

## Women at Warp Episode 229: Anglo-American Empire in Star Trek

[Women at Warp theme]

**Jarrah:** Hi, and welcome to Women at Warp: A Star Trek Podcast. Join us on our continuing mission to explore intersectional diversity in infinite combinations. My name is Jarrah, and thanks for tuning in. With me today is Andi.

**Andi:** Hello.

**Jarrah:** And special guest, Fiona.

**Fiona:** Hi there.

**Jarrah:** And before we get into our main topic and let Fiona tell us a bit more about herself, we have a little bit of housekeeping to do first. Our show is made possible by our patrons on Patreon. If you'd like to become a patron, you can do so for as little as a dollar a month and get awesome rewards, from thanks on social media up to silly watch-along commentaries. Visit [patreon.com/womenatwarp](https://patreon.com/womenatwarp).

Looking for podcast merch? Check out our TeePublic Store. There are so many designs with new ones being added all the time and on so much more than just T-shirts. We have notebooks, masks, tote bags, things like that. Find it at [teepublic.com/stores/womenatwarp](https://teepublic.com/stores/womenatwarp).

Now, I also have one other important item of housekeeping, which is that it was recently Fiona's birthday.

**Andi:** Woo-woo.

**Jarrah:** So, we're going to wish Fiona a very happy birthday.

**Andi:** She gets all her patron rewards on the same episode. We were just like, "Synergy, that's how we roll."

[laughter]

**Fiona:** Thank you. [laughs]

**Jarrah:** All right. So, Dr. Fiona Davidson is an Associate Professor of Geosciences at the University of Arkansas. So, Fiona, tell our listeners a bit about yourself and your connection to *Star Trek*.

**Fiona:** Hi, everyone. Well, I've had a connection to *Star Trek* since I was a little kid. One of my very first sort of formative memories of television is *The Lights of Zetar*. The sparkly lights in *The Lights of Zetar*. But I was too young then to really know what was going on. So really, I got into *Star Trek* as a teenager when it was on syndication on BBC Two at teatime. That was in the late 70s, and so then I watched the films. And then by the time *Next Generation* came along, I was in graduate school and became a thing for us all to get together and make a big batch of chili or spaghetti and drink wine and watch *Star Trek* and then talk about it incessantly.

[chuckles]

**Fiona:** And so that kind of got at me through my last few years of graduate school. And then *Deep Space Nine* started and I was absolutely hooked. And *Deep Space Nine* is and has

always been my favorite *Star Trek* since it came about. And then, the JJ Abrams movies came along and they were fun. They weren't necessarily what I expected to be a *Star Trek*, but they were fun. Got me back into it, and it got me into fandom for the first time really for *Star Trek*. And then, we got new Trek, beginning with *Discovery* in 2017, and I was hooked from the first moment.

And by then, I was also looking at *Star Trek* from a critical theory point of view. My sort of large-scale research is in American elections, and I'm one of the authors of the four-year atlas of the American presidential elections. And that's really data heavy. Gets not tedious, but it certainly gets overwhelming. And so, it's really nice to branch off into critical theory and do something else. And so, this is my something else. My something else is looking at the geopolitics of *Star Trek*.

**Andi:** Very cool.

**Jarrah:** Fabulous. And, yeah, I feel that about how it's nice to have something else. And also, for us, it's critically analyzing *Star Trek*.

**Fiona:** [laughs] Yes, exactly. Yeah.

**Jarrah:** Today, we're going to build on our recent episode about diversity and progressivism in *Star Trek*. In that episode, we talked about times where *Star Trek* has been able to put forward diverse casts of characters while struggling to convey truly progressive or radical messages. So, Fiona, that was also a topic that you had suggested. Did you have thoughts that you wanted to add on to that discussion and how it connects to our topic today?

**Fiona:** From my personal perspective, because I am a professional woman in the US, one of the things that always fascinated me was, in the 24th century, professional women are still taking their husband's last names, which is something professional women in the 21st century don't necessarily do. And that is also a very Anglo-western perspective on that particular naming tradition, because that's not what perhaps even most of the women globally today do. And so, it was interesting to me that they never managed to get outside the box, to think outside that box. They do it occasionally, but even really prominent women like Beverly Crusher, who is Beverly Crusher, and Beverly Picard, and then Beverly Crusher again, but she's never Beverly Howard. Or Lwaxana Troi, who is an incredibly prominent woman on her own planet, takes the name of a lowly Starfleet lieutenant when she gets married. And it just strikes me as very odd that we're being so progressive, but we can't walk away from some of these very basic western ideas about what it is to be a culture and what it is to be a society.

More broadly, I literally just watched *Hegemony* again, Season 2, Episode 10 of *Strange New Worlds*. And it was fascinating to me that the meta narrative of that episode is almost exactly the same as the meta narrative of *TOS* from 60 years ago. So, I do find it interesting that we've progressed in some ways, especially in terms of things like representation, but the message really is not changing very much.

**Jarrah:** Mm-hmm. Well, that's a great segue into our topic today, which is about [Fiona laughs] some of the things that underpin the message of *Star Trek*. And we're particularly looking at a topic that you've done a lot of research about and that you're writing about, which is how the United Federation of Planets is a manifestation of Anglo-American empire.

**Fiona:** Yes. From its very basic inception as Roddenberry's sort of-- and having said that, I'm not sure when Roddenberry started *Star Trek*, he really had a particularly good conception of what *Star Trek* was going to become. But nonetheless, he has some basic ideas behind it. And Roddenberry was fascinating, because Roddenberry was very much a Woodrow Wilson

universal liberalism, sort of post-World War II American thinker in that sense, that the world would be made safe by this expansion of universal liberalism, which was something that Woodrow Wilson began in World War I.

And those ideals are sort of based on very basically far back, based on things like Greek and Roman ideals, but essentially come out of the enlightenment. And this enlightenment idea that there are universal values, and those universal values should be applied to everyone, and that everybody should want to be a part of those universal values, which I think is the most interesting thing, of course. Because that's when we get into this idea of hegemony and a hegemonic power, which is essentially what the United Federation of Planets is. It's a benign hegemony.

**Andi:** Mm.

**Fiona:** Even-- Oh. So-- Okay, it likes-- [crosstalk]

**Andi:** [laughs]

**Jarrah:** [laughs] It thinks of itself as a benign--

**Andi:** [laughs] I love that my first contribution to this discussion, while y'all are talking, is just, "Hmm, is it though?" [chuckles]

**Fiona:** Is it though? Yes. Well, that's the whole point. Is it's a benign hegemony in the same way that the British empire thought of itself as a benign hegemony? The American empire thinks itself?

