

## Bigger on the Inside, or Maybe on the Outside

Mark Bould

**Lindy Orthia, ed, *Doctor Who and Race*.** Bristol: Intellect, 2013. 308pp. £20.00 (pbk).

**Matt Hills, ed., *New Dimensions of Doctor Who: Adventures in Space, Time and Television*.** London: I. B. Tauris, 2013. 240pp. £14.99 (pbk).

**Paul Booth, ed., *Doctor Who*.** Bristol: Intellect, 2013. 164pp. £15.50 (pbk).

**Iain MacRury and Michael Rustin, *The Inner World of Doctor Who: Psychoanalytic Reflections in Time and Space*.** London: Karnac, 2014. xxvii + 339pp. £19.99 (pbk).

It must have been a slow news week at the end of May last year, and a confusing time at the *Daily Mail* offices in London. A bunch of presumably lefty – and foreign! – academics and fans were criticising *Doctor Who*'s racism.

Although the *Mail* knows, just knows, that the BBC is a left-wing conspiracy and that the corporation's privatisation is the very key to the survival of civilisation (see, for example, Kelly), the tabloid put aside its fury at public service broadcasting, rallied all the small-minded jingoism for which it is renowned and leaped to the series' defence. Momentarily abandoning its anti-immigrant scare-mongering and Islamophobic harangues, the *Mail*, whose long track record of 'not being racist' is why it is so widely revered as the keenest arbiter of such matters, set the record straight. Under a long-winded headline and a couple of pretty meaningless bullet points, we were presented, really quite surprisingly, with a not-inaccurate summary of Lindy Orthia's *Doctor Who and Race*, outlining some of its perfectly reasonable criticisms of the show as if they were damning indictments of the book. If that and a quote from some bland piece of BBC PR were not enough to persuade us of the nobility and justice of the *Mail*'s new crusade, then we should listen to the fans, who, the *Mail* assures us, 'dismiss such criticisms as "groundless" and "ridiculous"' (Hasting).<sup>1</sup>

Three days later, after rearranging the same paragraphs under a different headline (see Hasting and Sheridan), the *Mail*, confident that it had won over all right-thinking Britons by so roundly defeating the fearsome dragon-of-not-particularly-radical-cultural-criticism, retired from the field of combat. There were other dragons to slay. There are always other dragons for the *Mail* to slay. Many of them not from around here, or very slightly different in some way.

This peculiar episode in British journalism is every bit as intriguing as it was absurd. A television-series-turned-multimedia-franchise-turned-brand, that was long mocked by the tabloids for its wobbly sets and men-in-rubber-suit monsters but is now celebrated as quintessentially British and, especially in its revived version, as a global phenomenon, and that is aware of its public service commitment to a problematically construed and often only tissue-thin multiculturalism, suddenly finds itself being defended against charges of racism, on the grounds of its 'colour-blind' casting and other multiculturalisms, by the tabloid that elsewhere praised Prime Minister David Cameron for 'ending the failed multicultural era' (Forsyth). Here is a clear sense of *Doctor Who* as a British cultural institution, a sense so strong that a paper one would normally expect to deride fans as acne-ridden, anorak-wearing loners lacking social skills and female companionship actually identifies itself with them. Here also is a sense that the *Mail*, without this convenient stereotype to hand, cannot tell fans

---

<sup>1</sup> It would be churlish in the face of such a trademark *Mail* move – the crudely asserted anti-factual binary – to point out that half the book's contributors are fans, not academics, and that most of the academic contributors would probably also identify as fans or aca-fans.

from a broader general audience – but then, who can any more?<sup>2</sup>

The transvaluation of fandom is evident in *Doctor Who and Race*, which happily includes both fans and academics, each sometimes writing in modes more commonly associated with the other. This is not merely the outcome of some internet-enabled détente between two groups which were always far from mutually exclusive anyway, but a consequence of (and contributor to) broader shifts in cultural politics. Academics no longer have to deny personal taste, or even claim – as so many were still doing as recently as a decade ago – that their love of and interest in mass cultural products was, by some strange alchemy, ‘subversive’ or ‘transgressive’. In the UK, academics have spent the new millennium facing increasing pressure not only to publish (the RAE, the REF), but also to engage with wider audiences (the Knowledge Transfer, later the Knowledge Exchange, agenda) and thus have an impact (the Impact agenda) beyond universities. Simultaneously, the increasing marketisation of education, and of academic publishing, has led to a proliferation of books and journals deemed to have a crossover appeal to readerships outside academia. It is then unsurprising that the tabloid press should occasionally notice.<sup>3</sup>

Neither is it surprising that, in the year of *Doctor Who*’s 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary, there should be so many new publications on the series. Long gone are the days when you would have to wait a decade for a new volume, as we had to do between John Tulloch and Manuel Alvarado’s *Doctor Who: The Unfolding Text* (1983)<sup>4</sup> and John Tulloch and Henry Jenkin’s *Science Fiction Audiences: Watching Doctor Who and Star Trek* (1995). The four books under review here are just the tip of an iceberg sufficiently large it risks being used as evidence to deny climate change.

### ***Doctor Who and Race***

Orthia begins with the speculation that surrounded the casting of the eleventh Doctor in 2009. Would the role finally be taken by a woman or a person of colour?<sup>5</sup> Black actor Paterson Joseph was certainly the bookmakers’ favourite, and the BBC themselves reported that he was the front-runner, but the role went to white actor Matt Smith. Similar speculation surrounded Smith’s replacement, although suggestions that Chiwetel Ejiofor or Idris Elba might play the Doctor always seemed more like a bookies’ ploy to bilk punters than actual possibilities. The role eventually went to Peter Capaldi, and as much as one admires him, it was a disappointment – rather than a surprise – to see a middle-aged white guy being cast.<sup>6</sup>

*The Daily Mail*’s misrepresentations aside, Orthia’s edited collection does not treat racism as an either/or question or as some uncomplicated, singular phenomenon, nor despite the *Mail*’s righteous fury, does it claim that *Doctor Who* is straightforwardly racist. If Chris Hasting, the *soi-disant* journalist, had read the first page and a half of the book – or if his editors were more interested in facts than outrage – its position would have been clear: *Doctor*

---

<sup>2</sup> Matt Hills’ foreword to Booth’s *Doctor Who* postulates eleven different *Who* fandoms, and suggests there are inevitably more. In the same volume, Jeremy Sarachan asks if, in the era of digital social media ‘the barriers to becoming a fan have fallen, what is the difference between a fan and a typical viewer?’ (137).

<sup>3</sup> I have no idea how the *Mail* became aware of *Doctor Who and Race*, but I like to imagine the publishers figuring out which tabloid could be most relied upon to froth at the mouth at the mere thought of such a book – and such ideas – existing.

