I can make a whole martial arts style around it. And that's what we did. And sadly I never had it copyrighted, I gave it to the show, and it's become an icon of the Klingons, and everybody makes money from them but me.'
[vi] Interview with Rick Berman, MMD & RP, 17th Jan 2002
[vii] James B. Twitchell, 1992, *Carnival Culture*, New York: Columbia University Press

[viii] David Gerrold, 1973, *ibid*. p. 180

[ix] Herb Solow & Robert Justman (1996) *Inside Star Trek: The Real Story*, New York: Pocket Books/Simon & Schuster

[x] William Goldman, *ibid*, p. 78

[xi] William Goldman, *ibid,* p. 403

[xii] Interview with Michael Piller, Independent producer, Piller Squared, former Executive producer and head writer, on TNG, *Voyager* and DS9, interviewed January 10th 2002, Hollywood CA., MMD and REP

[xiii] Interview with Michael Piller, *ibid*

[xiv] Interview with Michael Piller, *ibid*

[xv] William Goldman, 1983, reprinted 2001, *Adventures in the Screen Trade*, London: Abacus

[xvi] Interview with Michael Piller, *ibid*

[xvii] Judith and Garfield Reeves-Stevens, 1997, *ibid*

[xviii] Threats to the integrity of the self are a popular theme in Star Trek – and as Thomas Richards points out, they usually come not from within but from outside, from some sort of 'alien' interference; Richards suggests that 'alien forces are often standins for the dark forces of the mind.' Thomas Richards, 1997, *Star Trek in myth and legend*, London: Orion Books, p. 88

[xix] Thomas Richards, 1997, *ibid*

[xx] Here, the holodeck is an invaluable invention – one of the few ingenious production ideas not anticipated by Roddenberry.

[xxi] Interview with Brannon Braga, MMD & RP, January 10th 2002

[xxii] Interview with Brannon Braga, *ibid*

[xxiii] Interview with Brannon Braga, *ibid*

[xxiv] Interview with Brannon Braga, *ibid*

[xxv] 'Week of Hell', VOY, transmitted on Sky One, UK, 25th April 2003