**Andi:** Yeah, that's [crosstalk] where I was getting at there is like, they very much view themselves as benign, whether they are actually benign, I think it's really hard to fully analyze your own behavior, and by this, I mean not just as a personal person, even though it is. That's why we go to therapy, right? [chuckles]

**Fiona:** Right.

**Andi:** So, we can get a third party perspective on our own [unintelligible 00:07:47]. But even as a society or a country or a nation or a state, any of those things, if you're actively a part of that system, you're not going to be able to fully critique it because you are influencing it and biased by it. So, I really loved that right off the top, Fiona, you were like, "*DS9* is my favorite," because *DS9* is also my favorite. But I think what you're talking about is basically like *TNG* to me is about as purely liberal as you can get in terms of politics. And *DS9* to me is like the leftist reaction to that. And then, they very much are like, "Mm." And then they have all of these other characters that are outside this perspective because *TNG* and *TOS* is very much fully rooted in, "This is Starfleet. This is Federation." All our characters are from there. Whenever we're seeing characters from outside that, it's usually in conflict and either they're antagonist or we are benevolently again bringing them civilization or whatever you want to say. And then with *DS9*, you actually get fully formed and thoughtful characters that are outside of this system, and they critique it regularly and pointedly and well. So, that's one reason why I love *DS9* so much.

**Fiona:** Yeah. Eddington is always the one we bring up as the most obvious because it's a direct critique of-- and it's a direct critique in the language that I use, which is the language of hegemony. But Quark does it regularly. And also, the storylines-- or at least individual episodes of *DS9* do it in some very interesting ways. One of my favorite episodes is *In the Pale Moonlight* because it directly addresses the fact that life has to be more complicated than these simple decisions of being moral or being wrong. And I love the fact that we're

actually able to address that in *Deep Space Nine*. They don't do what they do in most of *Star Trek*, which drives me crazy, is that they do this deontological thing where your morals are the most important thing about you, and you get to stick to them and then the writers are going to fix it so that you get to be both moral and victorious.

**Jarrah:** Let me just jump in for a second. For folks that are from countries that also have like a big L liberal party, can we maybe just take a second to kind of define what is small l liberalism from this kind of universal idea? Like, what are the ideals that small l universal liberalism is purporting are these universal values or ideals?

**Fiona:** Well, I actually have this written down because we talk about what are these universal ideas that were a part of universal liberalism. It's the idea of the rights of self-determination at the community and personal level, and above all, the primacy of the individual. And these rights of private property, much of this is derived, driven from Kant and these ideas of the circumscription of space and the idea that you can own space and that you can control space and you can control land, and that there are groups that have the right to-- that you privilege the individual, and you privilege the legitimization of using force to protect property, these are all small l liberal ideas. And they become neoliberalism in the 80s under Reagan and Thatcher when they're actually attempt to expand that by deconstructing government. And I think *Next Generation* plays into that hugely, particularly once they bring in the Borg, is that's very much a neoliberalist way of looking at the world, is we have to destroy this whole idea of collectivism.

**Jarrah:** So, on that, because I definitely want to get more into the Borg piece and the whole like Eddington calling out the Federation and the Borg, there's also a paper talking about the similarities between the United Federation of Planets and the Terran Empire and are they really all that different. But when I saw the list of what are the values, I will admit that at first, I was surprised about the idea that *Star Trek* espouses the value of private property, because we also have this like *Star Trek's* luxury gay space communism. What I think though from what I've read and from what we've discussed, is that maybe it's actually more accurate that *Star Trek* is the way it is, just because of post-scarcity and not because it's really actually adopted any kind of collectivist values.

**Andi:** And we never actually see our luxury space communism in practice. They say it, but they don't show it. And they regularly undermine it with showing private property. Like Picard's a great example of that. Picard is the guy who said to us, "We moved beyond this," and all that, and then we smash cut to his palatial vineyard, and it's like, "Mm. Mm."

[laughter]

**Jarrah:** Well, plus it just has capitalist ideals in terms of the right being based on the individual. And some of even the episodes we talk about, as some of our favorite episodes in *Women at Warp* are like *Measure of a Man*, and these ones that are about what is the right of a human, and it's shaped by these same kinds of ideals. But it's like ultimately, the individual's right to self-determination is kind of paramount, as much as folks, Vulcans might say the needs of the many outweigh the needs of the one in *Star Trek*.

**Andi:** Yeah, it's another example of Spock says that all the time, but then as soon as it comes down to it, he can't give up Kirk.

**Fiona:** It's fascinating to me that we have this idea of the United Federation of Planets that is more than just humans, but it's never more than just human universalist values. Even the Vulcans, who Roddenberry clearly holds up as these paragons of virtue in terms of their morality, their logic, their rationality, they have two basic, fundamental tenets of existence, which are IDIC, and the needs of the many outweigh the needs of the one or the few. And

we almost never, ever see that actually come into play, every time we're faced with a choice. Whether it's Picard putting Titan up against the Shrike for the sake of Beverly Crusher, or whether it's Pike trying to save Tilly and putting his entire ship at risk, it always comes down to, we're going to risk the many for the one, and we're just going to rely on the writers to get us out of it.

**Jarrah:** So, this makes me think of *Galileo Seven*, because basically that whole episode is Spock trying to put that into practice, and both the writers and the characters acting like he's an inhuman monster for trying to put that idea into practice.

**Andi:** Mm-hmm.

**Fiona:** Yeah, occasionally people will say to me, "Well, it's a conversation between the United Federation of Planets and whoever else is out there. And we go out and explore these places and find these people, and we come to an accommodation." And I'm like, "No, it's not." Even with the people within the Federation, human values, or universal liberal values, which are human values, are never compromised to any great extent. It's not a conversation. It's our values are right, and you join us once you accept that. And that's hegemonic. That's what hegemonies do.

**Andi:** One thing I was thinking about, Jarrah, when you were talking about-- when you were segueing us from diversity versus progressivism, one thing that has always struck me is that there is a lot of diversity on *Star Trek*. But whenever you have a character that's othered and that has been brought into the ship, right from the beginning, Spock is again a great example of this, Worf, Ro, they bring them on, but then they expect them to assimilate to the broader culture pretty immediately, and those specific cultural practices are either smoothed away or just not shown again. And so, "Yeah, we are totally diverse, we welcome all perspectives," but not really.

