THESIS

FROM TIME AND SPACE: SCIENCE FICTION AND ITS PRESENT MOMENT

Submitted by

Andrew Jones

Department of English

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the Degree of Master of Arts

Colorado State University

Fort Collins, Colorado

Spring 2012

Master's Committee:

Advisor: Doug Eskew

Donna Souder
Juan Morales

ABSTRACT

FROM TIME AND SPACE: SCIENCE FICTION AND ITS PRESENT MOMENT

In this paper, I will argue that science fiction (sf) is typically misunderstood as a predictive text but is actually firmly and permanently grounded in the time it was created. Sf, as I present it, can be seen as more of what Mendlesohn calls “a product rather than a critic of social patterns” (120). An example of sf that is typically misunderstood as critic rather than product of its time is *Star Trek*, the 1960s television series. I show through Pierre Bourdieu’s theories of language as symbolic power that despite *Star Trek’s* hopeful view of an integrated future, thanks to its “USS Earth” metaphor, the show’s content develops a Eurocentric market through its linguistic capital of rank and professional titles, or what Bourdieu calls “investiture” (119). Though the USS Enterprise promotes an environment and future where diversity and equality are commonplace, the ship’s crew are never so unified that officers of lower rank, alien origin, or non-Euro-American descent are allowed to forgo the laws of classification. In fact, I argue that these laws are never ignored or suspended *except* between Captain Kirk and Dr. “Bones” McCoy, *because* they are able to negotiate their capital and manipulate their market in an exchange of “doctor/Captain” for the more familiar “Bones/Jim.” Kirk and Bones prevail as embodiments of a Eurocentric patriarchy in a television series designed to bridge 1960s race and gender gaps. In studying *Star Trek* I will show how sf

is a form that allows for a more accurate study of the past instead of the future. Ultimately, my critique of *Star Trek* shows how sf reflects its present moment in order to promote a new way of thinking about sf criticism.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract…………………………………………………………………………………..ii

From Time and Space: Science Fiction and Its Present Moment……………………….1

Bibliography………………………………………………………………………..…42

FROM TIME AND SPACE: SCIENCE FICTION AND ITS PRESENT MOMENT

In the late twentieth century, science fiction (sf) imagined mostly utopian futures. Utopia made up most of the content of *Amazing Stories*, the magazine most often cited as the start of sf as we see it today, where authors wrote of peace reached and maintained globally and galactically (Mendlesohn 120). A peaceful future was considered likely by sf authors even when fears of U.S. involvement in growing international conflict lasted well past the end of World War II. Utopian sf was deemed plausible and relevant because of its textual relationship with hard and theoretical science, a new public interest after the the A-bomb, a harbinger of fear and scientific discovery. Sf co-opted the logic of science in tropes like artificial intelligence, robots, space travel, warp speed, and genetic engineering (Miller 85) to imagine peace and the path to it. Perhaps by pairing science's plausible developments with a social improbability like peace, authors and readers could more easily imagine utopia in the future.

But some, like John W. Campbell, sf author and editor for *Astounding Stories*, equated imagining the future to predicting it. Campbell and other authors argued that sf's legitimacy was not only in the genre's application of science and its logic to create plausible plots, but also in its ability to predict the future with scientific reasoning (Domingo 324). Since these influential authors presumed sf would predict what would happen in the twentieth century, its legacy has been to offer foresight for much of its

audience. According to Sheryl Hamilton, sf is widely understood as “a prosocial knowledge with predictive power” (273). Some critics seem to agree that sf has predictive abilities. Elyce Rae Helford argues, “science fiction is about the future, new options and new ways of thinking” (131). Darko Suvin sees twentieth century sf as “a diagnosis, a warning, a call to understanding and action, and—most importantly—a mapping of possible alternatives” (30-31). A utopian future could certainly be a welcome possible alternative to whatever problems plague society at the time an sf is constructed. But by looking toward future alternatives, critics often times overlook where sf has come from, and fail to recognize or address that perceptions of utopia require a present dystopia. To look toward a future utopia, sf must be aware of its presently dystopian or troubled social environment; to get “there” we must start from “here.” In this essay, I want to examine that "here," that social environment from which an sf originates.

As it turns out, the “here” of sf inception is not terribly scientific. Hamilton explains that science has been inappropriately used to lend “predictive credibility” to sf (273), which has led to a belief that science is fundamental to sf. As Hamilton argues, “[s]cience and sf are not the same thing; they are distinguishable and they are—and should be—differently valued in society” (273). Science in sf can be valued as a literary device: a character, vehicle, or setting. Characters like robots or androids are walking scientific technology. Similar technology appears as a vehicle to get characters from “here” to “there” via warp drive or wormholes, in spacecraft, or by molecular teleportation. Science as setting can be as concrete as a craft scientifically advanced enough to travel the cosmos or as abstract as the surface of another planet, which characters would be unable to reach were it not for the benefits of science. This use of

science is simply what makes sf different from other literary genres according to some scholars.[1] Yet however possible an imagined science may be, it does not validate any "predictive abilities of the [sf] writers," nor does it legitimize predictions posited through "rigorous inquiries into scientific as well as social aspects of progress" (Domingo 324). Robert Scholes finds fault in textual soothsaying as well, saying "We are not so aware of the way that our lives are part of a patterned universe that we are free to speculate as never before" (211). In short, no matter how scientific or empirical the foundations of prediction, the future of our society remains difficult to trace.[2]

Yet however much the future is portrayed in sf, it is not the most immediate concern for sf theory and criticism. One of the primary concerns has become the very definition of sf, or what Miller calls "a naming of true names" (79). These names, these definitions, vary dramatically from one analysis to another, and naming overall has led to more coincidence than consensus. Among the more frequent agreements pertinent to this discussion: sf is unique in its use of science in narrative exposition; sf is a social critic. While some suggest that sf is fundamentally social,[3] little evidence has been presented to

---

[1] Eric S. Rabkin sees sf as "the branch of fantastic literature that claims plausibility against a background of science" (459). James Gunn considers questions raised by texts, like "how did we get there from here? If the question is irrelevant or whimsical, then the fiction is fantasy," not sf (9).

[2] Clyde Wilcox notes, "[W]hen humans settle beyond the solar system, the range of [scientific/social] observations increases dramatically. […] Such incomprehensible numbers of worlds create the possibility of great varieties of political, social, and economic systems" (144). The social variables awaiting us are so innumerable that they are incalculable.

[3] See Moylan, "'Social' versus Sociopolitical."

move from suggesting sf's social interest and criticism to implementing a theory of a social sf. Semantic arguments advocate considering the genre in new terms,[4] such that are not as dissonant and misleading as "two heterogeneous nouns [left] unmodified" (Chu 100). Whether sf is fictional science or scientific fiction remains unclear to many. Greg Grewell sees a similar issue in terminology, noting "science" as connotative of fact, and "fiction" as a contradiction of "an implicit scientific code of accountability" (26-7). I, like Samuel Delany, see science as a distinctive feature of sf but not its force (291). Sf looks to our future in or after the exploration of outer space with the aid of science, but this is only a metaphor for exploring a social inner-space, particularly that of the present moment. Arguments similar to my own have been made, but critics have yet to reach anything approaching a critical consensus concerning sf as socially oriented *and* grounded in its present and originary moment. Critics who do name sf as social tend only to add to the larger debate on how to define and value the genre, making the attempt at definition, as Joseph Miller says, "endlessly engaging" (79). I see an end to the engagement. James Gunn believes "meaningful criticism" will never come for sf texts until "an appropriate set of critical standards is developed for them" (12). Delany also sees a lack of "critical vocabulary" to explain the many differences sf can show between the sf text and the reality in which it was created (291). I would argue for a mode of

---

[4] Suvin argues for an "understanding of sf as the *literature of cognitive estrangement*" where a subject is recognized but simultaneously made unfamiliar. It has become the "*formal framework*" of sf. (24) Robert Scholes suggests "structural fabulation" a mutation in the tradition of speculative fiction with updated technological, natural, and social science (212). Marleen Barr proposes "feminst fabulation," which serves to "unmask the fictionality of patriarchal master narratives, rewrite patriarchal tales, and be feminist metafiction—fiction about patriarchal fiction" (qtd. in Helford 105).

analysis away from such differences, one that focuses on the similarities between a text's moment of construction and its constructed future.

As I noted above, my claim here is not entirely unique. Still, for every argument agreeing with Farah Mendlesohn that sf is “better seen as a product rather than a critic of social patterns” (120), several more recognize sf as solely a social critic. For Delany, sf texts are produced by “futuristic distortions” (291): problems, or distortions, of social patterns presented in a future setting. Raffaella Baccolini suggests sf’s “extrapolation of the present” gives readers a Brechtian critical distance (432).[5] The belief that sf is a critic of the present has seeded arguments for sf as modern myth. Sf and myth are analogous to one another according to Tatiana Chernyshova, who sees the two as sharing an exposition of the unknown in a world of the known, the present reality (348). Myth, to Cory and Alexei Panshin, is the reality of the fiction that “validates [sf], and gives it substance” (230); myth *is* the sf. Sf-as-myth functions by supplying information “from some other domain,” like a presumed future, to “supply the missing links” in the event that “there is not enough information about a given phenomenon” (Chernyshova 348), namely, in sf’s case, human behavior and its future.

Critically viewing sf as present situations set in the future, or understanding sf as unchanged myth, a refurbished relic, that offers guesses at the unknowable indicates a stronger message *about* the present social moment rather than one originating *from* it. I can see where these perceptions of purpose come from. By reading about the present set in another time, readers can remove themselves from their moment, stand apart from their

---

[5] On Brecht and the alienation effect, see Brecht and Bentley, “A Model for Epic Theater.”

culture while being a part of it; be an active critic. Left with thinly veiled social analogies, readers may place seemingly naturally occurring social events in new occasions and contexts to understand them as a spectator rather than a participant.