<sup>4</sup> This was the very first academic text I read, borrowed in mid-teens from a public library just because it was about *Doctor Who*, and painstakingly read from cover to cover with little real comprehension.

<sup>5</sup> There are now several precedents for such casting. In ‘The Doctor’s Wife’ (14 May 2011), the Doctor refers to the Corsair, a fellow Time Lord, as male and female, implying s/he switched sexes when regenerating. At the end of ‘The War Games’ (19 Apr–21 Jun 1969), when Troughton’s Doctor is given some choice about his regenerated appearance, one of the options presented to him is black, and in ‘Let’s Kill Hitler’ (27 Aug 2011) it is revealed that, in her previous incarnation, River Song (Alex Kingston) was black.

<sup>6</sup> Most of the controversy this time around came from showrunner Steven Moffatt’s ill-considered comments about casting a female Doctor.

*Who*'s 'negotiation of race-related themes has been diverse and complex across the decades' and 'its representations of race have been, by turns, insightful and ignorant, utopian and pessimistic, oppressive and liberatory. It has offered great hope for peoples opposed to racism in its many forms, and has perpetuated discourses of race that are deeply problematic' (4).<sup>7</sup> If Hasting had read the book in its entirety, he would also have discovered that it had no party-line on the series: different authors bring different perspectives, frameworks, insights, as well as differing degrees of willingness to condemn or condone the series' failings and to praise or circumscribe its successes.

Leslie McMurtry, for example, notes that regardless of John Lucarotti's 'historically sound' script for 'The Aztecs' (23 May–13 Jun 1964), the story itself falls into a long tradition of colonial fictions which divide indigenous peoples into "good" and "bad" Indians' (105). She traces it back to Cortés and Columbus, and its route into sf can be traced through westerns and imperial adventures (e.g., James Fenimore Cooper, Rudyard Kipling) to Wells's Eloi and Morlocks, Edgar Rice Burroughs's Barsoomians and the *Star Wars* franchise's Jawas and Tusken Raiders. John Vohldika outlines several variants of this structure in 'The Colony in Space' (10 Apr–15 May 1971), 'The Mutants' (8 Apr–13 May 1972), 'The Face of Evil' (1–22 Jan 1977) and 'The Power of Kroll' (23 Dec 1978–13 Jan 1979). In each story, the Doctor finds himself faced with a conflict between a "civilized" ... group or society whose attributes are defined by technology, city-style culture and rationalism' and a "native" ... group or society whose attributes are defined as being "close" to nature (living off the land) or described in the story as "primitive" or "savage" (125). While Vohldika's argument that each story's apparent degree of progressiveness – respectively, depicting a colony fighting for independence from its homeworld, critiquing the British empire, arguing for decolonization, and satirising some of the actual processes of decolonization – is largely a consequence of its author's age is woefully inadequate, the important point is that 'the show's position on imperialism ... and racism ... was not consistent; nor could it be considering the variety of people involved in producing' (135) it. In a similar vein, Richard Scully outlines the rather different ways in which the show depicts Nazism. In the 1960s and 1970s, programme-makers who had personal memories of the Second World War tended to draw 'on more critical appreciation of the state of scholarship and popular memory', including the 1961 Adolf Eichmann trial, William L. Shirer's *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich* (1960) and Jack Kaufman's 1968 documentary based on it, and *The World at War* (UK 1973–4) documentary series, while in the 1980s Nazism was utilised to suggest that Thatcherism, and neoliberalism more generally, 'represented a revival of fascism in a new form' (191). In the new millennium, the Second World War and Nazism have been deployed much more consciously as 'aspects of brand identity, reinforcing rather than questioning the perceptions of audiences' (191).<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Such constantly unfolding contradictions and transformations are nicely captured in Emily Asher-Perrin's observations about how the flourishing of interracial (and interspecies) relationships in Russell T. Davies's *Who* has drastically tailed off under Steven Moffat. This is not to suggest the Davies era was perfect; it did, for example, bracket off the first gay interracial couple in an alternate universe, and ultimately did not include the revelation that they are a couple in the broadcast version of 'The Age of Steel' (20 May 2006). Part of the problem with Moffat is his emphasis on complex narrative structures that fold back on themselves and hide things in plain sight (see Charles), which tends to require memorable iconic images and fixed rather than fluid identities. As Rosanne Welch notes, Moffat created Rory and Amy's school-friend Melody (Maya Glace-Green, Nina Toussaint-White) as a person of colour primarily to keep 'the audience from guessing she was a young River [Song]' (70).

<sup>8</sup> However, when Prime Minister Harriet Jones (Penelope Wilton) orders the destruction of the fleeing Scyrorax spaceship in 'The Christmas Invasion' (25 Dec 2005), the conscious echo of Margaret Thatcher's decision during the Falkland's Conflict to sink the retreating *Belgrano*, with the loss of 323 Argentinean lives, is clearly intended as commentary on Tony Blair's taste for warmongering, 'humanitarian' and otherwise, suggesting that, under Davies at least, the critical potential of the 1980s had not been entirely lost.

In his conclusion, Vohldika describes ‘the fantasy solution of the Doctor, who stands outside such [local] dilemmas’ and is thus ‘able to provide a resolution’ (135). Vanessa de Kauwe argues that the TARDIS, which ‘provides the Doctor with the possibility to transcend all sociohistorical trappings’ and ‘affords’ him ‘the potential for understanding and representing the most universal point of view’; however, she adds, ‘this potential of the Doctor does not alter what, to date, has been his reality’ (144). This failing is perhaps best captured by Rachel Morgain’s observation that we never learn what the Silurians call themselves. This species of sentient lizards, which dominated the Earth before humans evolved, are introduced and named in ‘The Silurians’ (31 Jan–14 Mar 1970), but as Pertwee’s Doctor points out in the related ‘The Sea Devils’ (26 Feb–1 Apr 1972), ‘they would more rightly be called “Eocenes”’.<sup>9</sup> In ‘The Hungry Earth’/‘Cold Blood’ (22–29 May 2010), Smith’s Doctor comments on this problematic nomenclature, only to problematise it further by renaming them *Homo reptilia*. This appeal to ‘the Linnaean system of biological classification’ produces the ‘illusion’ that this name and naming are ‘somehow more objective, neutral and scientifically accurate than the other terms’ (261). This species name is, of course, absurd – they are not some branch of the primate genus *Homo* – but also revealing inasmuch as it positions them as a lesser variety of humans, defined by their reptilian nature rather than their sapience (262–3).