**Jarrah:** Yeah. It's very much turned into the melting pot idea, or if you want not that much better view, that Canada prided itself on when the US was going down the melting pot road is that we're like, "Well, we're a mosaic." But fundamentally, the idea was that diversity was distilled into the three Ds, the dining, dancing and dress. And you can have your festival, and everyone will eat the food and look at how cool you're dressed and watch you dance and then feel good about themselves. But fundamentally, you're still working in the same capitalist nightmare that the rest of us are.

[laughter]

**Fiona:** Yeah, Ro always struck me. I remember having a conversation about it, and partly because, again, I think with Roddenberry's insistence that this had to mirror some kind of naval tradition, that we had to have-- all the men have to have short hair, all the women have to have their hair-- I mean, it's amazing to me how many women still have long hair and we're not allowed things like jewelry because it steps outside of the norm of the American military. I mean, I guess I was just glad that Riker got to have a beard.

**Andi:** Yeah, because beardless Riker is scary and should not be allowed. I look back at first year *TNG* and I'm like, "How did I handle this for so many episodes?"

**Fiona:** I know.

**Jarrah:** [chuckles]

**Andi:** I just didn't know better. I just didn't know. And then, as soon as I knew, I can't look at him. His face looks so weird to me.

**Fiona:** Well, I handled it because it was *Star Trek* back on the screen again.

[laughter]

**Jarrah:** Yeah. I mean, there's so many traditions in *Star Trek* that are directly taken from the navy, not to mention the names of all these ships that are also aircraft carriers and things like that. But yeah, let's go back to this idea about the Borg particularly, and the other ways that sort of the Federation is contrasted with the sort of big bads in the *Star Trek* universe.

**Fiona:** Well, *Star Trek*, the writers and the showrunners have always defaulted to using American antagonists as the big bad in some way or-- I mean, this goes all the way back to Gene Coon, who comes in and says, "We want the Klingons to be Asiatic Mongols, but we all know that they're representing the Soviets." So, not only are we othering them in terms of ideology, but we're going to make sure they don't look like us either, because we don't want our others to look like, and then the Romulans, of course, are the Chinese because they're mysterious. This is before Nixon has gone to China. So they're mysterious and ruthless.

**Andi:** And inscrutable.

**Fiona:** And inscrutable, exactly, yes. And then *Star Trek* continues to do that. And so many of the *TOS* episodes are based directly on that conflict with the Soviets, whether it's mediated through the story of Vietnam or it's mediated through things like the US spying on North Korea. And we always come out, we're always the good guys, we've always got this protagonist-centered morality that says whatever we're doing is good because we are the good guys and we will not do bad things with this information or these acts.

And then, we move to *TNG*. Well, I should say, of course, that plays out in its final form in the *Undiscovered Country*, which is very obviously indirectly, and Nimoy says it, and this is the fall of the Soviet Empire. "The Soviet Empire needs our help, and so we will go in and magnanimously help them, and then they will be civilized enough to join us." So, by the time *TNG* comes along, the Klingons are part of Starfleet.

**Andi:** I'm so glad you brought up *Undiscovered Country*, because that's one of the first things I thought of when we were thinking of this idea is *Undiscovered Country* is a great example of how it both reinforces and critiques this underpinning. You just went through how it reinforces it, but it also critiques it because it puts us in the very rare position of watching our crew be wrong repeatedly and xenophobic in a landscape in which we've been told explicitly many times that they're not xenophobic at all. Oh, but we are literally watching that, and the movie is very clearly saying that how they're acting is wrong. So, it's one of the few times you see that. But I also think it's pretty striking that now that the Klingons are going to be friends, they're all played by British white guys that are quoting Shakespeare.

**Fiona:** Yeah, of course. Of course.

**Andi:** So, how do we very quickly show that actually these people aren't other, they are just like us.

**Jarrah:** Well, and then the evil ones called Chang.

[laughter]

**Jarrah:** And has a Fu Manchu mustache. So, you basically made them all British except for the one that's obviously supposed to be the villain as per comic book stereotypes of racism. And it's also interesting because I think ultimately Kirk's arc in that movie is he has to come

to realize that this racism that he's holding against the Klingons, although I should call it prejudice, because he's individually not systemically racist, he is participating in a racist system, but his individual prejudice is ultimately something he has to let go of for a future of peace for both their peoples. But it's undermined by the fact that this is kind of shown in an authoritarian show trial leading to them then being put in a labor prison by the Klingons.

[laughter]

**Jarrah:** So, it's still keeping that the Klingons are not morally equivalent to us. I mean, [unintelligible [00:22:01] line about know human rights, the very word is racist is awesome, but it's still undercut as a message by the idea that, "Well, we should still feel superior to them."

**Fiona:** Then, we move on to *TNG*. It's clear in the first-- One of the reasons the first season is so problematic is they haven't figured out who the villain is going to be. And so, they give us the Ferengi, who are clearly supposed to be some sort of uber capitalist-- but they make them such a joke that-- well, we won't even talk about the anti-Semitic tropes that are in there, but they make them such a joke that you can't take them seriously. So then, it's like, "Okay, so who do we come up with that's genuinely threatening?" And so, what we come up with is this idea of collectivism, and collectivism as represented by the Borg. And it's interesting because if you look at the timeline of when the Borg come into play, it's when the US is starting-- it's when the Soviet Union has started to recede as a threat and China is becoming more threatening. And we actually see quite a lot of anti-Chinese media at that time.

So, we get this collectivist-- this idea that this collective behavior is terrifying and that reinforces the whole neoliberalist 1980s, we need to get rid of government so that individuals can be free to fail or presumably to succeed without the trappings of government. Which only works in the case of *Star Trek*, because this idea of post-scarcity has got rid of all of the uglier parts of neoliberalism. If you can't actually fail, then okay, theoretically, neoliberalism is okay. But that's not actually the lesson that's being taken from this. The lesson that's being taken from it is that neoliberalism is just fine, and that's what we should be doing because that's what supports the individual. And the individual is the primary unit of consciousness, whatever. I mean, the individual is the most important building block of society.

It reminds me of Margaret Thatcher's horrific line during the 1987 general election, which was, "There is no such thing as society." Her idea was there are only individuals, there's no such thing as-- And I think that's what *Star Trek* is reinforcing, deliberately or not deliberately, in *The Next Generation*.

**Jarrah:** Yeah, I mean, I think that they would say they have a society, but it's like a monoculture. As an ideal, it's a monoculture, which is weird because of infinite diversity and infinite combinations-

**Fiona:** Right. [laughs]

**Jarrah:** -and the diversity piece. You mentioned the sort of other characters, and then there's a lot of encounters with the stranger, aliens are very much like an individual who is the only one of their kind to meet the federation, like Saru or the Medusan in *Is There in Truth No Beauty?* Like, we see a bit of Zero's people in prodigy, but Zero is kind of the only Medusan that we interact with. And so, these are the exceptions that want to be part of the Federation or want to interact with the Federation, and then we get to pat ourselves on the back for look how inclusive we are when we actually didn't form a relationship with a people.