Such an alienated critical activation may result from a more-or-less simple temporal movement of the fiction into the future; however, the resulting temporal array requires a dialectically complex critical appreciation. As Jameson puts it, sf's orientation toward the future masks an originary present that is now already history, a future that has "turned out to have been merely the future of one moment or what is now our own past" (151). History matters to the moment of an sf creation and to its future insofar as the future is where its readers reside--a future the text has been inadequate to predict. Sf speculates, with few exceptions, "within the expectations of its own historical context," according to Mendlesohn, addressing especially the more pressing issues of this context (124), like the social and political. It seems paradoxical to find signs of the past and present in futuristic fiction, elements of "here" in "there," but it is through the "analogous strategy of indirection that SF now brings to bear on the ultimate object and ground of all human life, History itself" (Jameson 152). We can gather much from sf if its works are deciphered as artifacts, not as predictions of the future or solely commentaries on the present.

Reaching a consensus that sf reflects more of its originary moment than a simple criticism requires an analysis of sf texts with such an understanding in mind. An analysis of a sf text like the original television series *Star Trek*, which is largely viewed as critical of rather than a product of its time, can illuminate this theory of sf-as-the-present-moment. The program features the results of changes in race relations and gender roles

while addressing fears of international conflict and global Armageddon, and projects these issues forward into a quasi-utopian 23rd century. The original series and subsequent entries into the franchise have had the fair share of criticism, but such critiques tend to focus on the programs as reflections of the present or generally. By contrast, I intend to use the original *Star Trek* series to display sf 's complex relationship to time and the power of its originary moment as an ever-present now, as a historical document and context, and as a text for an always already future reader. In addition, I wish to make apparent how inadequate such a temporal complex is for predicting future social development.

It is difficult to imagine a more ideal representative of sf, one that contains all the tropes and messages of sf, than *Star Trek*. Its ubiquity suggests its cultural impact on even those who do not self-identify with sf. While it may seem like a generalization to look at a tendency of all sf through the text of one, I feel I must point out the non-linear narrative of *Star Trek*. Each episode acts as its own sf tale, showcasing sf tropes in at least one instance.[6] In its broader narrative, *Star Trek* fulfills George Slusser and Daniele Chatelain's expectation of "classic American sf" by generating "a cultural dynamic based on an interaction of collective and individual forces that strives to escape the binary 'trap'" (104). Numerous binary "traps" were prevalent in the 1960s and *Star Trek* aimed

---

[6] These being time travel (as seen in "Assignment: Earth"), the robot ("I, Mudd" for the android, "The Changeling" for less sophisticated machinery) faster than light travel (which happens regularly), the paranormal ("Catspaw"), artificial intelligence (featured prominently in "The Ultimate Computer"), genetic engineering ("Space Seed"), and "the Social Science Project" which asks if we are capable of understanding, predicting, and improving human behavior (nearly all episodes feature this but "Bread and Circuses" and the heavy-handed "Let That Be Your Last Battlefield" are particularly noteworthy) (Miller 85-6).

to address them all. The equal opportunity space of the bridge of the *Enterprise* sees a future evolved from 1960s fears of Russians and the Japanese, American gender roles, and racial inequality. But the multicultural message of *Star Trek* only keeps it further locked in its moment of production.[7] Slusser and Chatelain recognize that multiculturalism may be "a modern fantasy" which "taps the dystopian nightside of the utopian dream, which seems to say that mankind is only free when it is in chains" (105). The freedom to imagine places "where anything can be true" and where "there can be no heresy" (Scholes 211) is limited to our collective experience. *Star Trek* exercises the ability to imagine places and times where anything may happen but does so tethered to its moment of creation in its telling of these stories.

Some, like Miller, argue that *Star Trek* or any televised sf is less legitimate than sf literature,[8] but Carl Freedman points to visual sf as the kind that "attracted a truly mass audience" and allowed sf to become "one of the defining cultural forms of American society. It was not literary science fiction that attained this stature" (542). I personally see no need or value in holding one medium over another, particularly because sf itself, no matter its medium, is marginalized outright anyway. Jameson attributes this branded

---

[7] As John Guillory claims, "Multiculturalism defines Western culture as its political antagonist, and vice versa." To recognize multiculturalism, then, is to recognize the "monolith of Western culture" (1473), which, in proposing multiculturalism even theoretically, generalizes and confuses the complexity of different cultures. This, certainly, was a concern in the U.S. of the 1960s as much as it is today in a different context.

[8] "Television has Captain Kirk and the new improved Captain Picard; we have Captain Sirocco Jones!" (86). While Miller draws the distinction between two white males and Jones, a bisexual woman, he also separates written and visual sf, putting the former in a less legitimate light than the latter. In the same gesture, Miller also segregates audiences invoking "we," who are not the unspoken Other sf television viewers.

illegitimacy to sf's "own dynamic, which is not that of high culture," and stands in " a dialectical relationship to high culture or modernism as such" (149). Sf plays an important role in American society, one that at once upholds and questions "high culture" in either print or visual media. As visual media, *Star Trek* fits the trend of twentieth century sf in its utopian themes and inadequate representations of them. I am not suggesting the utopian future of *Star Trek* could never be in store for us, but anticipating it as the show does is impossible. Moreover, the creators of the series are in a position as any author of sf is to reveal the impossibility of escaping the "here" to accurately predict "there." The utopian future in *Star Trek* actually points to what Jameson considers our inability to imagine the future at all through no fault of our own, "not owing to any individual failure of imagination but as the result of the systematic, cultural, and ideological closure of which we are all in one way or another prisoners" (153).

The language at once crafted by writers and expressed by characters reveals more similarities, not differences, between the text of *Star Trek* and the social patterns that prompted it. In imagining a utopia apart from social problems of the 1960s, *Star Trek*, as we may interpret its language now, reveals more about its troubled present than the potential for utopian future. Jameson's belief that sf's "deepest vocation is over and over again to demonstrate and to dramatize our incapacity to imagine the future," (153) is apparent in the scripts of *Star Trek*. Its characters, who are prey to the same power structures that the show's future boasts to have overcome, practice Pierre Bourdieu's theory of language as symbolic power, which is one way to recognize the implicit present moment imposed on the imagined future of *Star Trek*.

Bourdieu identifies the relationship between language and power; language, in its usage as communication, relays power that classifies, or dominates its speakers. The symbolic power of language allows individuals to enter or create new classes, gain authority in them, and marks speakers as belonging to a particular social structure. The mark of a social structure is imposed through language: what and how something is said in particular situations, and to what end. Bourdieu discusses language and its ability to classify, value, and de-value in economic terms; utterances that form a language are "capital" which is used in interactions and social occasions or a specific "market." The cost of admission into a particular market is dictated by price formation: a specific kind of linguistic capital or verbiage meets the price of a market. Although Bourdieu uses economic terms, his analysis is not exclusively economic. The complexity of this terminology is in the broader understanding of economic exchange as action in response to individual interest, and the effects of these actions on those who act. In this sense, language serves as cultural and/or symbolic capital: representations of not just possession and wealth, but of knowledge, prestige, and roles in social structures.

In expressing social structure, speakers recreate it, making any linguistic exchange a moment in which individuals develop or exercise dispositions toward a particular social structure. In Bourdieu's take on *habitus*, these dispositions allow speakers to, among other things, stand apart from and be a part of a situation that marks them as "this" not "that." Yet through linguistic maneuvering, speakers invariably situate themselves in the struggle between "this" and "that." It is struggle that necessitates and forms the *habitus* of symbolic power. A linguistic *habitus* is comprised of ways to respond in daily life and in specific social situations or "fields" where more complex

struggles lay. These fields, these spaces of struggle, are situations where a specific norm is challenged or upheld but, in either instance, faces opposition.

Foucault speaks of what arises from these challenges of the status quo, that which is the result of a present moment, more specifically, the response to “an urgent need” at a particular moment in time, one that enhances and maintains power in society: the apparatus.[9] The very struggles that necessitate a *habitus* birth the apparatus, emphasizing power where it is challenged, and maintaining it, as such struggles may threaten to erase order where it is needed. In *Star Trek*, as I will explain, addressing and challenging the needs of its social moment recreated its present, and reinforced the status quo by challenging it. The action of this particular apparatus, the perpetuation of the *habitus Star Trek* intended to scrutinize, is the subtext of the program that gives the show its ultimate definition as sf: product not critic.

While subtext may not always be easily identified, it does stand to, as Jameson argues, “always be (re) constructed after the fact” (185), or interpreted after the text has been written and presented to audiences. The subtext, though, is paradoxical in its symbolic act of “producing its own context” while simultaneously separating itself from the context. Subtext creates an “illusion” that what is before a reader is nothing but a text presenting a unique situation that was non-existent before the formation of the text. The subtext, then, is the reality, the present moment, of the situation in the fiction; “the literary work […] brings into being that very situation to which it is also […] a reaction”

[9] On the apparatus, see Foucault, “The Confession of the Flesh.”

(185). There is a close relationship between language and "the Real" for Jameson, in that language is the vehicle for the subtext reality.

