Impossible Worlds, Impossible Things

Impossible Worlds, Impossible Things: Cultural Perspectives on *Doctor Who*, *Torchwood* and *The Sarah Jane Adventures*

Edited by

Ross P. Garner, Melissa Beattie
and Una McCormack

CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS
PUBLISHING

Impossible Worlds, Impossible Things:
Cultural Perspectives on *Doctor Who, Torchwood* and *The Sarah Jane Adventures*,
edited by Ross P. Garner, Melissa Beattie and Una McCormack

This book first published 2010

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-4438-1960-3, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-1960-2

This work is lovingly dedicated to Alexandra Smith, who passed away suddenly in April 2009, and without whom none of this would be possible.

Ars Longa
Vita Brevis
Amicitia Aeterna.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EDITORS' ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to start by thanking all of the attendees and presenters at the "Whoniversal Appeal" conference that took place at Cardiff University from 14–16 November 2008. A special mention deserves to go to Tessa Brailsford and Edmund Schluessel for their continuous help in the organisational process, and for handling such mundane issues as front-of-house with great aplomb. Thanks also to Dr Matt Hills for both his keynote speech and his ongoing guidance regarding the editing of this volume, Dr Rebecca Williams for her sustained analytical perspective on the conference, Dr David Butler for his fervour towards the project at its inception, and Harriet Monkhouse for her generous assistance prior to publication. Finally, thank you to Gareth David-Lloyd, Barnaby Edwards, and Robert Shearman for giving up their time to attend the conference and for the insightful contributions that they freely provided.

Thanks to all those involved at Cambridge Scholars Publishing for their support for this collection, especially Amanda Millar for her initial enquiry concerning the conference, and Carol Koulikourdi for her support and enthusiasm throughout the process of assembling this volume. We would also like to extend our grateful thanks to Andrew Pixley for his consistent enthusiasm for this project and his Foreword, and to Jessica Frey for the ideas she gave to us throughout the process of bringing these essays together.

Thank you to all of our colleagues and friends: Matthew Adams, Mark Baker, Dr Paul Bowman, Emily Danvers, Dianne DeSha, Jeanne Devore, Linnea Dodson, Bill Ernoehazy MD, Valerie Kessler, Dr Matthew Kilburn, Elizabeth Lewis, Jaspal Mann, Philip May, Kate Pilkington, Claire Rees, Gary Russell, Ray Stillwell, Dr Shaun Tougher, Sarah Tovey, Cathy Udovich, Dr Ika Willis, Kalyn Wilson, Paromita Pain of *The Hindu*, the Cardiff Bay *Doctor Who* Expo, Peter, Caleb, James, and Swithun of *A Podcast of Impossible Things*, the BUFVC, and all of the unsung heroes of Cardiff University such as the administrative and security staff. We could not have succeeded without any of you.

Finally, we would like to say a great thanks to Alexandra Smith to whom this volume is dedicated. Alex tragically passed away whilst this book was being assembled, but we know she would have taken great pride in seeing it finished. She was a superb colleague and, more importantly, a true friend. She remains forever in our thoughts.

The editors, contributors, and publishers have made all efforts to trace copyright holders. Any who have been overlooked are invited to contact the publishers.

FOREWORD

ANDREW PIXLEY

One afternoon in May 1988 when I was stuck at home, off work with the flu and feeling a bit sorry for myself, I received a phone call which offered me *the* best job in the world. Well, the best job in the world for me at any rate... I add this caveat in case anybody erroneously believes that a similar bout of influenza may in some way lead to their ideal career structure. The caller in this case was John Freeman, then editor of Marvel's *Doctor Who Magazine*, who was ringing to say that Richard Marson (a kind, generous man who went on to act as editor of *Blue Peter)* was no longer to write the title's Archive feature, would I like to take it on, could he ideally have one ready in the next week or so... and, no, he didn't know what the word count was normally.