Earlier in her essay, Morgain identifies a deep structure in anthropology that formulated the entire science around the ‘apparent division between observers and observed, between the supposedly racially “neutral” authors and racially “marked” subjects of knowledge’ (257). This presumption reaches far beyond anthropology. Writing about ‘The Ark’ (5–26 Mar 1966), de Kauwe describes a planet that is ‘masterfully but benevolently ruled by a super-race who are colourless, featureless, invisible altogether, who further claim to be superlatively neutral and objective in their reasoning’, ‘an early foreshadowing’, she suggests, of the ‘liberal and ... colour-blind cosmopolitanism’ evinced by the relaunched series (155). Indeed, Slavoj Žižek seems to have them in mind when he critiques multiculturalism as

a disavowed, inverted, self-referential form of racism, a ‘racism with a distance’ – it ‘respects’ the Other’s identity, conceiving the Other as a self-enclosed ‘authentic’ community towards which he, the multiculturalist, maintains a distance rendered possible by his privileged universal position. Multiculturalism is a racism which empties its own position of all positive content (the multiculturalist is not a direct racist, he doesn’t oppose to the Other the *particular values* of his own culture), but nonetheless retains this position as the privileged *empty point of universality* from which one is able to appreciate (and depreciate) properly other particular cultures – the multiculturalist respect for the Other’s specificity is the very form of asserting one’s own superiority. (44)

As de Kauwe reminds us, multiculturalism tends to perpetuate colonial power structures by normalising the particular culture of the former coloniser, and ‘common aspects of cosmopolitan life are an *enforced commonality*’, ‘not agreed upon by democratic consensus’ (155). Rather, because ‘cosmopolitanism largely occurs in the homeland of the colonizers, where survivors of colonization are gathered’, the ‘common language, lifestyle and law of cosmopolitanism remain the reign of the colonizer’ (155). Anit Gupta’s essay on the post-imperial nostalgia represented by the ‘Victorian cricketer’s garb’ (38) of Davison’s Doctor could easily have made the same point by referring to the 1990 suggestion by Norman

---

<sup>9</sup> In the Silurian period, 400 million years ago, vertebrates had not evolved.

Tebbit, a former member of Thatcher's cabinet, that Britons of South Asian and Caribbean extraction who support the visiting side during English test matches have failed to integrate properly.<sup>10</sup>

Perhaps the most intriguing attempt to think about *Doctor Who* in relation to the history of immigration from former colonies into post-war Britain comes in the parallels and dissonances Mike Hernandez finds between the Doctor and Stuart Hall, one of the founders of Cultural Studies. Each has 'a complicated relationship with both his home culture and his adopted culture, understanding both and identifying wholly with neither', a similarity which enables the Doctor to be read 'as a metaphor, a reflection and site of crisis for British national identity in the face of diaspora and an ever-increasing need for inclusivity' (48). On the one hand, like the Doctor, Hall had constantly to 'renegotiate his own identity, creating it anew instead of simply returning home' (50); but on the other, the Doctor 'is generally cast in a position of privilege, travelling ... as he pleases, ... the intellectual superior of all and the moral superior of most', and whatever oppression he has experienced, it was meted out by 'his own people' rather than 'slavery or colonization' (49). This difference is best captured in 'The Shakespeare Code' (7 Apr 2007), when Tennant's Doctor advises an understandably anxious Martha (Freema Agyeman) to 'just walk around' Elizabethan London 'as if you own the place – it works for me'.<sup>11</sup> Ultimately, the contrasts Hernandez draws out depend upon the failure of the comparison between the Doctor and Hall, which can thus be seen, as Morgain notes in another context, as an indicator of the limits of liberal humanism, with its dependence on 'concepts of possession, sovereignty and [the] inscription of borders' (258).

### ***New Dimensions of Doctor Who: Adventures in Space, Time and Television***

*New Dimensions* draws together 11 essays, many of them by major figures in *Doctor Who* studies to address three key concerns: first, as the eighth season of the new series approaches, to reconsider the particularities of this iteration in relation to the original series; second, to more fully embed our understanding of the new series in relation to the major changes not only to the television industry since the end of the original series, but also in relation to new media, social and otherwise; and third, to consider the new series in relation to new spaces (its home in Cardiff), and new temporalities (the return and passing of Elisabeth Sladen, and the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary).

David Butler argues that the rebooted *Doctor Who* began with a strong emphasis on 'the acceptance of difference and coming to terms with the alien' (19), but that Murray Gold's scoring of the new series often works against this politics. Long gone are the days of the Radiophonic Workshop's experimental electronica; instead of alien soundscapes, there are 'classic Hollywood-derived orchestral scores fused with popular idioms' (20). This pursuit of 'the perceived cinematic grandiosity of the symphony orchestra' (27) works simultaneously to distinguish the series from its earlier, much lower budget incarnation (and whatever negative connotations it might have) and to make the series more familiar to a mass audience who are not necessarily *sf* aficionados, simultaneously reducing its potential to estrange. Butler compares the decision to pursue a *Star Trek* (US 1966–) approach – talk multiculturalism, even practice some multicultural casting, but score according to 'European traditions and

---

<sup>10</sup> The main weakness of Gupta's brief essay is that, although it does refer to the amazing West Indian cricket team of the 1970s and 1980s, including the rebel West Indian team's victorious tour of boycotted Apartheid South Africa, his emphasis on cricket as a tool/signifier of imperial domination fails to take account of its importance in anti-colonial and post-colonial struggles and identity formations. This is, of course, not the reason the *Mail* held his essay up to particular ridicule.

<sup>11</sup> The description of Martha as the first companion of colour is often criticised for neglecting Mickey (Noel Clarke) and sometimes for ignoring Alison Cheney (Sophie Okonedo) in the webcast animation 'Scream of the Shalka' (13 Nov–16 Dec 2003), but rarely for failing to address the problem of Leela, who was played in brown-face make-up (and with brown contact lenses) by white actor Louise Jameson.

concerns' – to that taken by the makers of *Battlestar Galactica* (US 2004–9), which matched its story of diverse human fragments with a 'soundworld' that included 'the Armenian duduk, Japanese taiko drums, Indian tabla and sitar, Balinese gamelan, Irish uilleann pipes, Chinese erhu, Portuguese guitar and glass (h)armonica' (26).

Butler unpicks the consequences of this decision through several episodes, including an exemplary reading of 'The Hungry Earth'/'Cold Blood'. He establishes the diversity of personalities and behaviours among both human and Silurian characters, and then demonstrates how 'the music for the story and the choice of instrumentation for key cues privileges the humans and suggests that aggression and refusal to accept the Other are Silurian traits as opposed to being shared by both species' (31–2). Furthermore, as the narrative draws to a close, scenes of reconciliation are accompanied not by 'a blending of human and Silurian sounds but the reassertion of the calm and harmonious European orchestra' (34). Drawing on Homi Bhabha via Janet Staiger's critique of the notion of genre hybridity, Butler sees Gold's playful slippages between orchestral and popular forms as inbred rather than hybrid, and considers this failure or refusal of cultural hybridity as profoundly detrimental to the series' avowed multiculturalism (it could, however, also constitute evidence that the BBC's multiculturalism is the disavowed racism described by Žižek).