I hope to avoid developing an ideology of sf in drawing out "the Real" in a way that understates or overemphasizes the moment of the symbolic act or the symbolic act itself, or imply that either is imaginary. Bourdieu's theory of language as symbolic power indicates that the symbolic act of creating the text of *Star Trek*, and symbolic acts that take place in the text itself have a very real effect. The effect, I argue, is a reflection and product of history, a past moment to viewers who retextualize *Star Trek* in what is the program's future, our now. History, as Jameson makes clear, is "inaccessible to us except in textual form," (185) but not the text itself; history is only understood through retextualization. Examining *Star Trek*'s retextualization in this moment, the "there" to *Star Trek*'s "here," may draw out the real from the fiction, the actual from the plausible. The actual "here" of *Star Trek* is visible in its plausible future "there" when examining its language through Bourdieu's lens. Characters' dialogues represent the *habitus* of *Star Trek*'s present in its future through their use of language's symbolic power to classify other characters, and represent the reality that produced *Star Trek*.

Among the varieties of sf, I see *Star Trek* as good a place as any, if not possibly the best, to look, via Bourdieu, into Jameson's proposal on our incapability to look beyond the Real into the future, a proposal which "now needs to be demonstrated in a more concrete analytical way, with reference to the [sf] texts themselves" (153). *Star Trek* is an artifact of a moment in history, a record and symptom of historical change but not an accurate recording of true change. The recording of histories is part of the *Enterprise*'s five-year mission "to explore strange new worlds" and "seek out new life

and civilizations." It is a bold quest and unconscious colonization in making first contact with alien species that is itself a historical trend. Steven Mailloux identifies first contact narratives, like *Star Trek*'s, with those "told about our own ancestors and descendants, including the stories that articulate our political hopes and fears" (122). An articulation of hope, as in a utopian sf, is simply the articulation of what we hope for, not an accurate prediction of what we can plan on. What we can be certain of is that *Star Trek* is at once a historical document and a performer of its own history, a reenactment of social anxieties and hopes for future audiences. It is in the functionality of *Star Trek* as history that I examine its narrative, to apply Mendlesohn's point that sf, here represented by *Star Trek*, is a product of its social patterns.

The not-so-distant future that *Star Trek* presents is racially and politically integrated, and without gender barriers; the helmsmen are of Russian and Japanese descent respectively and the leading communications officer is an African-American woman. African-American men are occasionally featured as doctors or brilliant scientists. Human and alien women appear as military leaders, experts in their professions, or ambassadors of their people. Despite *Star Trek's* hopeful view of an integrated future, it reforms its present American context by developing a Eurocentric market through its linguistic capital of rank and professional titles, or what Bourdieu calls "investiture" (119). The *USS Enterprise* promotes an environment where diversity and equality are commonplace, but the ship's crew are never so unified that officers of lower rank, alien origin, or non-Euro-American descent are allowed to forgo laws of classification provided by the symbolic power of language.

Symbolic power is used to delegate responsibility to the *Enterprise*'s crew; Ferguson, Ashkenazi and Schultz note the similarity between Starfleet's ranking system and the U.S. Navy's formality of using rank to address individuals (219). Bourdieu claims that "the more formal a situation is, the more likely it is that the dominant linguistic competence will function in a particular market as linguistic capital capable of imposing the law of price formation" (70). On the *Enterprise* we see language being used to define one's identity in terms of one's rank or profession, i.e. a captain, a doctor, a science officer, and so on. These terms of classification can have vastly different or no meaning in another market, as Captain Kirk, Mr. Spock, Dr. Leonard "Bones" McCoy, and Montgomery "Scotty" Scott discover when they are embodied as the Clantons and McLaurys in an alien re-enactment of the showdown at the OK Corral and their titles are literally a joke ("Spectre of the Gun").

Titles like "captain," or "doctor," signify authority or what Bourdieu calls "profit" (66). Profit is attained because, as Bourdieu argues, language is not a single thing that speakers trade and communicate through on an equal level.[10] There is always profit to be gained and its imposed authority dominates those who do not share the wealth. Bourdieu identifies "those who operate the […] field" of a linguistic market dominate through language's symbolic power (60). In Starfleet, one is immediately and completely aware of who holds power and why: the captain is in charge because he/she has been given the

---

[10] "The social mechanisms of cultural transmission tend to reproduce the structural disparity between the very unequal *knowledge* of the legitimate language and the much more uniform *recognition* of this language" (62). The dominant language that constitutes the capital of a particular market is the "legitimate" language. Dominant classes of speakers employ legitimate language that manipulates a particular market. The gained power is profit from using the legitimate linguistic capital.

title of captain. When the captain is away from the bridge, the second-in-command is in charge but is not "captain" because he/she has not been provided such a title. These authorities establish themselves by utilizing legitimate language in their particular market. Aboard the *Enterprise*, the market is defined in terms of Starfleet protocol: who answers to whom when an order is given and how one addresses another in that exchange. The legitimate language aboard the *Enterprise* works in this fashion: a commanding officer gives an order to one of his crewmen and addresses him by first name or last name with a formal title that is almost never honorific. The crewman responds more formally with an honorific title:

> KIRK: Warp factor two, Mr. Sulu.
>
> SULU: Aye, captain.

or

> SPOCK: You received my signal Mr. Scott?
>
> SCOTTY: Yes, sir.

In these examples, Kirk and Spock employ legitimate language by referring to officers of lower rank as "Mister," garnering responses punctuated with "sir" or a person's investiture. However, there are limits to the function of legitimate language. Bourdieu comments, "the legitimate language no more contains within itself the power to ensure its own perpetuation in time than it has the power to define its extension in space" (58). Legitimate language can only be eradicated if it is no longer recognized. The struggle to attain legitimate language and adopt its power must also be ignored for legitimate language and its dominance to cease. Yet, in a space like the *Enterprise*, ignoring the

power of legitimate language is impossible. It is legitimate language that maintains order and keeps the *Enterprise* crew working efficiently.[11]

Starfleet rank is ordered in terms of power gained through language imposed or branded on an individual; a person who is now "captain" was once called "lieutenant," "ensign," and so on down the chain of command. Growth within the hierarchy of rank is only attained through investiture that "consists of making [a difference] exist as a social difference" (Bourdieu 119). In other words, a captain is set apart from the rest of the crew because authority invested in "captain." The social difference is not simply in the utterance "captain" but in the degree and amount of authority that is attributed to that title. Laws of classification conversely determine who must answer to those who are given power through a particular investiture. Those who must obey the authority of an investiture, or those who aspire to acquire a new or more powerful investiture are dominated by language. The dominated must attempt to use legitimate language to reach new levels of power and authority to escape symbolic violence and domination.

Symbolic violence is only imparted by individuals who use it and dominates only those who allow themselves to be dominated by it. Since both parties believe that language can be used to separate and distribute power in a market, symbolic violence is considered real (140). The effects of real symbolic violence result in the laws of classification within a market. On the *Enterprise*, where every member of the crew has willingly entered into a market where classification is status quo, symbolic violence is ceaseless. Although *Star Trek*'s message is one of universal peace, the *Enterprise*'s

[11] The legitimate language is the ranking of personnel, an explicit model of the struggle for legitimacy and power and a "[norm] of a field" (Bourdieu 159).

purpose to carry out a peaceful mission, Captain Kirk and Dr. "Bones" McCoy exploit symbolic violence through their investiture in various markets. That these two characters establish themselves as the most powerful members of the crew outside of their rank is indicative of the present reality in *Star Trek*.

Both Kirk and Bones have much power to impose in their markets. Kirk has been given the title and responsibility of "captain," accepting the authority that comes with it. In "Turnabout Intruder," Bones states that a ship's chief medical officer has the authority to medically examine anyone that he deems fit for examination, especially if those people are suspicious. The definition of "suspicious" is entirely dependent on the perspective of said chief medical officer. Bones, then, is as autonomous as Kirk; Bones is allotted power over any member of the crew, even dominating captain Kirk through "doctor's orders" in "Shore Leave," when the captain is ordered by the doctor to rest. The captain and doctor are then established among the crew of the *Enterprise* as two figures that can freely give orders. Kirk and Bones constantly re-affirm themselves in terms of their titles to maintain their authority among the crew. Kirk addresses foreign dignitaries and unidentified life forms by introducing himself with his investiture.[12] He also invokes status when he must defend his decisions or remind crewman of their position under the captain, as in, "I'm the captain of this ship." Kirk the man and Kirk the captain are never separated in the eyes of the crew or life forms that interact with the *Enterprise*.

Bones similarly interjects his investiture into self-description, identifying himself as "a simple country doctor" on occasion and, when asked to do something outside the

---

[12] "This is Captain James T. Kirk of the starship *Enterprise*," or "This is James T. Kirk, I'm the captain of this ship."

realm of his expertise, passionately declares; "I'm a doctor!" then proceeds to state what he is *not* (i.e. an escalator, an engineer, a bricklayer). Since being a doctor in Starfleet is tantamount to being nearly free of the system of power that a captain imposes and upholds, Bones is determined to be identified as his title and keep the authority that accompanies it. Both Bones and Kirk introduce or identify themselves in what appears to be a practical linguistic maneuver to clearly communicate with new life forms, but by ceaselessly invoking their investiture in their introductions, they solidify their authority and position among the other crewmen and women. By referring to and introducing themselves as their titles, Kirk and Bones struggle to have their power recognized on other planets as well as on the *Enterprise*.

In "Friday's Child," Bones' authority as a doctor clashes with Capella IV's cultural mandate that a woman may not be touched by any man who is not her husband. Bones appeals at first, stating, "But I'm a doctor, and it's my tradition to care for the sick and injured." Bones is still unable to convince the woman of his legitimacy and informs the woman, "I'll touch you in any way or manner that my professional judgment indicates," as if the earthly title of "doctor" holds the same amount of authority in another culture. Bones is physically rebuked and responds in kind, slapping the pregnant woman. The woman resigns and allows Bones to touch her stomach and he determines that she will soon give birth. The woman, stunned by Bones' force and intellect, asks how he is sure of the impending birth. Bones simply responds, "Because I'm a doctor, that's how I know." In this case, Bones establishes his power physically before he can allow language to do it for him. Yet his reliance on the symbolic power of language is evident in the fact that he associates his title with the authority to do whatever he pleases in any market and

then consecrates himself as "doctor" after striking the pregnant alien woman and achieving his goal. Bones no longer needs to raise his voice or abuse the woman as he has imposed symbolic violence to do the work for him; the female Capellan has learned that earth doctors can do what they please. For the rest of the episode the woman allows only Bones to touch her and ultimately names her baby after the doctor. An apparatus has been engaged on Capella IV that responds to a need to establish and reinforce Bones' authority.