The lack of a firm word count was significant, because it was an open invitation for me to start writing and not stop. Ultimately, I built into my overview of the 1972 story "The Mutants" (still one of my all-time favourites despite the derision heaped on it) just about every fact that I could lay my hands on about the tale in question... and constructed them to show a chronological development of events as seen by the production team. It was really one of the first times that this had been tried, but John liked it, the readers seemed to like it, and so we carried on. And on. And on. And yesterday evening, some twenty-one years later—and now fully recovered from the flu you'll be pleased to hear—I opened up the script, production information and associated bits and pieces covering "Dreamland", the most recent *Doctor Who* episode to be broadcast, so that I can continue the task of cataloguing the making of the show. In due course this text will be edited, spall choked, and wing its way off to editors Tom Spilsbury and Peter Ware down at Panini (the regenerated incarnation of Marvel, so to speak) who to this day publish the same title. And, after two decades, I'm just about feeling confident at generating this sort of text...

But the best thing is that after twenty years, I'm *still* loving it. I've been fortunate enough to be given access to all manner of scripts and filming schedules and PasBs and casting notes and contracts and commissioning forms and bits of videotape and snippets of soundtracks

and editing scribbles and memos (both internal and external) which *almost* sate my appetite for details and trivia. All those funny little timing cuts, all those bits of library music, all those walk-ons too humble to qualify for an on-screen credit... all the odd, tiny loose ends have been itemised, documented, and published. My research and experience have amplified immeasurably my admiration for the talented, hard-working and quick-thinking production teams whose creative output has happily filled so many hours of my life since childhood. Along the way, I hope at best that readers have also come to admire the dedication and work of these imaginative types who have delivered 25/45 (delete as applicable) minutes of weekly delight—on and off—for the last 46 years. And at worst, I hope it has cut down on readers' purchase of Horlicks.

But for me, the Archive's where it ends. I've assembled the facts into what is hopefully an accessible sequence (albeit only slightly more interesting to read than a gas bill), the editors have turned my half-blind arthritic typing into English, the designers have made it look colourful and pretty... and that's it. The facts are there for people to read, ignore or use at their own leisure. Job done. And the storyline background and cataloguing of running times, tape numbers and credit listings are really—when compared to the enjoyment of the programme itself—entirely academic.

Only, in another sense, academic is precisely what the Archives are not.

What I'm not generally doing is then *using* all the facts to show patterns and trends, to speculate on the piece's place in history, to ruminate on the cultural influences, to ponder on how and why stories were shaped. If Terrance Dicks himself says that his giant K-1 robot was based on King Kong, that's fine by me and it goes in the body text. But unless a talented spiritualist ever makes firm contact with Geoffrey Orme, I'm unable to comment on which Old Mother Riley routines helped to shape "The Underwater Menace" since that involves speculation. And speculation—despite its use twice in this paragraph—doesn't really figure in my vocabulary.

This is why I love reading academic studies of *Doctor Who*, because all these clever people are writing something which I know I just can't do. Looking back at my spell in academia, it could be classed as a bit of a waste of time: four years during which I simultaneously acquired first class honours and masters qualifications in electronic and electrical engineering... subjects which, since the misery of the 1990s recession, I studiously avoid. In retrospect, the most constructive element of my sojourn at university—from Nena eulogising ninety-nine red balloons through to The Firm doing some star trekkin'—was the Wednesday

afternoons spent cataloguing programmes from the city library's set of *Radio Times*. Maybe if I'd pursued an artistic course of study (which I was assured by careers teachers offered only poverty and malnutrition) as opposed to the scientific (which, the same people promised me, would guarantee me a job for life), then my style of writing might be something a bit richer in content and more speculative in nature.

Concurrent with my learning about OR-gates, Pascal, matrices, imaginary numbers, and block transfer computation in the early 1980s, I dipped a toe into the world of academic study concerning my favourite series, and—like many—was baffled by vocabulary enhancing phrases such as "semiotic thickness of a performed text" some years before I'd hear them spouted by the characters themselves. More recently I've encountered more accessible texts, and have been delighted to see imaginative, fresh and exciting new perspectives on the material I'm so familiar with... bolstered by a profusion of footnotes.[1] James Chapman's *Inside the TARDIS* was such a brilliant summary of the whole landscape in which the series evolved, studying influences at a macro level and revealing the big picture, as opposed to my trivial messing about with studio numbers and project codes. Last year, David Butler's *Time And Relative Dissertations In Space* offered a plethora of delights, challenging my perceptions of genre classification and delivering a brilliant exposition of how technology shaped the series' storytelling. And I love it. Well, most of it. Occasionally you come across a forty page essay which explains to you that children like Daleks because, well, they're a bit scary really, aren't they? But by and large this new market of incisive study into my favourite show is one which I hope will continue to feed my appetite for many years to come, and reveal to me a structure on which to hang all the random, disparate facts which I have exhumed from the depths of history.