**Fiona:** Well, it didn't require the Federation to change in any way. And I think that's fundamental to this idea that we can interact with you so long as you accept that you're interacting entirely on our terms.

**Andi:** Mm. I think this kind of goes to another thing I was thinking about is the many times, especially in *TNG*, where we see the Federation doing almost like anthropological studies on other planets, which is just extremely patronizing. And the idea that, well, the whole idea of the prime directive kind of gets into this, where it's just like, it's very clear that we have reached the pinnacle of culture and society. And if you want to be a part of our club, you have to meet all of these criteria to become a part of our club. And we see multiple episodes in *TNG*, where we have planets that want to join the Federation. And there's very clearly, like, a process that is set out for them to join that. I think Jarrah and I, when we had our conversation on government structures-

**Fiona:** Yeah, I remember that.

**Andi:** -in *Star Trek*, we talked about how it's very clearly based on kind of like a European Union type thing, but then there's like, because one culture is so dominant, it's basically like, "Here's a checklist of all of the things we expect you to be like, and it's all of the ways you have to be exactly like us."

**Fiona:** Well, *Who Watches the Watchers*. But it's clear that in *Strange New Worlds*, they're still doing the same thing. In children of the comet, they have an entire society there that's a pre-contact society that they have a name for and that they apparently say-- and their name for themselves is, which means that their Federation is obviously spying on them. They know what they call themselves, but they're a pre-warp society. They're a pre-industrial society. So clearly, they're still doing that. They would still be doing it because it's *TOS* timeline, but we're still doing it in the sense that it's the 21st century and we're still constructing *Star Trek* in this way that says that this is a perfectly acceptable thing to do.

**Andi:** And I think one thing that comes out of *Strange New Worlds* particularly mirroring this, is *Strange New Worlds*, was very much set up to be *TOS* for a new generation. It's very clear that they're trying to go back to the basics with that and with *Star Trek* and that has pros and cons because I love me a standalone episode and I miss them. But we also have stuff like this.

**Jarrah:** What you said, Fiona and Andi, was making me think of the *Voyager* premiere, *Caretaker*. And I was reading E. Leigh McKagen's work on *Voyager* and imperialism and Anglo-American identity and American exceptionalism. And it was talking about basically the call that Janeway makes to destroy the array simply based on that they've decided the Kazon are morally inferior to them. And that the Ocampa are worth protecting. So, like, out of this guise of humanitarian intervention, which echoes a lot of US foreign policy and European, Canadian, Australian foreign policy, western white people foreign policy. [Fiona laughs] Realistically, did she really need to do that, given how limited the involvement was, that need to happen in that time frame that it was done without discussing with any Ocampa because of the prime directive, really. It was done without really discussing with the Kazon. And then there's a result of that, which is violence for the rest of the first couple of seasons. And it's just kind of framed as, "Well, this was a situation. We didn't ask to be part of it. It just happened." So, McKagen talks about this sort of hiding or like deniability of the imperial project of this thing, using the passive voice to just say, "This thing occurred," instead of, "We did this thing."

And the other example that I hadn't thought of was how the whole situation with the Hirogen essentially starts because they were like, "Oh, hey, we came across this ancient comms array," and the Hirogen say, "Don't use our shit." And they're like, "Well-



**Fiona:** "Well, we have to." [laughs]

**Jarrah:** -we need to send messages home and our needs equal our rights," basically. Yeah.

**Fiona:** The *Caretaker* also fascinated me because it took me back to *The Apple* and *Return of the Archons* where you have *Star Trek* or Starfleet making a determination that the Ocampa are being held back by the Caretaker.

**Jarrah:** Oh. Oh, my gosh.

**Fiona:** And that their society is being suppressed by and, of course, Kes feeds into this. But the fact is, again, without consultation, they remove their source of support, and because they can violate the prime directive, because in situations, and Kirk says this directly, I think in *The Apple*, because their society is stagnated and therefore it's not worth protecting.

**Jarrah:** Yeah. And that actually connects back to *Symbiosis*, it's very much neoliberalism, this idea that we know best for marginalized people, what they need and what they need is to pull themselves up by their bootstraps.

**Fiona:** Their bootstraps, yeah, exactly. It's fascinating. I will say, because we were talking a little bit about, are there times when Starfleet officers show an ability to think beyond that? And one of the really interesting episodes for me is in *Voyager's Endgame*, where we actually have Captain Janeway, not Admiral Janeway, but Captain Janeway, making a consequentialist decision to sacrifice her crew to preserve the Alpha Quadrant or to save the Alpha Quadrant from having to deal with the Borg. And that's really interesting because we don't often see that. Usually, we would see her-- because Admiral Janeway gives her all these reasons why she shouldn't do that. 23 people are going to die, and Chakotay is going to be devastated by the loss of seven. And it's really interesting to me that she makes that-- But again, the writers get us out of it and give us both. But I think that is an example where you do actually have somebody making what would be a Starfleet-- the highest ideals of Starfleet decision and upholding it.

**Jarrah:** Interesting. So, we've covered a fair amount of the pre-streaming era track. So maybe let's segue into *Disco*, because I know you have some thoughts on *Disco*, particularly Season 1, and then maybe some of the shifts we've seen towards Season 4. But yeah, we mentioned it a little bit on the diversity and progressivism episode. But do you want to get into the problems with *Disco* season 1?

**Fiona:** Yeah, Season 1. Again, I was hooked from the first moment we saw Georgiou and Burnham, I thought it was fabulous. And then it kind of went sideways in terms of, for me, in part because of what they did to Michael Burnham. Making her character go through what she had to go through was an interesting choice, let's say. But the fascinating thing for me about Season 1 of *Discovery* is what they do with the Klingons. And I'm not talking makeup. [chuckles] We're talking about, it is explicitly, and I'm not sure they would argue this, but it's explicitly again an American antagonist. In this case, you cannot divorce what they've turned the Klingons into from Islamic fundamentalism. I don't think that's possible if you look at it with anything like a critical eye.