Kirk, facing a unique, personal apparatus, must re-establish his authority as captain of his ship when he is split into two halves in "The Enemy Within." Through a transporter malfunction, Kirk returns from the surface of a planet in two forms, one indecisive and docile, the other reckless and belligerent. The "good" and "evil" Kirk are at odds as they both try to use the symbolic power of language that will legitimize one or the other as the true captain of the *Enterprise*. Evil Kirk understands the power he holds as captain by experimenting with it in the first few moments of his arrival; he drops his investiture, granting yeoman Rand entry to an elusive informal discourse in hopes of seducing her: "'Jim' will do here, Janice." Evil Kirk also neglects the ship's linguistic market by addressing the yeoman by her first name rather than by her position or last name. The market is changed to suit his own desires while Good Kirk labors to find the courage to live up to the title of "captain" and the current market of the *Enterprise*.

Good Kirk is advised to regain his post by regaining his confidence. Spock reminds Good Kirk that he is the captain and as such has unique responsibilities: "You are the captain of this ship. [...] You haven't the right to be vulnerable in the eyes of the crew. You can't afford the luxury of being anything less than perfect. If you do, they lose

faith…and you lose command." Spock demonstrates that he too is aware of his dominated situation because Kirk is "the captain" and has the ability to command. In a preliminary effort to find the ability to exercise the symbolic power provided by his investiture, the good Kirk addresses the crew for the first time since the split by stating, "This is the captain speaking." Good Kirk proceeds to refer to Evil Kirk as "an imposter," stripping his other half of any investiture or true identity. Fearing domination, evil Kirk maniacally screams, "I'm captain Kirk!" in a vain attempt at self-investiture. Ultimately, good Kirk prevails by accepting "if I am to be the captain I've got to act like one." Good Kirk does not take all that his title comes with at this point, but simply prepares himself for the authority that he holds as a captain. Kirk's investiture is paused for a moment until he can master it once again and wield its power as he did when he was a single entity. When Kirk merges his two halves together, his first utterance is an order. He immediately exercises his authority over the crew to maintain unquestionable command.

Bones similarly labors to keep his title and authority in "This Side of Paradise" when he inhales spores that provide total peace of mind therefore releasing him from his duties and concerns as a member of Starfleet. While under the influence of the spores, Bones states that he will abandon the *Enterprise* and remain on the planet Omicron Ceti III. The planet's colony has been maintaining a farm and requires McCoy's assistance but, ultimately, Bones resists the lifestyle of anything other than a doctor. McCoy asserts "I'm a doctor," threatens bodily injury and attacks the colony's leader in an effort to remain a doctor if his linguistic dominance may fail.

Whether it is Bones imposing his symbolic power on alien life forms or Kirk reconciling himself and rank on the *Enterprise*, they both are aware of the value of their

investiture. Their linguistic capital is their investiture that yields a high profit by imposing symbolic power over the crew. The crew is left to answer to the captain and the doctor as no one else is given enough authority to demand recognition of his/her power as provided by his/her investiture. Kirk's identity is "captain," and Bones is ubiquitously known as "doctor." In the sense that these two men *are* their titles, they both have an identity that the crew must acknowledge where the rest of the crew have no identity. Everyone aboard the *Enterprise* is a representation of nothing more than his or her placement under the captain and doctor. The laws of classification as determined by investiture and its importance in Starfleet rank impose domination, its own *habitus*: anyone who is not a captain must answer to the captain, nurses must obey the doctor's requests, everyone must follow the doctor's medical orders.

The *habitus* shaped by Kirk and Bones on the *Enterprise* mirrors that which was present during the writing and filming of *Star Trek*. The original pitch for the television show describes the *Star Trek* universe to include "people, quite similar to that on earth," and "social evolution," sharing a "similarity with ours" (Roddenberry 4). George Takei, the actor who played Sulu, confirmed: "The starship *Enterprise* was a metaphor for starship earth" ("Birth of a Timeless Legacy"). The crew of the *Enterprise* represents the "USS Earth" beyond Kirk's Midwest U.S. and Bones' Old South. Hikaru Sulu represents East Asia, Pavel Chekov stands for the larger portion of Europe, and Nyota Uhura signifies Africa. An occasional Indian, Hispanic, or Native American officer conspicuously appears to round out the globe.[13] Despite this hopeful view of an integrated

---

[13] Narrowing whole continents or regions of the planet, culturally and geographically, amounts to a global Orientalism, the assumption that geographical regions (for Said's

future, two white, American males dominate all aboard the "USS Earth" through symbolic violence and power, an image difficult to escape after the internment of Japanese-Americans, or during the Cold War, or civil rights movement.

Indeed, the *Enterprise* is a metaphor for earth. Led by two powerful white males, the ship flies through the galaxy in a search for life with the Starfleet Prime Directive in mind.[14] The Prime Directive is of paramount importance to uphold as Federation captains who have violated the Prime Directive have led civilizations to embrace Nazism ("Patterns of Force") or Communism ("The Omega Glory") while restructuring discovered societies. These episodes highlighting the Prime Directive serve as parables, imparting a message that mankind can only taint that which he touches with power structures and struggles. Mark P. Lagon sees the Prime Directive as a metaphor for "problems in American statecraft" or a commentary on American foreign policy (234). Lagon notes the problems and themes of U.S. foreign policy were both intentional and unintentional. The unintentional themes were not a commentary on the present moment's foreign policy, "but they aptly confront new problems for the United States in the global context twenty-five years [after the show]" (234). The Prime Directive metaphor for *future* foreign policy is obviously not a prediction or even an attempt at one, as Lagon notes. The future, as *Star Trek* unconsciously suggests, holds no progress for society and its struggles because the show was written and produced in a moment of questionable

---

purposes, 'the Orient' specifically) are unified racially, geographically, politically, and culturally. See Said, *Orientalism*.

[14] "No identification of self or mission; no interference with the social development of said planet; no references to space or the fact that there are other worlds or more advanced civilizations" ("Bread and Circuses").

U.S. foreign and domestic policy.[15] This reversal of intent seems unavoidable considering the show's *habitus*, which recognized the struggles of colonization and racial and gender equality but still favored white males. Although, the more compelling struggles in episodes featuring the Prime Directive and its power may be as implicit as Kirk and Bones' symbolic power aboard the *Enterprise*.

The implicit nature of symbolic power is, as Bourdieu claims: "invisible power which can be exercised only with the complicity of those who do not want to know that they are subject to it or even that they themselves exercise it" (164). Just as Kirk and Bones are unaware that they propagate and participate in classification yet still classify, so were the writers of *Star Trek* unconsciously constructing a future universe where two white, American males serve as the most powerful individuals aboard a metaphorical earth staffed with women and minorities. Characters are established in terms of the symbolic power of language; when those with investiture are threatened with losing their power by losing their titles or when the dominated follow orders without question, the characters are revealed to be part of a system built on power and the constant struggle for it. The writers for *Star Trek* were influenced by their present moment so strongly as to

---

[15] Lagon sees five themes that address U.S. foreign policy: First, Kirk's colonial mission to "spread the Federation's way of life"; second, routine breaking of Federation policy on non-intervention in a planet's social development; third, America's views of Third World political development; fourth, "the symbolic role of small planetary powers who served as clients of the Federation"; and finally, the theme of "American intervention in Southeast Asia and its intrusive efforts at nation-building in South Vietnam" (235-6). Each of these themes is a culmination of the U.S.' history of foreign policy up to the late 1960s, or representative of a situation in the 60s, like American interest in sitting governments (the Salvadorian government), insurgent regimes (the Contras), or "patron-client relationships with Central American nations" (Gasiorowski qtd. in Lagon 236).

render objective, accurate depictions of the future impossible. The writers instead imagined a future upholding twentieth century laws of hierarchy and classification.

I argue that these laws can never be ignored or suspended aboard the *Enterprise* except between Captain Kirk and Dr. "Bones" McCoy, because they are able to negotiate their capital and manipulate their market in an exchange of "doctor/captain" for the more familiar "Bones/Jim." Kirk and Bones are allowed an exclusive informal discourse that allows them to establish themselves as more than the two dominant military figures aboard the *Enterprise*. By exchanging "doctor/captain" for "Bones/Jim," Kirk and Bones not only reveal an acceptance of their symbolic power, but also their struggle for more power among one another.

Because the captain and doctor hold so much symbolic power they may adopt an informal discourse as a kind of profit, a bonus that allows them to create their own personal market between themselves. Their personal market consists of Bones referring to captain Kirk as "Jim," looking past his investiture and addressing him by a shortened version of his first name, and Kirk naming Dr. McCoy "Bones," an abbreviation of an older medical moniker "sawbones." By transcending the laws of classification of the *Enterprise*'s *habitus*, Kirk and Bones understand the mechanics of investiture, the nature of their market, the price formation set by rank and military etiquette, and the magic of violence through language. This general understanding of symbolic power is evident in exchanges between the doctor and the captain when the two manipulate their market by reversing their informal interaction to assert their respective powers.