Just as the change scoring distances the new series from the old, so does the rhetoric around the redesign of classic monsters, while at the same time having to maintain these creatures familiarity. Piers D. Britton situates this process within significant technological shifts – the increased emphasis on post-production rather than pre-production manufacture, enabled by the development of CGI – and institutional changes – the move from a Design Group whose 'departments ... worked for the most part independently of one another, each exerting complete artistic control over the elements within its purview' to a 'phased and collaborative' approach (41). New *Who* reprioritised somatic design. Human costuming, rather than pursuing the imaginative extravagances practiced by the original series' June Hudson and Amy Roberts, now tends to low-key contemporary fashion, regardless of how far in the future the story might be set. This can be understood as another example of de-science-fictionalising *Who* so as to avoid alienating (in either or both senses) a mass audience. Instead, greater prominence has been given to creature design, to the more evidently iconic – and merchandisable – images.

Under Davies, two principles governed the redesign of classic creatures – modernisation and functionalism. The new Daleks and Cybermen had 'to *embody* machine-age force, even in a still photograph' (46), while 'prime indicators of "personality" – the teardrop under the Cybermen's eye – 'were to remain unaltered' (47). Organic creatures, such as Davros and the Silurians, had to be recognisable but more expressive (and capable of expression) than the original rubber or papier-mâché masks allowed them to be. Building on this newly established look, Moffat has adopted a 'more ludic approach' (49), for example introducing a Dalek redesign which recalled 'the tall, brightly coloured, "non-canonical" Daleks' from the two 1960s *Doctor Who* movies. This has been matched by a significant shift in the publicity rhetoric from Davies's 'responsible modernisation' (40) to such nebulous concepts as 'cool' and 'fun' (49). As Britton concludes, this management not only of design but also of the discourses around it works to reinforce a sense of 'the brand's historical coherence and its on-going vitality' (51).

Ross P. Garner addresses a different case of intradiegetic allusion to the series' past: the embodied presence of Elisabeth Sladen, recreating the role of the Pertwee/Baker companion, Sarah Jane Smith, three decades after she originally left the series. Unlike the Daleks and Davros, Cybermen and Silurians, she was redesigned or rebooted (or recast). Sladen – and Sarah Jane – has merely continued to age at the same rate as her fans, 'affect[ing] nostalgic responses by recognisably, but differentially, embodying the character'

(201), reminding us simultaneously of continuity and mortality, but perhaps also restoring the experience of temporality to the otherwise reified nostalgia of the commodity universe. Sladen's sudden death of cancer in 2011, partway through making the fifth series of *The Sarah Jane Adventures* (UK 2007–11) spin-off series, prompted a period of grieving (myself included). Drawing on Anthony Giddens's work, Garner argues that Sladen's embodied presence – not just on television but over the years at countless fan events – provided a kind of ontological security for fans in an era when an increasing number of significant human relationships are technologically mediated. Her death ruptured this security, not least because her presence had so long been a means of 'easing anxiety and preserving fan's coherent self-narratives' (207). By voicing childhood memories of Sarah Jane, fans were able to manage their sense of loss and reiterate their identities.

Catherine Johnson positions *Doctor Who* in relation to the BBC's branding strategies, asking why the series was identified as a 'key programme brand' and what it means to 'understand [it] as a brand rather than a television series' (95). In the contradictory context of reduced funding for public service broadcasting in the UK and growing pressure to expand the BBC's role into digital services, branding presented itself as a way in which to increase revenue from the commercial activities of BBC Worldwide: it encourages a mode of thinking not of individual programmes and the baseline product differentiation between them but of intellectual property that can be protected by trademark and exploited more effectively across multiple media and merchandising platforms. While the BBC continued to neglect and deride *Doctor Who* after its 1989 cancellation, BBC Enterprises and subsequently BBC Worldwide continued to develop it as a franchise, deriving a reliable income stream from videos, DVDs, books and so on, ultimately positioning it in such a way that its selection as a key BBC brand became almost inevitable.

Johnson is careful to consider this institutional logic alongside the actual messiness and complexity of the real world, identifying the role played by auteur discourses (around Davies and Julie Gardner) in conceptualising the brand, the commercial imperative to develop brands, and the organising function played by a brand identity in co-ordinating 'the increasingly extensive co-production and distribution deals involved in a series that spreads across platforms and media and is licensed and sold in multiple territories' (101). She also offers detailed discussions of the redesign of the *Doctor Who* logo for the Matt Smith era and of the 2009 launch of the free *Doctor Who: Adventure Games* for PC and Mac. The latter initiative demonstrates the ways in which the *Doctor Who* brand can fulfil its public service remit 'to engage with its audiences in new ways, and ... to stimulate new forms of creativity and deliver the benefit of emerging communications technology', while at the same time indentifying and/or creating a 'potential market' for future commercial games developed by BBC Worldwide (109). (Elizabeth Evans's essay traces the pedagogical value and limitations of the fifth *Adventure Game*, 'The Gunpowder Plot', released the following year. While the game develops various pedagogic strategies – narrative learning, 'found' learning, ambient learning – with varying degrees of success, it is caught between the contradictory logics of the public service broadcaster and its commercial arm, which require it to balance educational functions with entertaining gameplay, resulting in a game which can be completed without having to pay any attention to most of the historical information it contains.)

While Johnson consider the *Doctor Who* brand in relation to the BBC brand, Melissa Beattie addresses its relationship to the branding of Cardiff through a lens provided by *The Doctor Who Experience* – a purpose-built, themed tourist destination run by BBC Worldwide and located close to the Roath Lock studios, home to the series. The *Experience*, which replaced Experience Design's earlier 'Up Close' exhibition, is clearly an exercise in brand strategy but also of managing fan interaction with the series. The collaboration between Cardiff City Council and BBC Worldwide in the redevelopment of the Cardiff Bay area can

be understood as part of the increasing anti-democratic private control over public space, with local communities marginalised or ignored as corporate image-making takes over. This regeneration or gentrification of what was once Tiger Bay – a ‘dockland that fell into disrepair after the shipping boom faded, leaving a multicultural, socioeconomically impoverished population that was considered unsafe by the mostly-white Anglophone government’ – has eradicated the history of the place, substituting a ‘glossy waterfront’, luxury apartment blocks and other signifiers of prosperous modernity (182). Information boards refer to the area as Porth Teiger, as if to establish a link to a past it otherwise works hard to conceal, while this ‘tourist bubble’, disconnected from ‘the city’s present-day impoverished areas, skews the semiotics of Cardiff and confines ‘associated economic gains to one main area’ (184-5). As urban regeneration goes, nothing about this particular instance is unusual, except perhaps the role played in it by a public service broadcaster.