They are a mytho-religious polity, which means their diplomacy and their entire structure is based on this idea of a religious callback. They're tribal, they're fractured, they are united by a religious call. They're talking about the threat of cultural erasure. They believe in total war with no possibility of compromise. There's Burnham talking about Klingon nature is violent, and you can't even negotiate with them unless they become more like us. There's even things like their use of suicide bombing, which they talk about in terms of that's how they

destroy Starbase 12. Or their use of beheading as a way-- even infants, as a way of-- And then, of course, they introduce it through Voq and through Ash Tyler, which they actually physically use somebody who manifests, who is a British Pakistani actor, to manifest that. There's no way to step away from that.

And I think that it was fascinating to me, and it really drives me crazy about *Discovery* Season 1, that you can't say that they must have been-- surely, they must have been aware of what they were doing.

**Andi:** I think it's quite fascinating to me how often-- as much as writers and creators are trying to produce a cohesive creative vision, how much of their biases sneak in subconsciously, which is something that I wish we had the same sort of primary source documents that we do for *TOS* through *These Are the Voyages*--

**Fiona:** Exactly, yeah.

**Andi:** --Or stuff like this because when you would read the behind-the-scenes stuff in *These Are the Voyages* by Marc Cushman, which Jarrah and I love to look at whenever we're talking about *TOS*. Because it's fascinating to me how many times I think that there is a very clear theme or character choice or whatever where I think like, "There's no way they didn't mean to do that," and then I'll read it, and they didn't mean to do that at all. And I'm just like shocked by this.

So, I do think that it's entirely possible that they meant to do that, but I think it's equally probable that they just didn't notice also. I do think that it's this interesting kind of relationship that we have as an audience member and as a critical viewer or reviewer because one of the things that I love to do through *Women at Warp* primarily is critique. And when you're doing that, it's a relationship between what the creative meant to do and then what you as an individual bring to the table in terms of your worldview and your experiences and knowledge, and it's like the actual end product is a melding of those two things. Which is why art is so personal. Which is why I can watch an episode and think, "Wow, hot damn, they really nailed that." In the same episode, someone else can watch and be like, "Wow, that was a terrible mess. What the heck?" Because we're all bringing our own thoughts and background and all of the feelings, like emotional resonances into interacting with that.

I think we sometimes project those thoughts back onto the art, and it doesn't necessarily mean it's wrong. It definitely doesn't mean it's wrong. It just means that it's a give and take. So, like you as a professor that thinks about these sorts of things regularly and is thoroughly grounded in these sorts of media takes, that stuff was really clear to you. But I don't know. [chuckles] I would love to see the memos, [Fiona laughs] is what I am saying. I would love to see the emails. Can we FOIA the [chuckles] *Star Trek* writers?

**Jarrah:** What I was going to say about Season 1 *Discovery* is that I think that it also doesn't help that we are pretty confident that they didn't critically think about race at all in Season 1 *Discovery*, or other things. But there was the whole thing with the first season of *Discovery* and the first season of *Picard* and all of the deaths of people of color, violent deaths of people of color, especially women of color. And so, I think that it's entirely possible that they replicated some seriously problematic tropes just by thinking like, "Oh, I really liked 24," and not thinking about it. I don't think they actively went out to say, "Let's demonize Muslims." But ultimately, those tropes kind of reflect the same stuff that's been done about Islam and Islamic peoples through media, and which was pretty explicitly the inspiration in *Enterprise* around the Xindi war. And there, we do have memos.

[laughter]

**Fiona:** Yeah, exactly. [unintelligible [00:38:15] calls it the television of fear, which comes around after 9/11. Yeah. And there's all kinds of things going on in Season 1 of *Discovery*, Lorca's relationship with Burnham, which is so very-- [crosstalk]

[chuckles]

**Jarrah:** Well, and we've definitely talked about the murder of Culber before.

**Fiona:** Yes.

**Jarrah:** I feel like another way we can go with this is-- another link for Season 1 *Discovery* is the piece that I referenced by Javier Francisco on the Federation versus the Terran Empire. And the argument is essentially that the Federation and the Terran empires share common challenges and that the only real difference is that *Star Trek* at least pretends to have a commitment to universal rights or equal rights between all of its citizens. But in fact, we see that Starfleet is critical for military, exploratory, political and commercial ties. That, as you were saying that we don't really see non-human ideals, and when I say nonhuman, I mean non-Anglo-American ideals being kind of adopted full scale. So, yeah, I just thought that was an interesting piece.

**Andi:** No, Jarrah, that can't be right, because Georgiou eats people, and we don't eat people.

[chuckles]

**Andi:** So obviously, we are very different.

**Fiona:** Yes, but remember, the Klingons eat people.

**Andi:** Yes.

**Fiona:** So, that's our other way of telling us that the Klingons are bad.

**Andi:** Well, I think that's part of the problem I have with the Terran Empire. And to be fair, some of the stuff-- This goes all the way back to TOS. Some of it is like cartoonishly evil. The whole idea of, "How do we show quickly that these people are bad?" "Let's have Georgiou eat a Kelpien." Like, it's just kind of over the top, which makes it kind of silly sometimes. When you're not really showing a nuanced version of the evil that you're seeing, it's easy to just be like, "Well, we're nothing like them." And then, it kind of devolves from there. It just becomes silly rather than thought provoking.

**Fiona:** And I think that's one of the problems, is if we keep using American or western antagonists as a mirror for these Starfleet antagonists, then what we're essentially doing, we're saying that the UFP is a future better us, but because we're using our own antagonists, it's very easy then to just see us as the good guys now. We don't need to be better because we're already the good guys. And I think that makes it really easy for a lot of viewers to just sit back and enjoy it and not think about it. And I think that's one of the reasons for me, at least, why Season 2 of *Picard* is so interesting.

**Jarrah:** Before we dive into season 2 of *Picard*, I was going to just dig more into what you were just saying about the, basically, "We're the good guys," and wondering how you view episodes like *In the Pale Moonlight* kind of through that lens where there seems to be some critique.

**Fiona:** That's why I love them because there is actually a serious critique of what's going on. In some ways, I'm trying to think, when is that? Early 90s, mid 90s, when there's actually a serious critique there maybe somebody's thinking about, these were the kinds of things we've been doing throughout the Cold War, and maybe we should think critically about some of the things we did during the Cold War. And you could argue that we did them for the right reasons or even just we did them to preserve our own way of life. Fair enough. But at least the recognition that these were not necessarily good things to do, I think, is really important in terms of-- and that's why I love that episode.

**Andi:** Well, think of how the Geneva Conventions came about. The Geneva Conventions didn't come about just because of Germany. They didn't come about just because of Japan or Italy. They also came about because there was a reaction from the American-English side that were like, "Oh, wait, we maybe went too far when we carpet bombed Dresden and killed a bunch of civilians." So, it was meant to be a way of reining back that impulse that comes up during war to do the wrong thing. But you can see even now in a modern context, people being like, "Well, are you saying we did the wrong thing when we dropped the bomb on Hiroshima?" Yes, that is what I'm saying. We did do the wrong thing when we did that. That was very clearly a war crime.