These reversals occur in several episodes. In "The Man Trap," for instance, Kirk and Bones debate the cause of death of a security officer during a landing party

expedition. Bones calls captain Kirk "Jim," as he describes that there is no detectable cause of death. The doctor then becomes nostalgic and muses over the appearance of a past love on the planet where the crewman was killed. A weary Kirk snaps at Bones: "How your lost love affects your vision, doctor, doesn't interest me. I've lost a man. I want to know what killed him." Bones responds, "Yes, sir." Kirk resorts to using a different market in his frustration, eliminating Bones' personal identity and calling him "doctor." Bones uses the language of the dominated in this new market of the moment by substituting "Jim" for "sir." Bones uses "sir" until Kirk reverts to using "Bones" when offering an apology much later.

Another notable power assertion appears in "The Enterprise Incident." The episode begins with a medical log recording that describes McCoy's concern for Kirk's mental well-being. Bones confronts Kirk, claiming he had "no authority" to move the ship into a Romulan neutral zone. Kirk replies, "Dismissed, doctor." Kirk denies the informal discourse between he and Bones when the captain's authority is questioned. Bones appeals, "But Jim---," in an effort to reform the class he and the captain create when using "Jim/Bones." Bones is dismissed nonetheless. Kirk exerts power over Bones in a checks-and-balances exercise; Bones may be able to dictate when Kirk must take a break from being a captain but Kirk can still direct Bones to his quarters.

Just as Kirk and Bones remind one another of their ability to enforce laws of classification and subsequently dominate one another, they also reinforce one another's positions and authority. In "Devil in the Dark," Bones is forced to treat a Horta, a silicon-based life form that resembles a mass of magma. Kirk directs Bones to "Help it. Treat it." McCoy responds, "I'm a doctor, not a bricklayer." Kirk details the duties of a "doctor" in

terms of his/her responsibility to patients, not his/her power to dominate: "You're a healer, there's a patient. That's an order." Through Kirk's order, Bones rediscovers the potential of his title in non-authoritative terms. Only Kirk, a man who is able to use language to gain power as Bones does, can affirm Bones' medical abilities, or vocational investiture. The captain's push for Bones to live up to his title results in a more confident McCoy who successfully heals the stone creature's wounds. Bones claims he is beginning to believe he can "cure a rainy day." The doctor's accomplishment in curing the Horta has led to the belief that McCoy is not just a good doctor; he is the *best* doctor in Starfleet, possibly in all existence. Bones has gone beyond the title of chief medical officer to some unnamed position where he has the potential to cure anything.

Bones helps Kirk find his extra-nominative power when he reassures Kirk that he is better at being a captain than a new automated navigation system in "The Ultimate Computer." The *Enterprise* is set to test the navigation system in war games. When the computer makes judgments that are deemed suitable for future use of the system in all starships, captain Kirk is named "captain Dunsel" by another captain.[16] Kirk, stricken by the excision of his name and the affliction of "Dunsel," questions why he has taken the new name attributed him so personally. He asks, "Am I afraid of losing command to a computer? Am I afraid of losing the prestige and the power that goes with being a starship captain? Is that why I'm fighting? Am I that petty?" It is no surprise that these questions are posited in an exclusive conversation with Bones. Kirk can only reveal his intimate attachment to his title, and the awareness of the profit that investiture brings as

---

[16] "Dunsel" refers to an obsolete mechanism, a term used by midshipmen at Starfleet Academy.

linguistic capital, to Bones, the man who is in a similar position of authority. To answer Kirk's questions, Bones suggests, "Why don't you ask James T. Kirk?" McCoy drops investiture and addresses Kirk the *person*, not Kirk the *captain*, in an attempt to retain Kirk's identity. Bones proposes looking past the profit of the term "captain" and examining the individual who has accepted the investiture. This may be impossible for Kirk as he has identified himself as a captain for so long.

Bourdieu addresses this syndrome in his exposition of language's power to allow individuals to be selected and made delegates of a larger body of other individuals or ideas. A delegate must lose his personal identity to speak for the group by becoming one with the group. "The ordinary individual must die [...]; die and become an *institution*" (211). Captain Kirk is a delegate of the United Federation of Planets while he carries out his missions and is an institution of authority and order aboard the *Enterprise*. "James T. Kirk" may no longer exist unless under the moniker "captain." The disappearance of the individual is evident when Kirk, dejected by his potential replacement by a computer, toasts not to redemption as captain Kirk but to the new name given him under his old investiture: "To captain Dunsel!" Kirk essentially takes his investiture where he can get it, even if it accompanies an unsavory term. Bones reinforces Kirk's original title in rebuttal: "To James T. Kirk: captain of the Enterprise." Kirk can only be "captain Kirk" if someone names him as such. The process of delegation works reversely too as seen in Kirk's immediate and unrepentant adaptation to "captain Dunsel."

The way in which Kirk and Bones recognize their market and exploit their titles while dropping them between one another is a clear example of Bourdieu's process of investiture in which the person consecrated is transformed into that title "because [the

title] transforms the representations others have of him and above all the behaviour they adopt towards him" (119). To everyone, even Bones on occasion, captain Kirk is not "Jim," "James," or "Kirk." He is "sir," or "captain" and must be obeyed as such. The same is true for Bones, who to everyone but Kirk is "doctor." Bones' medical authority is recognized throughout Starfleet; the chief medical officer may confine crewmembers to sickbay or order immediate medical examinations of anyone at anytime. If the *USS Enterprise* is indeed "starship earth," it is a telling decision to make its leaders white American males, vested with unquestionable power and, arguably, universal authority.

The power and authority invested in Kirk and Bones through their titles is even more apparent when observing and analyzing their language and how they utilize it as a means to establish or validate their authority. Kirk and Bones categorize those around them in non-Starfleet rank terms. Enterprise officers are re-ordered and "being the product of that order, [are forced] to recognize that order and thus submit to it" (Bourdieu 131). Those who are particularly subject to such order are aliens, non-American crewmembers, and women. The maltreatment of aliens, specifically Spock, and non-Americans, like Scotty, points to hopes for tolerance in the future but also illustrates the mistreatment of minorities and struggles for equality in the present moment of *Star Trek*'s creation.

I feel it necessary to discuss Spock and Scotty specifically for two reasons. First, the episode "By Any Other Name" defines the necessary personnel aboard the *Enterprise* as Kirk, Bones, Spock, and Scotty. For this discussion, it is significant to recognize Spock and Scotty as members of the central cast of characters yet not of the exclusive informal discourse established between Kirk and McCoy. Secondly, both characters'

interactions with Kirk and Bones demonstrate how the captain and doctor dominate those around them through language and reflect *Star Trek*'s present social moment. Spock and Scott are dominated by language because they advocate the symbolic power of investiture by calling Bones "doctor" or "doctor McCoy" and Kirk "captain" or "captain Kirk." With their allotted power, Kirk and Bones dominate Spock and Scott further; Spock, who is half human, half Vulcan, is persistently badgered to embrace his human side. Spock's dual heritage as a human and Vulcan implies "possibilities of connections across species differences" in the future (Ferguson, Ashkenazi, Schultz 215) but Kirk and Bones' insistence that Spock embrace his human heritage shows an interesting metaphor for Eurocentricity in the future: geocentricity.

Spock describes his two sides in "The Enemy Within" as being "submerged, constantly at war with each other." Kirk and Bones' urging for Spock to abandon his alien heritage seems insensitive at first glance but is more consequential in the linguistic market of the *Enterprise* where suggestions to be more human serve as insults to Spock.[17] An insult is "a kind of curse" when exchanged as capital in a market, a word or phrase that "attempts to imprison its victim in an accusation which also depicts his destiny" (Bourdieu 121). It seems that Spock's destiny is to be ridiculed, or to finally assimilate fully to human life. Spock, when not pressed to adopt more emotional responses to situations, is insulted by being called a computer by Bones; Spock recognizes that computers "make excellent and efficient servants" ("The Ultimate Computer"). Bones' insults classify Spock as not only unresponsive to emotion but also as a subservient and

---

[17] In "Devil in the Dark," Kirk suspects that Spock is "becoming more and more human all the time." Spock reacts, "Captain, I see no reason to stand here and be insulted."

inferior life form to humans. The fact that Spock interprets advice to "be more human" as an insult and that he understands the associations of Bones' "computer" insult shows that Spock is indeed dominated and destined to remain so.

Spock experiences a unique market as a half human, half alien first officer in another way; he is only referred to as "Mr. Spock" in formal settings or occasionally when his expertise is needed. Typically, Spock is simply called "Spock" but this is not like what Kirk and Bones share in their informal exchange. We learn in "This Side of Paradise" that Spock does indeed have a first name, but humans are incapable of pronouncing it. The alien nature of Spock is compounded in this linguistic failing humans have in relation to the Vulcan language. In Kirk and Bones' personal market, "Spock" is not an exclusive name used by the privileged, but simply a monosyllabic utterance, a label: "Spock," a hybrid thing who has little legitimate power and no true identity.

Spock is a sign for "Othered" races, the socially and politically underrepresented, which appear in *Star Trek* as equals or superiors to dominant races, in this case, American whites. Race, according to Henry Louis Gates Jr., is the "trope of ultimate, irreducible difference between cultures, linguistic groups, or practitioners of specific belief systems [...]" (1894). The ultimate, racial differences between people in the *Star Trek* universe have been erased, but the differences between human and alien cultures are just beginning to be explored and obviously not accepted by humans. Differences between human/alien cultures in *Star Trek* represent racial differences in the program's notably socially turbulent moment of creation. My Bourdieulian view of Spock's place in *Star Trek* illustrates what Gates sees as carelessly used language, utilized by either Kirk/Bones or the writers of the show, that makes racial differences seem natural. As

Gates sees it, language has the potential to worsen cultural differences instead of rectifying them (1894). In the attempt to show a future where cultural differences have been rectified, *Star Trek* is unable to ignore questions of race from its originary moment, and casts Spock in a role of difference, one that is seemingly natural and irreconcilable unless the difference is erased by Spock's full human assimilation.