Matt Hills rounds out the collection with, appropriately enough, a discussion of *Who*’s 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary, focusing on ‘how industry practices of “the TV show anniversary” have themselves altered along with the television landscape’ (217) since 1973’s 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary. Persuasively arguing that ‘anniversaries do not merely record empty, calendrical “multiples” of time, but instead take on different meanings within reconfigured industry/audience contexts’, Hills identifies ‘four modes of TV anniversary – naive, hybrid, niche, and hyped’ (217–8). ‘The Three Doctors’ (30 Dec 1972–20 Jan 1973) team-up demonstrates a rather cavalier notion to multiples of calendrical time, being broadcast almost a year before the tenth anniversary it was intended to mark. This naïve celebration also did not take any special account of the series fandom, being produced for a mass audience as part of the ephemeral, irrecoverable flow of programming in the age of televisual scarcity. A decade later, as this scarcity was disappearing in the face of new channels and platforms, the hybrid anniversary team-up, ‘The Five Doctors’ (25 Nov 1983), was intended to appeal to both fans and a general audience, being broadcast just two days after the actual anniversary<sup>12</sup> but as part of the BBC’s showcase *Children in Need* telethon, which has run annually since 1980. Subsequent hybrid anniversaries, five and ten years later – ‘Silver Nemesis (23 Nov–7 Dec 1988) and ‘Dimensions in Time’ (26–27 Nov 1993) – were considerably less successful, with the latter often seen as a particular low-point for the series. However, as Hills notes, its ties to other successful BBC programming – *Children in Need*, *EastEnders* (UK 1985–), *Noel’s House Party* (UK 1991–9) – and use of new technologies – audience phone-in, 3D broadcasting – can be understood as a proleptic positioning of the series within soon-to-emerge BBC branding strategies. The niche anniversaries of 1998 and 2003 were largely fan-oriented, playing out not on television but in ancillary media – novels, audio drama, online animations, DVD releases. The hyped 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary is the first time that *Doctor Who* ‘has been both an active, popular, mass-audience TV show and subject to rigorous practices of brand management’ (229). Kept in the news cycle throughout the year, ‘with each month thematically coordinated around its numerically-corresponding Doctor’, this anniversary demonstrates the ways in which a brand can now organise across multiple platforms so as to maximise its ‘attention-capital’ in a crowded mediascape. The peculiar position of the BBC as a public service broadcaster means that this particular show’s anniversary is able discursively to unify ‘consumerism and public value’ and, by reinforcing *Doctor Who*’s “historical” worth as a public good’, to recontextualise ‘lifelong fans as amateur historians and popular curators rather than obsessives’ (230).

## *Doctor Who*

---

<sup>12</sup> On US PBS, it was broadcast on the actual anniversary.



One of the inaugural volumes in Intellect's *Fan Phenomenon* series,<sup>13</sup> Booth's collection of thirteen essays asks two key questions: 'Who are *Doctor Who* Fans?' and 'What Do *Doctor Who* Fans Do?' For him, 'it's a book about emotion: the emotional attachment people can feel for a TV show, for the people on that show, and for fellow fans that follow that show' (17). This affective engagement is neatly captured in the opening paragraphs of Ivan Phillips's essay, in which he recalls the 'white' curls of Pertwee's Doctor being regenerated as the 'dark brown' curls of Tom Baker – the latter 'enable[d] me to associate my living dad with my fantasy Doctor' and now the former 'enable me to associate my fantasy Doctor with my dead dad' (17).

Phillips's primary concern, however, is with nostalgia, which the series seems to have invited from the moment of the very first episode's 'junkyard tableau', a 'setting of muddled relics and discarded remnants, an ultrafuturistic concept hidden in an environment primed with a spirit of elegy and nostalgia' (19). The relaunched series could not rely upon an audience nostalgic for the original series, which had ended sixteen years earlier. But some such sensibility could nonetheless be evoked by other means, such as, for example, the overtly 'steampunk' look of the new TARDIS console. Michael Pickwood's subsequent redesign, the 'more metallic science fiction appearance' of which was revealed in 'The Snowmen' (25 Dec 2012), signals for Phillips 'a shift from one nostalgic register to another, with many fans commenting approvingly on Pickwood's homage to Peter Brachacki's original console from the Classic series' (23). If this can be understood as part of a negotiation of separation and loss (ideas central to Iain MacRury and Michael Rustin's *The Inner World of Doctor Who*, discussed below), so too can the fan reconstructions of missing episodes of the original series that Richard Wallace discusses. *Doctor Who* is unusual in that while 97 of the junked episodes remain lost, there are audio recordings – made by fans – of all the missing episodes. Furthermore, the BBC's Written Archive Centre holds Tele-snaps – that is, still photographs – from most episodes broadcast between May 1966 and October 1968, a period that includes many of the lost episodes. From the late 1980s onwards, and especially in the mid- to late- 1990s, fans such as the Change of Identity, Joint Venture and Loose Cannon groups recreated – as far as these and other elements permit – missing adventures in audio-visual form. The history of this practice outlined by Wallace also charts the constantly shifting and reforming relationship between fans, programme-makers and brand owners.

Craig Owen Jones and Dylan Morris turn to the question of fan identities constructed around two very specific kinds of lack. Jones considers 'the ways in which those who became fans during the hiatus' between the original and new series 'arrived at their fan identity', paying particular attention to their relation to McGann's Doctor from the 1996 television movie. He discusses the role played by the rather limited number of repeats broadcast in the 1990s, the even more limited 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebrations and programming, the *New Adventures* and *Missing Adventures* series of novels, the television movie, audio dramas (Pertwee's 1993 and 1996 radio serials, Big Finish Productions, and so on) and online content, including the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary six-part animation, 'Scream of the Shalka', featuring Richard E. Grant. None of which could make up for the lack of a regular broadcast series, but all of which provided entry points into fandom and the seeds of fan identities.

Morris focuses on fans of the new series in 'young American nerd culture', who lack the experience of being British but nonetheless find certain imaginative, intellectual and emotional resources in British culture – they all, it seems, have read 'Lewis Carroll, C.S. Lewis and J.R.R. Tolkien' and grown 'up with J.K. Rowling's *Harry Potter*' (51). Charting distinctive paths between nerd, geek and fan identities, they consider 'the British past' to have 'better mythical and fantastical possibilities than America's own' (54). As 24-year-old Scott

---

<sup>13</sup> Other initial volumes are concerned with *Batman*, *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*, *Star Trek*, *Star Wars* and *Twin Peaks* fandoms.

remarks, ‘British linguistic and ethnic diversity, ancient monuments, pagan beliefs and overall long history’ have all ‘been appropriated as “British” in some way and viewed as the nation’s heritage, unlike America, where our ancient past is Other: Native American’ (54).