And what you hold in your hands is a terrific start, a course of delights which I've consumed and savoured with delight. Coming up in this learned tome, you'll be able to read...

SPOILER ALERT!

...the delight with which E. Charlotte Stevens over in the beautiful city of Toronto champions a too easily forgotten ingredient of intergalactic adventures, an incisive notion from Matthew Jones on how the series has recently mirrored a concern in British society, some smashing statistics and analysis of the past from Tony Keen, why Melissa Beattie knows that Dooley Wilson was only *partly* correct with his most famous performance,

and why it means so much more in the world of *Doctor Who*. And much much more!

Ah, yes. That SPOILER ALERT thing up there. If you're a serious academic, you may be baffled and concerned. If you're a devotee of *Doctor Who* and his many adventures, chances are you've taken it in your stride. In this new era of the Jet Age, it's what you write on the new-fangled interweb thingee if you've seen/read/heard a film/book/play that others may not have and you want to warn them that you're about to reveal part of the narrative that they may not be aware of.

You see, it's an example of one of the loveliest things about this work, which is that Ross, Melissa, Una, and their chums have taken the very sensible step in approach. "This volume is intended to be accessible to everyone, from interested academics in any field to the general public" they will boldly inform you in a few pages' time. And quite right too. I love having my understanding of the show I love enhanced by new perspectives, and that's just what this does. Okay, there are a few odd words I still have to look up in the dictionary and a few key names I need to Google. I'm a non-Media Studies graduate. I wouldn't expect these ladies and gentlemen to know about Ohm's Law (current is proportional to potential difference of voltage), Lenz's Law (current is induced in a direction opposite to the motion causing it) and Burke's Law (a rather stylish police detective show starring Gene Barry).

So, I concede that at times we may speak different languages and recognise different landmarks in the media landscape. For example, when it comes to cultural context, I could mention *Crackerjack*[2] and you'll only have understood the footnote that you've just read if you fit certain social, geographical and chronological profiles. However, I'm as at home reading these learned papers as I am savouring Jonathan Morris' analysis of Gallifreyan regeneration or Graham Kibble-White's debate about the artistic merit of the series in the pages of *Doctor Who Magazine*. Regardless of style and publication, there is a common love, a keen-ness, an appreciation... and, most importantly, a desire to communicate and share our enthusiasms and interests for this wonderful series.

As I said before, from my own approach all I have are the bricks. The facts. Lots and lots and lots of them. But it's the next step, the scholarship, which offers not only the cement to bind them with, but also the plan to assemble the building, and an explanation of why the finished product is so vital to society. Now, that's wonderful... and entirely academic.

December 2009

Notes

[1] Like this one.
[2] Crack-er-jack!

INTRODUCTION

FIFTY NOT OUT: THE DOCTOR'S ENDURING APPEAL

ROSS P. GARNER, MELISSA BEATTIE, AND UNA MCCORMACK

As *Doctor Who*[1] moves towards its golden jubilee, its popularity and status are greater than at any point in its history. The programme's 2005 relaunch has earned ratings and awards success and has helped re-establish the early Saturday night "family audience" for the BBC.[2] Two successful spin-off series, *Torchwood* and *The Sarah Jane Adventures*, have followed,[3] establishing BBC Wales as a significant player in contemporary British television production. Even moderate international success has come after the programme's transmission on BBC Worldwide and the niche-orientated Sci Fi Channel (now Syfy) in the US. As this book goes to press, transmission of the latest series of *Doctor Who*, starring Matt Smith as the eleventh Doctor and under the guidance of new executive producer and showrunner Steven Moffat, is under way, and a second series with this production team has been confirmed. Quite an achievement for a family programme.