The dominance of Montgomery Scott is shown in a more obvious way; he is nearly always ordered away from the bridge in an emergency. While it would appear that Scott is returning to his battle station in the engineering deck, he is in fact pushed away from a position of power both symbolically and in proximity. Not surprisingly, as Scotty heads to the lower engineering levels of the ship in tense moments, Bones, if not already present, reports to the bridge replacing Scotty. Montgomery Scott never develops an identity outside of his work as an engineer, unlike Kirk and Bones who become an institution through their investiture. Scotty is simply an engineer who must tend to the engines while more powerful men take responsibility for the actions of the *Enterprise*.[18] The oppression of Scotty in red alert conditions is the paradigm of class construction. The struggle between established classes, in which language is used as a means of gaining power, is derived from that class construction (Bourdieu 130).

The division between "captain" and "engineer" extends beyond Starfleet rank by creating social classes within the hierarchy of military rank. Scotty is an example of a crewman who must "discover within [himself] common properties that lie beyond the diversity of particular situations which isolate, divide and demobilize" (Bourdieu 130).

---

[18] Interestingly, James Doohan claimed in an interview that he portrayed Scotty based on a cultural stereotype; all the best engineers he had known or heard about were Scottish ("Birth of a Timeless Legacy").

With a sense of inner strength and autonomy Scotty may have power to operate on his own or even command when in the engineering deck, away from the domineering market that Bones and Kirk oversee, but Scotty's social identity and place on the *Enterprise* is entirely dependent on the "state of symbolic relations of power" in the local market (130). Ultimately, no matter the autonomy that may be exercised on the engineering deck, Scotty is under the power of the captain[19] and, through the symbolic power of the investiture of "doctor," Bones. No matter what Scotty believes he is or what he is capable of, his position as an engineer, not "captain" or "doctor," will always deny him recognition of individuality and equal worth to Kirk and Bones.

If Kirk and Bones' behavior were not enough to reveal power struggles of the 1960s thriving in the future through the magic of language, then Kollos, a formless ambassador of the Medusan race, explicitly discloses the way that language factors into human interaction and how it reveals attempts at gaining power. In "Is There In Truth No Beauty?" Kollos experiences new sensations and thought patterns in Spock's body. From all of the new feelings and thoughts Kollos is now a part of, he finds the use of language to be the most fascinating thing: "This thing you call 'language' though, most remarkable—and you depend on it for so very much. But is any one of you really its master?" Language aboard the *Enterprise* is not simply a means of communication but a way to classify and dominate individuals, which Bourdieu explicitly identifies and which Gates suggests will happen when language is used carelessly. If anyone could represent

[19] "The Enterprise Incident" reveals the totality of Scotty's servitude to Kirk when he is ordered by a Romulan commander to answer a question. Scotty responds that he will only follow the orders of Captain James T. Kirk.

an answer to Kollos' rhetorical question, or Bourdieu and Gates' anxieties toward language, it would be either Kirk or Bones. Although Kirk and Bones use language to create power and keep it while dominating those around them with linguistic capital, they too are a part of a class system but just happen to be of the dominating class. Seemingly Kirk and Bones are masters of their language because they can exploit their market with exclusive linguistic capital and attain profits. But the captain's and doctor's respective struggles to keep their power from being taken from them by another in "The Enemy Within" and "This Side of Paradise" is indicative of their role in a larger power structure. Kollos, then, is alluding that captain Kirk and doctor McCoy, though dominant, are vying for power as passionately as the oppressed.

Immediately after his commentary on language, Kollos reflects on the human condition: "But most of all, the aloneness. You are so alone. You live out your lives in this shell of flesh, self-contained, separate. How lonely you are. Terribly lonely." The juxtaposition of Kollos' thoughts on language and human relationships is no coincidence. The *habitus* of *Star Trek*'s creation is recognized; even to an alien being that is temporarily in the stead of a humanoid, the connection between language and a society of lonely, segregated peoples is clear. In the power struggle that results from human interaction and classification, the only tool available to *all* classes to better their situation is language. The employment of legitimate language to dominate or to escape domination is what Bourdieu calls "the process resulting from the *competitive struggle* which leads each agent, through countless strategies of assimilation and dissimilation […] while maintaining, precisely by running in the race, the disparity which underlies the race" (64).

The exact origins of "the race" for recognition in the *Star Trek* universe come from the race in the world *Star Trek* was written in.

But the thing that possibly reveals *Star Trek*'s connection to its originary moment most clearly is the role of women in the race for recognition. The struggles of women in *Star Trek* point not only to the treatment of women in the 1960s, but also to a larger trend in sf. Lynn F. Williams sees "happiness, or at least social viability, is achieved by keeping the sexes physically apart from each other" in sf (157). In *Star Trek*, men and women freely mingle in various respects, but the physical separation is subtly powerful. On the *Enterprise* and throughout all of Starfleet, women are kept apart from power and the captain's chair. The episode "Turnabout Intruder" reveals the mandate that women may not serve as captains for the first time in the series. Although women may not serve on the bridge as captains, they may be communications officers, like Nyota Uhura. While Uhura has been praised as a thoughtful and progressive inclusion in the series, her role is essentially "a cross between secretary and telephone operator" (Ferguson, Ashkenazi, Schultz 216). Frequently featured female characters, like the chief nurse, Nurse Chapel, and the captain's personal assistant, Yeoman Rand, are seen by Cassandra Amesley as existing solely to function as "sexual decoration" whose purpose is "to lust after the men" (328). However, Amesley notes that the reverse, men lusting after the women, does not occur because the text of *Star Trek* was formed so this interest could not exist and so women could never have the men they lusted after;

> "The text constantly constructs resistance to temptation, particularly sexual temptation, as loyalty to the task, and so the women's constant emphasis that they

are attracted to the men, and the men's resistance to their overtures, is embedded in many stories" (338). [20]

Emphasizing strong work ethic and resisting temptation may speak to moral values[21] of the time, but what is clearly underlined in *Star Trek* is men's power over women. Ferguson, Ashkenazi, and Schultz recognize the social progressivism of *Star Trek* in its questioning of "self and other" (214) in social contexts but also point out, "conventional gender identity generally went unchallenged" (215). If *Star Trek* were to accurately presume a future without gender roles, it would have had to represent women who do not, as bell hooks writes, "believe their sexual bodies must always stand in the service of something else" (91).

Overall, every female character stands in the service of a man. Whether part of the *Enterprise* crew or not, women wear revealing clothing in the *Star Trek* universe as an offering of their sexual body, a stark contrast to "the ordinary work clothes of the men" (Ferguson, Ashkenazi, Schultz 216) who wore long sleeved shirts and pants. The more

---

[20] The subject of Nurse Chapel's interest in Spock is featured prominently in "Return to Tomorrow" where Spock and Chapel make physical contact when possessed by the essence of another race. Kirk and Yeoman Rand have a less romantic encounter when Kirk is split in half and his evil side attempts to rape Rand. In both instances when the sexes are not kept physically apart or held to their duties as officers, at least one of the characters involved is not actually who they are written to be and are acting out of character.

[21] One moral value is obviously being a productive member of society by being a productive worker, but another is the understanding and implementation of proper sexual agency. bell hooks notes, "Before feminist movement […s]exist thinking taught to females from birth on had made it clear that the domain of sexual desire and sexual pleasure was always and only male" (85). While feminism was into its "second wave" by the time *Star Trek* was created, the indoctrination of male holding of sexual agency was centuries old and *a posteriori*.

visible female characters serve professionally subordinate positions to men: "Uhura as doorwarden; Rand as chatelaine of the castle; Chapel as acolyte worshipping at the feet of mystery/Mr. Spock" (216-7). The representation of women does not rest on only these three characters' shoulders. In fact, every female character in *Star Trek* either serves a man in some sense (we see this is true in races outside of the Federation in "By Any Other Name"), is seeking the favor of men (particularly in "A Private Little War"), or is incapable of handling the responsibilities that are attributed to men, like that of being a captain.[22] However, there is a single instance where a female serves as a military leader to be reckoned with. In "The Enterprise Incident" a female Romulan commander runs a ship holding an important cloaking device that Kirk has been ordered to retrieve. The female commander is tricked into revealing information and allowing Federation crew aboard after being seduced by Spock. Only after winning the affection of a man did the commander's attention to security and ability to lead flounder. Of even more significance is her race; the Romulans are hostile, feared, and of a darker complexion with pointed ears. It seems that the only way American writers could imagine female leadership in the 1960s was if it was alien and evil.[23]

---

[22] Instances in which women are seen as irrational, emotional to a fault, and childlike are legion throughout the series but "Turnabout Intruder" is perhaps the most explicit in this infantilization and demonization of women. In the episode, Janice Lester, a woman who is unable to live her dream to serve as a Federation captain, switches bodies with Kirk. The crew ultimately realizes Kirk is not wholly himself when he becomes increasingly emotional and illogical. This may, however, be a metacommentary on women's roles as Lester reflects, ""Believe me, it's better to be dead than to live alone in the body of a woman."