Intriguingly, Morris notes, just as we Britons often consider our witty, ironic and more sophisticated sense of humour to demonstrate our superiority to our stumblebum, irony-free American cousins, so ‘American proud nerds tell themselves a similar self-validating story about their relationship to a mainstream American culture that does not always value them. They, too, are wittier and more sophisticated’ (57). As a Briton, one is of course tempted to smile at such colonial naïveté, but that is precisely Morris’s point – the multiple and shifting ways in which we all draw upon cultural scripts to construct identities.

Teresa Forde’s account of *The Doctor Who Experience* draws upon the notion of performing heritage: ‘fantasy and realism are intertwined, especially when the imagination emerges from a series of bodily encounters – many but short – with “real” objects that are no more “real” than the products of fantasy’ (69 quoting Bærenholdt and Haldrup). This ludic approach to the emergence of identity suggests the ways in which the formulation of identity might contain site- and event-specific, temporary and ad hoc elements that might also potentially contribute to a longer lasting sense of selfhood. Booth closes the first section of his book with a focus on the latter possibility, recording 21 accounts by fans of their first experience of *Doctor Who* – the very moment that led to their fan identities.

A decade or so ago I wrote that fan activity ‘is utterly predictable in all but its finest detail’ (74), a sentiment expressed so bluntly that it almost deserved repeatedly to be taken out of context and attacked for saying something it did not actually, in that context, say. My point was that, within a remorselessly alienating commodity culture, it should be unsurprising to find people responding to its instrumentalist products creatively and across all the forms in which human creativity is expressed.<sup>14</sup> The second half of Booth’s collection contains seven essays on the finer detail of fan activity, which is where surprises are to be found: Leslie McMurtry writes on the many roles of women in fanzine culture; Katharina Freud on vidders who re-edit and remix *Who* footage; Brigid Cherry on knitting and other ‘feminine handicrafting’ (107); Denise Vultee on various efforts to create multiple Gallifreyan languages – vocabularies, grammars, types/fonts – from the occasional onscreen clues; Karen Hellekson on a series of audio adventures which work as alternative histories to the canonical *Who* timeline;<sup>15</sup> Jeremy Sarachan on the parallels and differences between slacktivism and social media fandom; and Nistasha Perez on gif fics<sup>16</sup> in which the fictional universes of *Who*, *Sherlock* (UK 2010–) and *Supernatural* (US 2005–) collide, implying the existence of a whole other fictional universe (or more).

Each of these chapters performs vital work in recovering and preserving the histories of affective, intellectual and creative engagements with mass culture that are often placed at risk by their ephemerality and marginal location in the chinks of the world machine. These activities may involve ironic and ludic dimensions, as with the female fan fiction authors who adopted ‘a position of increased femininity to identify with the overtly feminine companions’ and those who in the playground identified with ‘Sara Kingdom, a take-charge, militaristic woman’ (85). They might address shortcomings of the show itself, as with the vidders who

---

<sup>14</sup> Indeed, my actual criticism was aimed at purportedly leftist critics and theorists who postulated such activity as necessarily radical or subversive while overlooking the extent to which this activity, whatever particular instances might do, must also be understood as a means of incorporating the unpaid creative labour of individuals and groups into the commodity process.

<sup>15</sup> Discussed elsewhere in this issue by Neil Easterbrook.

<sup>16</sup> A gif (graphic interchange format), Perez explains, ‘is an image type that allows for multiple layers in one image’ which, ‘when combined and played at speed’ creates the impression that the image is moving; in ‘*SuperWhoLock*, gifs from all three shows are edited and combined with original subtitled dialogue to form gif fics’ (149).

found ways to ‘correct’ the shoddy treatment of Donna at the end of new *Who*’s fourth season, or provide the basis of social networks in which the series itself is not that central, as with some of the feminine handicrafters. They might add to the *Who* megatext by generating supplementary if not exactly canonical adventures, or challenge the notion of canon in the era of official branding. While Booth’s book barely scratches – can barely scratch – the surface of such modes of being and relating, it is a fine compendium.

***The Inner World of Doctor Who: Psychoanalytic Reflections in Time and Space.***

In the introduction to *New Dimensions*, Hills ponders what a ‘*Doctor Who* Studies’ might look like, and notes the lack of the cohesion and accumulation that such a project requires:

I think there’s a danger of writers on *Who* actually writing across each other rather than building this shared communal project: philosophers don’t always bother with TV studies (and sometimes *vice versa*); fan-scholars don’t always bother with academia (and *vice versa*); and academics sometimes write as if they’re slotting fandom into a favoured theory (or *Doctor Who*, for that matter). (3)

As someone who only occasionally works on *Who*, I am particularly conscious of this problem. Whenever I lack the sense to pass an invitation to write or peer review something about the series on to someone more qualified, a rapid period of reading – and of testing the friendship and collegiality of some of those more qualified people – ensues. This just about enables me to keep on top of the academic writing on *Who* (I long ago gave up any hope of being able to take substantial account of fandom’s critical output), but in the enforced hastiness of academic life I might have been tempted to skip *The Inner World of Doctor Who* since its disciplinary concerns are at some remove from my own. Indeed, this distance makes the book both fascinating and frustrating.

It is the third volume in Karnac’s *Psychoanalysis and Popular Culture* series, an offshoot of the AHRC-funded *Media and the Inner World* research network, which ‘addresses the emotionalisation of contemporary popular culture and the various kinds of psychological work associated with that development’, with a particular interest in ‘the usefulness of a post-Freudian, object relations perspective for examining the importance of emotional relationships and experience’ (xii). Therefore, *Inner World* focuses on ‘the relationships which [new *Who*] explores and develops between its characters, and the emotional challenges with which these face them’ (257).

MacRury and Rustin situate new *Who* in relation to other popular ‘quality’ dramas, science-fictional and otherwise, and to the trend in children’s literature ‘for emotionally engaging’ fiction by the likes of J.K. Rowling and Philip Pullman which ‘soften[s] boundaries between young and old’ (xvi), in the context of multiplatform media brands/consumption and related reconfigurations of niche and mass audiences. Building on the traditions of psychoanalytic literary and film criticism, and on ‘the distinctive “clinical” emphasis of psychoanalytic psychotherapy in the British tradition’ (xxiv), they explore the ways in which *Who* ‘is able to generate a kind of intimacy and significance for its audiences’ (xix), particularly through narratives concerned with departure, separation and loss, as well as with ‘love and attachments’ (xxvii). In the clinical setting, ‘the accent is on response to an experience, always in part an emotional experience, but also based on ... close observation: of the minute details of a baby’s movements, or interaction with mother, or of the tone and meaning of words’; and the authors attempt to ‘bring this kind of responsiveness to the episodes’ they discuss, ‘alert at the same time to the necessary differences between watching fictional television and engaging with people’ (18–9).