But I did want to bring up something that I was thinking of when we were talking about ways that *Star Trek* critiques this. This is another interesting example of ways it both critiques and reinforces, in that if you notice, almost always if you have a series bring up an antagonist or introduce an antagonist, your next series is going to have a single individual from that antagonist on your crew. So, think Worf, think Seven, think Quark, is a great example of that. He was the first Ferengi, but he's also like our best Ferengi. They bring them back and then they "humanize" them.

**Fiona:** Right.

**Andi:** And Hugh, you know what I mean? Like, they're going to come back and they're going to come back as like, "Hey, what if they're not the enemy? And what if they actually do have an individual personality that we should care about?", and all of these things. So, that is kind of a critique. It is a pushback on these are all our enemy, but it goes right into the woodchipper of that whole assimilation thing where this individual, not necessarily the whole group of them, but this individual is one of the good ones and they can serve with us on the Enterprise because Worf has assimilated to human culture.

**Fiona:** It's this idea that, again, this universal liberalism that the idea that you can only engage with us if you engage with us on our terms. And our terms are you have to accept these ideals. And once you do, then you're able to engage with us. It's this idea that you're an exceptional part, and you're exceptional because you've become more human. And I actually find this fascinating. It took me forever to figure out why I was never all that fond of Data, because I know he's beloved. And I realize it's for the same reason that I have issues with a lot of the characters in *Star Trek*, their highest goal is to become human, as if humans are apparently the highest form of life in the galaxy. Even at the end of *Wrath of Khan*, Kirk's ultimate compliment to Spock after he's dead is that, "Of all the souls I have known, his was the most human."

**Jarrah:** Yeah, that. And Kirk's comment there is also very ignores that clearly Spock would never actually explicitly say that's how he wanted to be characterized.

**Fiona:** Exactly. Spock spent his entire time trying to balance those two sides of himself. And so, I find it fascinating. And that human exceptionalism, of course, plays into American or western exceptionalism, because that's what it's reflecting. We are apparently the highest

form of consciousness in-- maybe not the most technologically advanced, but the one that everybody should aspire to. And that's why I have an issue with Data.

**Jarrah:** Maybe it's actually not that we're the best ones to aspire to, but just that we are the most confusing and messed up, and therefore the hardest to attain.

[laughter]

**Fiona:** Or in terms of hegemony, the most ubiquitous.

[laughter]

**Jarrah:** Yeah, that's true. It's just like a desire to fit in with the popular kids or the ingroup.

**Fiona:** If I want to be in Starfleet, which is doing all this cool stuff, I need to fit in.

**Jarrah:** Yeah. Let's go to *Picard* Season 2 with that, because I think there's some interesting comments in *Picard* Season 2.

**Fiona:** I find *Picard* season-- because *Picard* Season 2 was widely reviled amongst a lot of fans. The usual reason that people revile a *Star Trek* show is because, well, the writing was terrible. Well, I find that fascinating because, of course, the writing team, and it was written at just about the same time as Season 3, in which apparently, the writing is fantastic. And, of course, what it comes down to is, I didn't like the story in Season 2 versus I loved the story in Season 3. And I think one of the problems that people have with Season 2 is there's nowhere to hide. In every other *Star Trek* season, the antagonist is another of some kind. In Season 2 of *Picard*, the antagonist is us. And very specifically, it's us right now, right here. I mean, it came out in 2022, 2023, and it's 2024, but it's not removed in the way that, for example, we're removed in past tense or far beyond the stars.

**Jarrah:** Yeah. Or even in *Future's End*, where-

**Fiona:** *Future's End*, yeah.

**Jarrah:** -the antagonist is like one evil businessman, which we're also familiar with in our culture. Plus, stuff from the future.

**Fiona:** *Star Trek Picard* Season 2, they beam down into 2024 LA [laughs]. And they get it in its full homeless encampment, climate warming glory with Guinan's polemics-- I love Guinan's polemics in that. And ICE-- and I have to admit, my favorite moment in that is Rios' "You pledge your allegiance to a flag?" Man, that's hardcore. [Andi laughs] I would love to know if that was an ad lib, because that's not something I see the writers putting in there, because most Americans have a really hard time seeing how weird the Pledge of Allegiance is. Those of us who are politically aware and came to the country as adults are like,--

**Andi:** What? [laughs]

**Fiona:** What? [laughs]

**Andi:** That very much has shades of, they irradiated their own planet?

**Fiona:** Yeah, it definitely does. So, I would love to know if that was an ad lib, because it just feels like an ad lib to me. But yeah, we get the US 2024 in all its unvarnished glory, and I think people had a really hard time with that because there's nowhere to hide. And it's very clear that that is the genesis of the confederation of the 24th century, is allowing this to

continue along this path. So, while the bad guy theoretically is the confederation of the 24th century or 25th century, it's a function of what we are right now. I think people had a really hard time with that. And I have been reminded multiple times on social media that people just like to watch their science fiction, and they don't like to be reminded. I'm like, "Okay, fine. That's fine. You do science fiction your way and I'll do it mine."

**Andi:** [laughs]

**Jarrah:** Yeah. I feel like-- I'm not going to get us off topic. If you want to hear my thoughts on *Picard* Season 2, go listen to our extra long episode on that. But I definitely find that interesting. And then, how would you contrast that with the story that we see in *Picard* Season 3?

**Fiona:** I mean, from a meta narrative perspective, *Picard* Season 3 is incredibly conservative, which is a reason I think people-- again, that generation of *Next Generation* fans who are a little younger than me, but not much, love that because that's an inherently-- it's a nostalgia story. There are so many problems with Season 3 from my perspective, from the outside. From the inside, I love watching it. I mean, despite all his problems, I love Shaw because Shaw is a consequentialist. And we finally got to see a consequentialist captain. But the whole idea that the only way you can save the Starfleet and the Federation is by using old people, that everyone under 25 is not to be trusted? Yeah, well, plus we're going back to the existential threat of the Borg other. Season 3 is problematic for me.

**Jarrah:** In terms of Shaw, are you referring to both his-- "First of all, I don't even want to help you, Picard." And then also, "I'm 100% just giving Jack Crusher to these people."