[23] Ironically, "The Enterprise Incident" was written by a woman, D.C. Fontana. I find this piece of trivia relevant to the discussion here because, as far as my research has shown,

Sexism in *Star Trek* is not a direct message to viewers that women should fill such subservient gender roles. In fact, *Star Trek* aimed to broadcast quite the opposite message. The role of the first officer, played by Leonard Nimoy, was originally played by Majel Barrett, the woman who portrayed Nurse Chapel. Her character, "Number One" was written to be "mysteriously female" and "probably [the captain's] superior in detailed knowledge of the multiple equipment systems, departments and crew members aboard the vessel" (Roddenberry 6). But producers considered having a woman partially in command of a ship too controversial and Barrett's role was switched to a more socially acceptable position for a woman, that of head nurse. Perhaps this casting change was relative to what the show's associate producer, John D.F. Black, considered to be a violation of a guideline in writing an episode; "Never ask your audience to believe more than one extraordinary thing" ("Sci-Fi Visionaries"). A woman in power was too extraordinary a thing in the 1960s to be included among all the scientific potentialities like molecular transportation and artificial gravity. I believe *Star Trek* does not advocate sexism but does display symptoms of "crude sexism that would be laughable if it did not reflect so clearly the attitudes of many in the real world" (Williams 157). *Star Trek* is simply a reflection of its time, a transmitter of consequential social struggles.

The struggles in *Star Trek* represent those that occur on earth, specifically in the 1960s, and particularly those that were being addressed in public like racial and gender equality. The characters participate in the subtext of a competitive linguistic market to gain and/or hold power unconsciously, just as the writers who constructed the *Star Trek*

Fontana did not intend to make a feminist statement with "The Enterprise Incident," leading audiences to wonder at the origins of the implicit code of this episode.

universe were unwittingly creating a cultural representation of power struggles and language's role in them in a landmark sf television show. *Star Trek* serves as a cultural artifact of an attempt at social progression. But in attempting to distance itself from stereotypes, *Star Trek* has shown itself to be better suited to represent stereotypes as "a form of knowledge and identification that vacillates between what is always 'in place,' already known, and something that must be anxiously repeated" (Bhabha 293). That which is addressed is precisely what constitutes portions of the commentary. Amesley suggests a "double-viewing" method of watching *Star Trek*, which accounts for seemingly socially progressive actions that actually affirm present conditions.

To double-view *Star Trek* is to understand that the program may be viewed at once as two things: visual stories involving characters that are real in some sense and as texts constructed by writers (Amesley 329). A character is not a total creation of the writers "but has a life separate from them; yet, in some way, he is subject to their whim" (329). Considering everyone in the *Star Trek* universe as "separate subjects" to writers and audiences is telling of just how far humans can evolve socially and how accurately sf can predict and depict utopia. If society's utopian future includes all races and sexes, such a future, by the standards of the 1960s, does not include recognition of such equality in social interactions. In other words, a utopia that evolves from problems of the present moment is presented on an aesthetic level, a response to a condition of "here" that looks forward, as indicated by future technology and social possibilities, but is constructed by the condition itself. While writers shape new worlds and futures that *look* like positive alternatives, actions and dialogue of characters may reveal something deeper about the nature of sf. Whether the characters are acting as autonomous beings or are vessels for

writers' messages, the *habitus* of an sf will inevitably be revealed in its recreation at some level.

Forward-looking sf that stems from conditions of "here" is not exclusive to the U.S. or the *Star Trek* franchise, however. In soviet Russia, the technological development of the light bulb prompted writers to construct utopian sf derived from Lenin's hopes for the country at that time.[24] Anindita Banerjee cites 1920s Russian sf as a forebear to "the rhetorical and cultural ground for Bolshevik utopianism about electrification" (51) and the positive projections of the future started by the electrification of Russia "resonated with the particular anxieties and needs of the Russian context" (51). A similar cultural resonance is found in sf from post-WWII Japan. Themes of rebirth from guilt caused by the war were transmitted through the image of the Pacific Ocean.[25] Thomas Schnellbacher sees "[m]odern Japan's geopolitical situation" as "the element most essential to the discourse in question" when discussing Japanese sf (382). The collective history and feelings of the present moment are transmuted into sf texts that have a strong tendency to be a product of a national interest, concern, or trend. Canadian sf, particularly that from Quebec demonstrates social patterns reflected in sf also. Sf from this region, or SFQ, contains themes of postcolonialism, which stem from the colonization of the area by the French. It has been argued that postcolonial themes of language, race, and politics in SFQ stem from "real events such as Cold War concerns, the threat of nuclear war, and

---

[24] "Communism is equal to Soviet power plus the electrification of the entire country" (Banerjee 49).

[25] Schellbacher interprets the Pacific Ocean as something that is "associated with Japanese national identity, specifically with pre-1945 Japanese imperialism and the idea of Japan as a Pacific sea power" (382).

the successes (and failures) of space programs in the USSR and the US" (Ransom 294-5). Use of these themes in SFQ range from sf of the 1970s until as recently as 2004 and come from respective political climates and regional concerns.[26]

Recognizing the birth of a sf from social patterns, like political climates, regional concerns, and local or global histories, may serve as a first step in developing Miller's "a naming of true names" or Gunn's "critical vocabulary" in sf criticism. I see interpreting sf as a product, not a critic, of a historical moment as a step toward understanding sf in a new way that will allow audiences to find new lessons about humanity in literature and lay the burden of reaching peaceful futures on readers, not texts. These are just some of many potential "benefits to be gained by introducing alternative approaches and methodologies to science fiction criticism" (Mendlesohn 119). Although Mendlesohn sees understanding sf as a product of society eliminating "the need to examine closely the construction of text and choice of language," (119) I find new opportunities to deeply examine all sf texts and ultimately reveal subtexts that speak to how human beings interact and categorize one another in any moment of reality, especially in regards to language and its symbolic power. Identifying present rhetorical effects in future oriented texts may allow sf to more clearly communicate its ideas of change too. If it is true that "[s]uccessful communication takes place by the development of a theory and its

---

[26] Other countries experience sf forming from local histories and social matters, like Australian sf that deals with the disappearance of Aborigines from sf and the scope of social perspectives (Attebery 385), or Latin American sf of the 1970s, which ceased to be produced "as many countries suffered from the consequences of dictatorship and repression" (Bell qtd in Ginway 471). Twentieth century sf from East-Central Europe is also evidently a product of its time. Stanislaw Lem's works have been cited to be "the product of the specific political and social tensions that developed after the 'thaw' of 1956 and the collapse of Party efforts to promote *socrealizm*" (Tighe 758).

refinement" (Mailloux 121)[27] then sf, after being understood and read as a historical document, can promote the futures that reflect equality and peace. At its most basic level, sf criticism stands to gain a new perspective on the role sf can play as a unique literature, pointing toward utopia.

---

[27] Tellingly, Mailloux makes this claim on rhetoric and praxis while looking at cross-cultural communication in an episode of *Star Trek: The Next Generation*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"A Private Little War." *Star Trek*. CBS. 2 Feb. 1968. Television.

"Assignment Earth." *Star Trek*. CBS. 29 March 1968. Television.

Attebery, Brian. "Aboriginality in Science Fiction." *Science Fiction Studies* 32.3 (2005): 385-404. Web.

Amesley, Cassandra. "How to Watch *Star Trek*." *Cultural Studies* 3.3 (1989): 63-77. Print.

Baccolini, Raffaella. "The Persistence of Hope in Dystopian Science Fiction." *PMLA* 119.3 (2004): 518-21. Web.

Banerjee, Anindita. "Electricity: Science Fiction and Modernity in Early Twentieth-Century Russia." *Science Fiction Studies* 30.1 (2003): 49-71. Web.

Barr, Marleen. *Lost in Space: Probing Science Fiction and Beyond*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993. Print.

Bell, Andrea. "Science Fiction in Latin America: Reawakenings." *Science Fiction Studies* 26.3 (November 1999): 441-46.

Bhabha, Homi K. *Twentieth-Century Literary Theory: A Reader*, 2nd ed. Ed. K. M. Newton. New York: Palgrave, 1997. 293-301. Excerpt from *The Sexual Subject: A Screen Reader in Sexuality*. London and New York, 1992. 312-23.

"Birth of a Timeless Legacy." *Star Trek: The Original Series: Season One*. CBS/Paramount, 14 Jan. 2004. DVD.

"Bread and Circuses." *Star Trek*. CBS. 15 March 1968. Television.

Brecht, Bertolt and Eric Bentley. "A Model for Epic Theater." *The Sewanee Review* 57.3 (1949): 425-436. Print.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 1991. Print.

"By Any Other Name." *Star Trek*. CBS. 23 Feb. 1968. Television.

"Catspaw." *Star Trek*. CBS. 27 Oct. 1967. Television.

Chernyshova, Tatiana. "Science Fiction and Myth Creation in Our Age." *Science Fiction Studies* 31.3 (2004): 345-57. Web.

Chu, Seo-Young. "Science Fiction and Postmemory Han in Contemporary Korean American Literature." *MELUS* 33.4 (2008): 97-121. Web.

Csicsery-Ronay Jr., Istvan. "Science Fiction and Empire." *Science Fiction Studies* 30.2 (2003): 231-45. Web.

Delany, Samuel R. "Some Presumptuous Approaches to Science Fiction." *Speculations on Speculation: Theories of Science Fiction*. Eds. James Gunn and Matthew Candelaria. Maryland: Scarecrow Press. 2005. 289-99. Print.

Domingo, Pablo Santoro. "Science Fiction in Spain: A Sociological Perspective." *Science Fiction Studies* 33.2 (2006): 313-31. Web.

Dziubinskyj, Aaron. "The Birth of Science Fiction in Spanish America." *Science Fiction Studies* 30.1 (2003): 21-32. Web.

Evans, Arthur B. "Gustave Le Rouge, Pioneer of Early French Science Fiction." *Science Fiction Studies* 29.1 (2002): 1-14. Web.

Ferguson, Kathy E., Gilad Ashkenazi, Wendy Schultz. "Gender Identity in *Star Trek*." *Political Science Fiction*. Ed. Donald M. Hassler and Clyde Wilcox. South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 1997. 214-33. Print.