MacRury and Rustin describe their method as ‘offering a focus on textual analysis, a close observation of texts as a precursor to thinking about articulations between inner world experience and *Doctor Who*-as-cultural-object’ (xxv). However, the book contains little that I would consider textual analysis. Instead of examining the ways in which a particular episode creates meaning(s) through the audio-visual technologies and techniques available to its makers, and building from that towards more overarching arguments, MacRury and Rustin offer lengthy plot synopses. They assume the reader has either not seen the episode (or at least not recently) or would not feel the need (or desire) to rewatch it in order to consider what they say. Consequently, story description generally outweighs analysis and argument,<sup>17</sup> but to a large extent this arises from disciplinary differences and the assumptions the authors thus have about their primary intended readership, which is neither television studies scholars nor *Who* fans. This is not to say that the authors are innocent of the existing critical literature, nor that there are not significant compensations for the frustration felt at their tendency to treat characters as if they are real people and to reduce complex audio-visual texts to relatively unambiguous linear narratives.

MacRury and Rustin consider the series – in which both the Doctor and his companions must learn to start living their lives over again – as ‘somewhat reminiscent of the experience of psychotherapy’ (10), and the Doctor himself as ‘a kind of inadvertent therapist’ (290): where the ‘uncanny ... hides things (in the corner of the eye, at the shadowy doors of perception) the Doctor has the obverse powers: *to observe, to connect, [to] notice, to think*’ (236). The attraction his companions feel towards him stems from ‘absences in their emotional lives’ (7). This argument is initially – and most fully developed – in relation to Rose (Billie Piper). In ‘Father’s Day’ (14 May 2005), she is taken back in time to the day her father, Pete (Shaun Dingwell), died, only to intervene, change history and thus unleash the dragon-like Reapers, who set about lethally sterilising the wound she has caused in time. Eccleston’s Doctor, who for Rose has functioned as both a paternal figure and a potential lover, is temporarily displaced from the former role by the actual father she never really knew (but not without Pete first hitting on the young woman he does not recognise as his now grown-up daughter). While Pete becomes the nurturing and ultimately sacrificial father, the Doctor is more firmly aligned with the sadistic authority of the Law, ‘stand[ing] for the reality principle, holding fast against the omnipotence of fantasy’ (28).<sup>18</sup> Moving beyond such conventional Oedipal analysis, MacRury and Rustin relate Rose’s mourning for Pete, and her fantasy ‘that she would have willingly died to save him, and correspondingly that he would have died to save her’ to the experience of audience members in ‘late adolescence and early adult life’ who are on the point of choosing ‘a partner’ and for whom ‘the internal object of a father whose equal this must be, looms large’ (36).

Oedipal matters recur. The Doctor (Matt Smith), once the ‘seductive, ... addictive ... daddy’ (274) who swept Amy (Karen Gillan) off on adventures, finds himself both a parent and a child to her and her boyfriend/husband, Rory (Arthur Darvill). The Doctor’s insistence that their TARDIS bedroom has bunk beds is a curious blend of a father protecting his daughter and a child’s obliviousness as to why his parents might want to share a bed, with the

---

<sup>17</sup> MacRury’s chapters, which occupy most of the second half of the book, tend to be meatier, paying a little more attention to audio-visual aspects, being more adept in relating it to other cultural material and more wide-ranging and ambitious in the use of theoretical material. See, for example, his discussion of ‘The Shakespeare Code’ in relation to symbol formation (103–31).

<sup>18</sup> Although, as MacRury and Rustin note, in stories such as ‘Human Nature’/‘The Family of Blood’ (26 May–2 Jun 2007) and ‘The Fires of Pompeii’ (12 Apr 2008) the Doctor does allow history to be rewritten in small ways that save individual lives.

incest taboo thrown in for good measure (276).<sup>19</sup> MacRury and Rustin suggest that while ‘young male viewers’ are ‘invited’ to identify with the Doctor ‘as the hero’, his

inexperience and reticence in matters sexual and emotional may resonate with their own stage of life. It is after all normal for girls to develop emotionally and sexually a little earlier than boys. The apparent discrepancies in knowingness, experience, and sophistication between the Doctor and his young companions seems therefore to have some relation to the ways in which members of the audience might identify with them. (48)

While I find this relatively convincing, I am nonetheless concerned by the way in which it is articulated around commonsense conventional wisdom about gendered rates of development (elsewhere, and with a similar lack of reflection or nuance, romantic plotlines are deemed to appeal to *Who*’s female audience, and ‘the science fiction exotica and warfare’ to its male audience (65)). At moments like these, it is unclear which is more conservative, the series or its analysts.

There is no question, however, that the series contains conservative elements, some of which MacRury and Rustin open up brilliantly, if without comment. For example, they argue that in ‘Closing Time’ (24 Sep 2011), the ‘cybermat condenses and re-figures aspects’ of the relationship between the infant Alfie (uncredited) and his father, Craig (James Corden): the “‘cute” toy-esque metallic-rat-like character conceals a scary, biting threat’, thus resembling ‘(in concreted form) Craig’s earlier anxious conception of his baby’ as ‘a cute but persecuting, hungry, sleepless threat with no “off switch”’ (243); and it might also ‘concretise’ Alfie’s own ‘fantasy ideas’, especially aggression towards a father unable to feed his hunger for milk (244). Later, Craig will resist being turned into a Cyberman through the sheer power of his love for his son, who by the end of the episode has started to think of his father not as ‘Not Mum’ but as ‘Dad’. In a similar vein, the account of ‘Blink’ (9 Jun 2007), in which the discussion of castration anxiety that the Weeping Angels invite, even demand, is notably absent, MacRury and Rustin note the centrality of a range of love relationships: the friendship between Kathy (Lucy Gaskell) and Sally (Carey Mulligan), and the timeslipped Kathy’s lifelong marriage to the man from Hull; the aborted romance between Sally and black DI Billy Shipton (Michael Obiora/Louis Mahoney), and timeslipped Billy’s lifelong marriage to another woman; Sally’s presumably lifelong presumable marriage to Kathy’s brother Larry (Finlay Robertson). In both episodes, *Who* signals, and MacRury and Rustin interpret, these developments as instances of characters maturing, but the relentless heteronormativity and hyperconventionality of it all remains unquestioned by either – as does Sally’s narrow avoidance of a relationship with a person of colour.