**Fiona:** Picard fascinates me. And I met Patrick Stewart when I was 17 and he was in the RSC and he came to tea with us. So, I love Patrick Stewart. I've always loved Patrick Stewart. I find Picard fascinating because he allows Picard to be a complete and utter arsehole to almost everybody around him. But he's allowed to do that because-

**Jarrah:** He's Picard.

**Fiona:** -he's Picard and he's going to save the universe. The thing is, he doesn't know that as he's going, both season 1 and season 3, he doesn't know he's going to save the universe as he's making these decisions. He's completely deontologically saying that these are my morals and I'm doing this because it's morally right. And I don't care if other people die along the way. I'm not giving up. Now, at least in season one, he hires a ship, but in season three, he literally just tries to take a ship. And if we think about it, if we go back to the *Next Generation*, if some admirals had come on board his ship and tried to do that, he would have been Shaw, he would not have allowed them to just do that. And I think Shaw's right. He's the person who says, "I'm not risking 500 for the sake of 1."

**Jarrah:** He also sort of points out, "just because you're legends, you don't get to pull this crap."

**Fiona:** Right. And the whole idea that you're not doing this because ten episodes down, it's going to save the universe. You're doing this right now because you feel guilty about this girlfriend that you haven't talked to for 20 years. There's also a huge amount of privilege in there. Your average Starfleet grunt can't walk onto a ship and do that, but Picard can because he's a legend. So, he's using his privilege. And I've had lots of discussions with this. Well, you should always risk everything for one person.

And it was interesting because when *Picard* Season 3 came out, was right after Julian Sands went missing on Mount Baldy outside of LA. And I said, you know, there were times

during that rescue that they pulled back all the rescue efforts because it was too dangerous. Are they cowards because they do [crosstalk] and they have criteria under which you do certain things. Starfleet has criteria under which you do certain things.

And as an engineer, he's going to stick to those criteria because he understands the consequences. The only reason that people like Kirk and Picard and Michael Burnham does the same thing are able to do this is because they have the writers that back them up so that one in a thousand chance pays off and allows them to be both moral and victorious.

**Andi:** Yeah. Picard is always who I'm thinking of when I am laughingly making the joke of, whatever the captain wants is the correct decision. It is the moral and the correct decision.

**Fiona:** And I think they do that with-- I mean, they do it less with Sisko, but they do it with pretty much all the captains, that protagonist-centered morality drives *Star Trek*.

**Andi:** Yes, 100%, is definitely all of the captains that have this. I just think it's funny that Kirk is the one that has the reputation of being a maverick-

**Fiona:** Oh, boy.

**Andi:** -but he's not. Picard is very much the maverick in comparison to Kirk. And I think it's just funny that people have bought into this mythos of Kirk that just is not backed up by the actual text, and I think part of that is just a vibe thing. Like, Picard's so calm and he's British. He's just got all that going. And then, Kirk is just like sitting there and fingergunning, we think that Kirk is the one that's making the crazy decisions. If we're talking about the JJ Abrams movies, maybe that's a little bit more borne out by the text. But *TOS* Kirk is very measured.

**Jarrah:** Even though Picard is a character, is French, they were also colonizers. [laughs]

**Fiona:** Oh, yes.

**Jarrah:** So, they're not excluded from Anglo-American empire.

**Fiona:** Yeah. Although I did find it interesting, and I mentioned this in the notes that I sent to you. I find it interesting that in *Journey's End*, even though we have Riker, whose family is presumably still in possession of unceded lands, that what we have to talk about is the connection that Picard has to native American dispossession. And they have to stretch to get that connection where they have a connection right there. And I think that's trying to avoid making the audience uncomfortable.

**Jarrah:** Mm-hmm. Yeah, well, and this also-- *Journey's End* connects to another point that you had raised when we were chatting before the show about just like the borders of the Federation. So, do you want to talk a little bit more about that?

**Fiona:** This fascinates me as a geographer. The United Federation of Planets, the way they conceptualize space is fascinating to me and the way that we see it in terms of it being mapped. So, we see the mapping of the Federation frequently now. We see it during the Klingon war. And it's bizarre to discuss because it's a 3D space, and yet the only people who are members of the Federation are people who have-- this gets back to the prime directive. There are people who have discovered warp power. So, they are then invited to join the Federation. That means there must be hundreds, if not thousands of systems within what is mapped as Federation space that are not part of the Federation. So, the Federation essentially then is a Swiss cheese.

And what happens to those polities? What happens to those systems? So, we see with the Kileans in the first episode of *Strange New Worlds*, that even before we contact the Kileans, just the fact that they have warp power has April saying to Pike, "Well, we're going to have a new member of the Federation soon." I'm like, "Do the Kileans get a say in this?" I mean, is it just assumed that once you go to them because they've got warp power, they're now going to join? And then, we see the map, and the map is, "Well, here's all these systems that are actually members or are in the middle of joining." And we're like, "Okay, so everybody joins when they're contacted." I don't think that's realistic. But again, it reinforces this idea that the UFP is so attractive that, of course, the moment you get warp power, you're going to want to join it.

**Jarrah:** Mm-hmm. And then, the only reason you wouldn't is that we reject you because you're paranoid and xenophobic--

**Fiona:** Or you still have the death penalty, or your culture doesn't align with ours. But then, what happens to you because you're within UFP space, you can't ally with the Klingons. You essentially become isolated. So, the UFP gets to decide when you join, and it gets to decide if you join, and it gets to constrain you if you decide not to join.

**Jarrah:** So, we're real concerned with the self-determination of peoples until they develop warp becomes.

**Fiona:** Right. And I find it fascinating in that first episode of *Strange New Worlds* that not only do we assume they're going to join, but when it looks like they might not, Pike's response is gunboat diplomacy. I mean, he brings the Enterprise into orbit in a way that they very clearly can see that he's got what-- can I say this? A fucking big ship?

**Jarrah:** Yeah.

[chuckles]

**Fiona:** And he's going to use it if they don't comply. And I like the fact that the writers clearly thought they were being at least a little bit progressive by having January the 6th imagery in there as to how we were getting screwed up. But it's like, okay, are you giving these people a choice? Does the UFP really give you a choice when you develop warp power? And what choices do you have prior to warp power? You have the choice to be spied on by the UFP until they think you're ready. [laughs] So, yeah, the conceptualization of-- and the other interesting thing is that there's this idea that outside the Federation, it's a shit show. Everything outside the Federation is anarchic and chaotic. And there's human trafficking, and there's slavery, and there's-

**Jarrah:** Pirates.

**Fiona:** -pirates. And this is true in *TOS*. It's true in *Strange New Worlds*.

**Jarrah:** *Voyager* for sure.

**Fiona:** It's true, in *Voyager* for sure. In fact, that was where I developed the term, what outside the Federation is a shit show, when somebody asked me, "Well, what about *Voyager*?" I said, well, in *Serene Squall*, Pike actually says, "Well, this sector's is a version of the wild, wild west."