While such wide-ranging popular and commercial success is unprecedented, the status of *Doctor Who* has been long noted within academic discourse. As early as 1983, in the run-up to the programme's twentieth anniversary, John Tulloch and Manuel Alvarado suggested that *Doctor Who* had become "something of an institution within British cultural life",[4] and its unique position has been frequently reasserted in the decades since. Arguably, however, such celebratory discourses attest to residual scepticism over the study of television science fiction. Old attitudes concerning special effects and *mise-en-scène* still die hard,[5] despite recent significant work establishing television sf, and *Doctor Who* especially, as a productive area for cultural analysis.[6]

This book, an edited volume of papers given at "Whoniversal Appeal: An Interdisciplinary Postgraduate Conference on *Doctor Who* and its spin-offs", represents a new entry into the study of *Doctor Who* and its daughter series. The conference, which took place at Cardiff University from 14–16 November 2008, brought together almost seventy students, fans, and scholars from four different countries to discuss all aspects of the "Whoniverse" (the fan-created term for the diegetic world established in the various texts documenting the Doctor's adventures). The papers included here were selected to demonstrate the wide-ranging interdisciplinary responses which met our call for papers—media studies, literary analysis, production history, audience studies—and to examine the "Whoniverse" in all its diverse appeal—from classic series to relaunch, from *Torchwood* to *The Sarah Jane Adventures*.

From its earliest incarnation, *Doctor Who* has reflected upon issues central to British social, cultural, and political life. Exile and wanderer, a traveller passing through, the Doctor is positioned textually as social commentator and catalyst, and the essays in our first section, "The Ongoing Storm: The Doctor in British Society and Culture", examine such themes. John Paul Green, in "The Regeneration Game: *Doctor Who* and the Changing Faces of Heroism", argues that changes in the lead character reflect concomitant changes in society's expectations of how our heroes should be. Christine Gilroy, evoking Kipling in the title of her essay "The Doctor's Burden: Racial Superiority and Panoptic Privilege in New *Doctor Who*", questions the latent imperialism in the Doctor's self-presentation as racially superior and his role as "civiliser". Matthew Jones, in "Army of Ghosts: Sight, Knowledge, and the Invisible Terrorist in *Doctor Who*", explores how the new series has repeatedly depicted aggressors that can assume human form, thereby accessing contemporary British anxieties in the wake of the 7/7 bombings about enemies that cannot be recognised simply by sight. Erica Moore, in "Constructing a Space for the Subversive: Science Fiction, Comedy, and Cultural Commentary in New *Doctor Who*", discusses the use of humour to incorporate social commentary into the series.

The Doctor's incursions into human history—in particular, the classical period—provide the subject matter of our next section, "The Myth (Re-)Makers: Classical Tropes and Methodologies". Amanda Potter, in "Beware of Geeks Appropriating Greeks: Viewer Reception of the Myth of Philoctetes in *Torchwood*", reports upon her study of audience responses to the *Torchwood* episode "Greeks Bearing Gifts" with reference to the use made of the Philotectes myth.[7] Tony Keen, in "Sideways Pompeii!: The Use of a Historical Period to Question the

Doctor's Role in History", uses "The Fires of Pompeii" to investigate the Doctor's relationship to Earth's past.[8] Finally, Melissa Beattie examines the recurrent trope of kissing in *Doctor Who* and *Torchwood* through reference to the classical concept of *pneuma* in her paper "A Kiss is Just a Kiss (Except When it's Not): Life and Breath in the Whoniverse". These essays aim to provide pioneering methodological approaches to an emerging area of academic engagement with popular culture (and television specifically), and should be taken as stimuli for researchers both within this field and beyond.

The way in which institutional pressures continually impact upon televisual form provide a framing theme within the discipline of TV Studies,[9] and such practices provide the common theme for our final section, "Travelling with Auntie: Institutional Debates and Framings". Lisa Kerrigan, in "'Not sure if it's Marxism in action or a West-End musical': Class, Citizenship, and Culture in New *Doctor Who*", examines the significance of series 1 of new *Doctor Who* for the BBC, and herself participates in current debates over "heritage" television and the role of public service broadcasting. Ross P. Garner examines genre conventions and series format in his discussion "'Don't You Forget About Me': Intertextuality and Generic Anchoring in *The Sarah Jane Adventures*". E. Charlotte Stevens puts the Radiophonic Workshop in the broader context of European avant-garde music in order to deconstruct negative attitudes towards art created for organisational purposes, in "The Popular Electronic: *Doctor Who* and the BBC's Radiophonic Workshop". The final piece in this volume, "Working with Daleks", reports upon a discussion panel held at the conference in which writer Robert Shearman, and writer, producer, director, actor, and Dalek operator Barnaby Edwards shared with attendees their experiences and knowledge of the television industry. Dr Matt Hills, keynote speaker at the conference, then generously supplies the Afterword for this volume, offering a critical overview of the issues raised throughout and considering the implications of this book's arguments for both the ongoing study of the "Whoniverse" within the academy and, more generally, the articulation of scholarly identities in relation to popular culture.