Ultimately, this is where my frustration with the book lies: over 300 pages of criticism but almost no critique. For example, in discussing ‘The Empty Child’/‘The Doctor Dances’ (21–28 May 2005), set in the Second World War, and ‘Human Nature’/‘The Family of Blood’, which anticipates the First World War, MacRury and Rustin choose to comment on how ‘observant’ these stories are about their ‘historical setting[s]’ (56), but not on how they might relate to the moment of their production – despite elsewhere implying that we live ‘in the times and spaces afforded by a damaged social order’ (178). Furthermore, they conclude of the conflict with the Family of Blood that

---

<sup>19</sup> A similar set of contortions surround the relationship between Amy and her daughter, River Song, who grows up to become both the Doctor’s assassin and his wife (98, 278). Unfortunately, the structure of the book, which devotes each chapter to just one or two episodes, militates against this particular narrative arc being more fully unpicked.

we see how humiliation at the hands of social superiors can turn to a desire for revenge on the privileged when power relations are reversed. This is a perceptive glimpse into the dynamics of social reaction. One could make use of this episode ... as a lesson in social history. (57)

While individual psychologies undoubtedly play many and varied roles in social struggle and class conflict, to reduce such complex phenomenon to a mere interplay of ‘humiliation’ and ‘revenge’ is precisely the opposite of ‘perceptive’; indeed, the implied model of society as being stable and consensual apart from the over-reaction of the masses to the occasional abuse of privilege is a reactionary cliché familiar from Edmund Burke’s condemnation of the French Revolution<sup>20</sup> through to Fox News. A similar model is implied when the socio-economic relations on *Starship UK*, which appears in ‘The Beast Below’ (10 Apr 2010), are framed in relation to the distinctions Karl Polanyi drew in 1957 between ‘three methods for the distribution of economic goods, reciprocity, redistribution, and (market) exchange’ (172). MacRury and Rustin acknowledge the dominance of capitalism, but reduce the potentially revolutionary notion of redistribution to (deeply embattled) Keynesian state intervention to moderate some aspects of capitalism without fundamentally challenging it. Reciprocity – the starwhale’s gift of energy to *Starship UK* – is valorised as being, ‘almost by definition, ... the most fully interpersonal mode of economic relating’: ‘the most human’, the ‘most emotionally rich’ and ‘the most psychically demanding’ (173). While such gifting might prove psychologically rewarding, this focus on individual psychological well-being councils against any attempt at social transformation.

MacRury and Rustin’s emphasis on separation and loss draws frequent attention to ‘real life separations between people who love each other ... as when friends of relations move long distances away from one another, or otherwise lose contact when they have once been close’ or when ‘an imagined relationship that once had the possibility of developing into something substantial but for some reason did not’ (86–7). Sadly, the book’s rather thin image of society and of human relations outside of family/romantic contexts means that these observations are left hanging. Even when discussing the problem-solving skills that Donna (Catherine Tate) has picked up from her years of temping – from her ‘impermanent and peripheral connection to the labour market’ (149) – no connections are developed between the frequent experience of separation and the increasing precarity of all labour under neoliberalism.

The final pages of *Inner World* discuss *Who* in terms of the relationship between ‘potential time’ – a ludic dimension of ‘being and becoming, imagining possible and impossible futures, connections, and stories’ – and its ‘limiting and containing counterpart, ... historical [time], ... which cannot be rewritten’ (300). For me, reading *Inner World* was a similar experience: a road rolling determinedly onwards, rejecting other possibilities, not even seeming to notice the forks in its path, but also the site on which such potentials emerged, and as often as not the cause of them.

Each of these volumes is a valuable addition to *Doctor Who Studies*. Hills assembles probably the strongest line-up, with only a couple of weaker essays – on Cybermen and posthumanism, and on editing and pace – detracting from an otherwise impressive collection. Booth brings a wider range of voices to a wider range of practices, thus producing a never uninteresting introduction to *Doctor Who* fandom. Orthia draws together an even more diverse group of writers to tackle a core issue in our understanding of the series, although this range also becomes something of a liability in terms of diffusing the project’s critical drive. MacRury

---

<sup>20</sup> Elsewhere, ‘The Girl in the Fireplace’ (6 May 2006) prompts MacRury and Rustin to wonder whether ‘there is an erotic, Oedipal aspect to revolutionary attacks on monarchy, in the ceremonial execution of a queen?’ (76)

and Rustin work from a position sufficiently outside my own disciplinary traditions that I have been made to see aspects of the series anew and to recognise once more the limitations that such boundaries produce. Taken together, they demonstrate quite exhaustively that while *Doctor Who* is, like the TARDIS, bigger on the inside it is simultaneously also much bigger on the outside.

### Works cited

- Bærenholdt, Jorgen Ole and Michael Haldrup. 'On the Track of the Vikings'. *Tourism Mobilities: Places to Play, Places in Play*, ed., Mimi Sheller and John Urry. London: Routledge, 2004. 76–89.
- Bould, Mark. 'The Dreadful Credibility of Absurd Things: A Tendency in Fantasy Theory'. *Historical Materialism* 10.4 (2002): 51–88.
- Charles, Alec. 'The Crack of Doom: The Uncanny Echoes of Steven Moffat's *Doctor Who*'. *Science Fiction Film and Television* 4.1 (2011): 1–23.
- Forsyth, James. 'Cameron takes on extremism AND the Civil Service'. *Daily Mail* (6 Feb 2011). <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/debate/article-1354107/Multiculturalism-failed-Cameron-takes-Islamist-extremism-AND-Civil-Service.html>. Accessed 8 Jan 2014.
- Hastings, Chris. 'Discriminate! Discriminate! Doctor Who branded "thunderingly racist" by academics - because he conquers Daleks rather than slavery... and he even likes cricket!' *Daily Mail* 25 May 2013. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2330872/Discriminate-Discriminate-Doctor-Who-branded-thunderingly-racist-academics--conquers-Daleks-slavery--likes-cricket.html>. Accessed 8 Jan 2014.
- Hasting, Chris and Emily Sheridan. "'Doctor Who has a strong track record of diverse casting": BBC hits back at accusations the sci-fi series is "thunderingly racist"'. *Daily Mail* 28 May 2013. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/tvshowbiz/article-2332195/BBC-hits-accusations-Doctor-Who-thunderingly-racist.html>. Accessed 8 Jan 2014.
- Kelly, Tom. 'Sherlock's new press baron foe and more evidence of Left-wing bias'. *Daily Mail* 14 Jan 2014. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2538350/Sherlocks-new-press-baron-foe-evidence-Left-wing-bias.html>. Accessed 14 Jan 2014.
- Staiger, Janet. 'Hybrid or Inbred: The Purity Hypothesis and Hollywood Genre History'. *Film Criticism* 22.1 (1997): 5–20.
- Žižek, Slavoj. 'Multiculturalism, Or, the Cultural Logic of Multinational Capitalism'. *New Left Review* 225 (1997): 28-51.