**Jarrah:** There are no rules.



**Fiona:** There are no rules. And we see it again in the 32nd century, the Federation doesn't exist, so it's all a shit show run by the Orions, until Michael Burnham manages to be the glue that sticks the Federation back together again.

**Jarrah:** Yeah, that connects to the point about how a lot of times-- is like, yeah, this imperialist, colonialist distancing about the wild, wild west and how somehow, we have narratives in our head that can acknowledge brutal genocide and colonialist violence, but somehow see that as separate from cowboy adventures.

**Fiona:** *Picard* Season 3 fascinated me because I write notes as I'm watching, usually the third or second time through, and it literally says the top of my notes for Episode 1 of Season 3 literally say, "Frontier Day? Give me a gift, why don't you?" Why don't we just call it Indigenous Genocide Day? Why do they have to use Frontier Day? And if we come back to *Hegemony*, the last episode of *Strange New Worlds*, that's exactly the same meta narrative that we're getting in *Strange New Worlds* that we were getting in the 1960s. We have this colony that looks like the American Midwest of peaceful agrarian people being threatened by these big bad-- it's kind of *Firefly's* reavers, which we all know that that Josh Wheaton based--

**Andi:** Yeah, oh, God.

**Fiona:** Yes, but they're doing the same thing with the Gorn. The Gorn are these terrifying other that are coming to disturb these peaceful Americans basically on the Frontier. And I literally just watched *Hegemony*, and it hit me. It's like this is the exact same meta narrative that we had in 1966, and that's distressing. I'm hoping that they're going to do something else with the Gorn eventually.

**Jarrah:** Yeah. I mean, we'll definitely see in the premiere of the next season because they've got a lot of stuff to wrap up. But yeah, it's troubling for sure. I feel like we've outlined why the universalist ideals and that kind of stuff is an issue and some of the issues that it obscures by just kind of putting out there that whatever this set of values is the way to go, and that it contradicts some of the Federation's other stated values, which is weird. But one thing I've tried to think about is basically, could *Star Trek* be any different at this point? Or, is there a way to incorporate some more of the pieces that are more challenging to that in a way that complicates that narrative or creates space for a different way of viewing the future?

**Fiona:** Well, I almost thought they were going to get there at the end of Season 2 of *Picard* when we had Jurati Borg and Jurati Queen, and the whole idea of the voluntary collective. And then they threw that away in Season 3. But if we at least saw, what does the voluntary collective look like? What does Jurati Borg-- because collectivism, especially voluntary collectivism, it's often written into a lot of American science fiction as sort of ecotopia. It's often part of that. And Kim Stanley Robinson's work very heavily talks about collectivism as the future. And I think that would be a really interesting way to go, is talk a little bit about that. Give us Jurati Borg, give us the collective of the 25th century that's a voluntary collective that's willing to help us and be part of our-- But that helps us without assimilating into universal values of individualism in particular.

Agnes' whole story in Season 2 is about her loneliness. Actually Season 1 as well, is that she is alone, and now she finds the collective is her way to deal with that. And I think that spoke to a lot of people who have that kind of isolation in our society, that this kind of collectivism is not necessarily a bad thing, that maybe we've taken individualism a little too far and we can look at the future, this version of the future, as maybe setting a little bit of that to rights.

**Jarrah:** Mm-hmm. Yeah, I know that I was conflicted about that, but ultimately, I do think that you're correct that's an interesting model and that it should have been explored further. And you could explore, what does a feminist technotopia look like? Because the other thing that is, I think, worth noting is that also historically, that dichotomy between individual collective has also been a dichotomy between masculine and feminine. And so, to privilege individualism above all else has been to, I mean it--

**Fiona:** Privilege the male.

**Jarrah:** Yeah. And it underpinned American masculinity was synonymous with American exceptionalism in some. So, yeah, I think that's a really interesting suggestion as well. Maybe there are some other models that we can think of. I also think that the point that David Seitz makes, and I'm sure he's not the only one, but about the place-based organizing and solutions of *Deep Space Nine* and the way that by staying in one place, although that gets slagged by some fans, that was actually a radical thing, because it forces people to actually have to work stuff out with people who are different than them.

**Fiona:** Yeah, that's one of the reasons I love *Deep Space Nine*, again, because it allows you to move away from the problem of the weak and have you actually have long-term interactions. But *Star Trek* was-- *Star Trek* didn't do that because of Roddenberry's whole there is no interpersonal conflict in the 23rd century.

**Andi:** I think that it's definitely possible for *Star Trek* in the future to kind of critique and push back on some of these ideas, because they have in the past. They have in the past, they have explored some of these things in the past, they just haven't gone full throttle with it, and it hasn't been consistent. So, I think the biggest thing that would help is like someone actually needs to sit down and map out, "What does this society actually look like not a capitalist society?", because that is hand waved every-

**Fiona:** Absolutely.

**Andi:** -single time it comes up. And that, I think is the biggest problem is they're trying to build around that instead of building the foundation of what does that actually look like, and how would that actually impact our characters in a meaningful way. Instead, we just have throwaway lines that say it's communism and then act like it's still a capitalist society. I think that's the biggest flaw that is underpinning all of these problems. If they can address that, I think that they definitely have the-- or at least *Star Trek* in the past has had the range to tackle some of this, and that means that it definitely has that range in the future, it's possible.

**Jarrah:** All right. Well, I'm absolutely thrilled that we got to have you on, [Fiona laughs] Fiona, and that is about all the time we have for today. So, I'm going to ask if you want to plug anything that you're working on, and we'll also share links in the show notes, including to some of the pieces that we referenced in researching this episode.

**Fiona:** Yeah, no, I'm working on a book chapter right now in what will be a new book on the third age of *Trek* but probably won't come out till next year. We literally just have started.

**Jarrah:** I'm Jarrah, and you can find me at [trekkiefeminist.com](http://trekkiefeminist.com). And Andi?

**Andi:** Yeah, you can still find me pretty much anywhere you would expect to find me @FirstTimeTrek.

**Jarrah:** Awesome. To learn more about our show or to contact us, visit [womenatwarp.com](http://womenatwarp.com), email us at [crew@womenatwarp.com](mailto:crew@womenatwarp.com) or find us on Facebook or Instagram @WomenatWarp. Thanks so much for listening.

[Women at Warp theme]

[Transcript provided by [SpeechDocs Podcast Transcription](#)]