Freedman, Carl. "The Strongest Link: SF as Social Register." *Science Fiction Studies,* 30.2 (2003): 176-8. Web.

---. "Polemical Afterword: Some Brief Reflections on Arnold Schwarzenegger and Science Fiction in Contemporary American Culture." *PMLA* 119.3 (2004): 539-46. Web.

"Friday's Child." *Star Trek*. CBS. 1 Dec. 1967. Television.

Foucault, Michel. "The Confession of the Flesh." *Power/Knowledge Selected Interviews and Other Writings*. Ed Colin Gordon. England: Ashgate Press. 1980. 194-228. Print.

Gasiorowski, Mark. "Dependency and Cliency in Latin America." *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* 28 (1986): 47-66. Print.

Gerlach, Neil, and Sheryl N. Hamilton. "A History of Social Science Fiction." *Science Fiction Studies* 30.2 (2003): 161-73. Web.

Ginway, M. Elizabeth. "A Working Model for Analyzing Third World Science Fiction: The Case of Brazil." *Science Fiction Studies* 48.3 (2005): 467-94. Web.

Grewell, Greg. "Colonizing the Universe: Science Fictions Then, Now, and in the (Imagined) Future." *Rocky Mountain Review of Language and Literature* 55.2 (2002): 25-47. Web.

Gunn, James. "Science Fiction around the World." *World Literature Today* 84.3 (2010): 27-29. Web.

---. “Touchstones.” *Speculations on Speculation: Theories of Science Fiction*. Eds. James Gunn and Matthew Candelaria. Maryland: Scarecrow Press. 2005. 301-309. Print.

---. “Toward a Definition of Science Fiction.” *Speculations on Speculation: Theories of Science Fiction*. Eds. James Gunn and Matthew Candelaria. Maryland: Scarecrow Press. 2005. 5-12. Print.

Gates Jr., Henry Louis. “Writing, ‘Race,’ and the Difference It Makes.” *The Critical Tradition: Classic Texts and Contemporary Trends,* 3rd ed. Ed. David H. Richter. Boston: Bedford, 2007. 1891-1902.

Guillory, John. “Multicultural Interlude: The Question of A Core Curriculum.” *The Critical Tradition: Classic Texts and Contemporary Trends,* 3rd ed. Ed. David H. Richter. Boston: Bedford, 2007. 1472-84. Excerpt from *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation*.

Hamilton, Sheryl N. “Traces of the Future: Biotechnology, Science Fiction, and the Media.” *Science Fiction Studies* 30.2 (2003): 267-82. Web.

Helford, Elyce Rae. “(E)raced Visions: Women of Color and Science Fiction in the United States.” *Science Fiction, Canonization, Marginalization, and the Academy*. Eds. Gary Westfahl and George Slusser. Connecticut: Greenwood Press. 2002. 128-38. Print.

hooks, bell. *Feminism Is for Everybody: Passionate Politics*. Cambridge: South End Press, 2000. Print

“I, Mudd.” *Star Trek*. CBS. 3 Nov. 1968. Television.

“Is There in Truth No Beauty?” *Star Trek*. CBS. 18 Oct. 1968. Television.

Jameson, Fredric. "'On Interpretation: Literature As A Socially Symbolic Act.' *Twentieth-Century Literary Theory: A Reader*, 2nd ed. Ed. K. M. Newton. New York: Palgrave, 1997. 181-86. Excerpt from *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. London, 1981. 17-102.

---. "Progress versus Utopia; Or, Can We Imagine the Future?" *Science Fiction Studies* 9.2 (2003): 147-58. Print.

---. "Reification and Utopia in Mass Culture." *Social Text* 1 (1979): 130-148. Web.

Lagon, Mark P. "We Owe It to Them to Interfere: *Star Trek* and U.S. Statecraft in the 1960s and 1990s." *Political Science Fiction*. Ed. Donald M. Hassler and Clyde Wilcox. South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 1997. 234-250. Print.

"Let That Be Your Last Battlefield." *Star Trek*. CBS. 1 Jan. 1969. Television.

Mailloux, Steven. "Making Comparisons: First Contact, Ethnocentrism, and Cross-Cultural Communication." *Post-Nationalist American Studies*. Ed. John Carlos Rowe. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2000. 110-25. Web.

Mendlesohn, Farah. "Science Fiction in the Academies of History and Literature; Or, History and the Use of Science Fiction." *Science Fiction, Canonization, Marginalization, and the Academy*. Eds. Gary Westfahl and George Slusser. Connecticut: Greenwood Press. 2002. 119-25. Print.

Miller, Joseph D. "Popes or Tropes: Defining the Grails of Science Fiction." *Science Fiction, Canonization, Marginalization, and the Academy*. Eds. Gary Westfahl and George Slusser. Connecticut: Greenwood Press. 2002. 79-87. Print.

Moylan, Tom. "'Social' versus Sociopolitical." *Science Fiction Studies* 30.2 (2003): 174-5. Web.

Panshin, Cory and Alexei. "Science Fiction and the Dimension of Myth." *Speculations on Speculation: Theories of Science Fiction*. Eds. James Gunn and Matthew Candelaria. Maryland: Scarecrow Press. 2005. 219-234. Print.

"Patterns of Force." *Star Trek*. CBS. 16 Feb. 1968. Television.

Rabkin, Eric S. "Science Fiction and the Future of Criticism." *PMLA: Special Topic: Science Fiction and Literary Studies: The Next Millenium* 119.3 (2004): 457-73. Web.

Ransom, Amy J. "Oppositional Postcolonialism in Quebecois Science Fiction." *Science Fiction Studies* 33.2 (2006): 291-312. Web.

"Return to Tomorrow." *Star Trek*. CBS. 9 Feb. 1968. Television.

Roddenberry, Gene, prod. "Star Trek (First Draft)." CBS. 11 March 1964. Print. Transcript.

Rottensteiner, Franz. "Recent Writings on German Science Fiction." *Science Fiction Studies* 28.2 (2001): 284-90. Web.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1978. Print.

"Sci-Fi Visionaries." *Star Trek: The Original Series: Season One*. CBS/Paramount, 14 Jan. 2004. DVD.

Schnellbacher, Thomas. "Has the Empire Sunk Yet? The Pacific in Japanese Science Fiction." *Science Fiction Studies* 29.3 (2002): 382-96. Web.

Scholes Robert. "The Roots of Science Fiction." *Speculations on Speculation: Theories of Science Fiction*. Eds. James Gunn and Matthew Candelaria. Maryland: Scarecrow Press. 2005. 205-17. Print.

"Shore Leave." *Star Trek*. CBS. 29 Dec. 1966. Television.

Slusser, George, and Daniele Chatelain. "Conveying Unknown Worlds: Patterns of Communication in Science Fiction." *Science Fiction Studies*. 29.2 (2002): 161-85. Web.

Slusser, George. "Multiculturalism and the Cultural Dynamics of Classic American Science Fiction." *Science Fiction, Canonization, Marginalization, and the Academy*. Eds. Gary Westfahl and George Slusser. Connecticut: Greenwood Press. 2002. 103-17. Print.

Small, Elizabeth. "Religious Institutions in Spanish Science Fiction." *Science Fiction Studies* 28.1 (2001): 33-48. Web.

"Spectre of the Gun." *Star Trek*. CBS. 10 Oct 1968. Television.

"Space Seed." *Star Trek*. CBS. 16 Feb. 1967. Television.

Suvin, Darko. "Estrangment and Cognition." *Speculations on Speculation: Theories of Science Fiction*. Eds. James Gunn and Matthew Candelaria. Maryland: Scarecrow Press. 2005. 23-35. Print.

Thacker, Eugene. "The Science Fiction of Technoscience: The Politics of Simulation and a Challenge for New Media Art." *Leonardo* 34.2 (2001): 155-58. Web.

"The Devil in the Dark." *Star Trek*. CBS. 9 March 1967. Television.

"The Changeling." *Star Trek*. CBS. 29 Sept. 1968. Television.

"The Enemy Within." *Star Trek*. CBS. 6 Oct. 1966. Television.

"The Enterprise Incident." *Star Trek*. CBS. 27 Sept. 1968. Television.

"The Man Trap." *Star Trek*. CBS. 8 Sept. 1966. Television.

"The Omega Glory." *Star Trek*. CBS. 1 March 1968. Television.

"The Ultimate Computer." *Star Trek*. CBS. 8 March 1968. Television.

"This Side of Paradise." *Star Trek*. CBS. 2 March 1967. Television.

Tighe, Carl. "Stanislaw Lem: Socio-Political Sci-Fi." *The Modern Language Review* 94.3 (1999): 758-77. Web.

"Turnabout Intruder." *Star Trek*. CBS. 3 June. 1969. Television.

Wallmann, Jeffrey M. "Flight of Passage: Space Travel as the Metaphoric Crossing of the Threshold." *Space and Beyond: The Frontier Theme in Science Fiction*. Ed. Gary Westfahl. Connecticut: Greenwood Press. 2000. 95-100. Print.

Wilcox, Clyde. "Social Science in Space and Time." *Space and Beyond: The Frontier Theme in Science Fiction*. Ed. Gary Westfahl. Connecticut: Greenwood Press. 2000. 143-50. Print

Williams, Lynn F. "Men and Women in Separate Spaces." *Space and Beyond: The Frontier Theme in Science Fiction*. Ed. Gary Westfahl. Connecticut: Greenwood Press. 2000. 157-61. Print.

Williamson, Jack. "On the Final Frontier." *Space and Beyond: The Frontier Theme in Science Fiction*. Ed. Gary Westfahl. Connecticut: Greenwood Press. 2000. 49-52. Print.