Our hope is that this volume not only encapsulates a new spirit of cooperation across disciplines, but that its interest extends beyond the academy. This volume is intended to be accessible to everyone, from interested academics in any field to the general public. We hope anyone wishing to step inside the blue police box will find something to enjoy. That, we think, would be truly fantastic.

Bibliography

Butler, David. "Introduction." In *Time And Relative Dissertations In Space: Critical Perspectives on Doctor Who*, edited by David Butler, 1–15. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.

Chapman, James. *Inside the TARDIS: The Worlds of Doctor Who*. London: IB Tauris, 2006.

Cook, John R., and Peter Wright, ed. *British Science Fiction Television: A Hitchhiker's Guide*. London: IB Tauris, 2006.

Corner, John. *Critical Ideas in Television Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Hills, Matt. *Triumph of a Time Lord: Regenerating Doctor Who in the Twenty-First Century*. London: IB Tauris, 2010.

Hockley, Luke. "Science Fiction". In *The Television Genre Book*, edited by Glen Creeber, 26–31. London: BFI, 2001.

Johnson, Catherine. *Telefantasy*. London: BFI, 2005.

Newman, Kim. *BFI TV Classics: Doctor Who: A Critical Reading of the Series*. London: BFI, 2005.

Tulloch, John, and Manuel Alvarado. *Doctor Who: The Unfolding Text*. London: Macmillan, 1983.

Notes

[1] *Doctor Who*, BBC, 1963–1989, 1996, 2005–date. Throughout, the 1963–1989 production period will be referred to as "classic" *Doctor Who*; the post-2005 BBC Wales relaunch as "new" *Doctor Who.* We follow the convention established by BBC Wales in referring to the 2005 series as "series 1", the 2006 series as "series 2", etc. From here forwards, references will be given to individual stories and episodes. Space precludes a full episode listing for all three subject programmes: for classic *Doctor Who*, we direct the reader to James Chapman, *Inside the TARDIS: The Worlds of Doctor Who* (London: IB Tauris), 207-216; for the new series to the BBC's programme website, http://www.bbc.co.uk/doctorwho (accessed 11 April 2010); for *Torchwood* and *The Sarah Jane Adventures* to numerous online guides.

[2] David Butler, "Introduction," in *Time And Relative Dissertations In Space: Critical Perspectives on Doctor Who*, ed. David Butler (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), 9.

[3] *Torchwood*, BBC, 2006–date; *The Sarah Jane Adventures*, BBC, 2007–date. From here forwards, references will be given to individual episodes.

[4] John Tulloch and Manuel Alvarado, *Doctor Who: The Unfolding Text* (London: Macmillan, 1983), 1.

[5] See, for example, Luke Hockley, "Science Fiction," in *The Television Genre Book*, ed. Glen Creeber (London: BFI, 2001), 26-31; James Chapman, *Inside the TARDIS*, 9; and Butler, *Time And Relative Dissertations In Space*, 2.

[6] Recent studies provided by Catherine Johnson, as well as the various contributors to the volume edited by John R. Cook and Peter Wright, arguably attest to this point in relation to British science fiction television. Moreover, as Matt Hills touches upon in the Afterword to this volume, there has been a sharp increase in academic analyses of *Doctor Who* in recent years such as the studies provided by Kim Newman and James Chapman, as well as Hills' own recent engagement with the new series. See: Catherine Johnson, *Telefantasy* (London: BFI, 2005); John R. Cook and Peter Wright, ed., *British Science Fiction Television: A Hitchhiker's Guide* (London: IB Tauris, 2006); Kim Newman, *BFI TV Classics: Doctor Who: A Critical Reading of the Series* (London: BFI, 2005); Chapman, *Inside the TARDIS*; and Matt Hills, *Triumph of a Time Lord: Regenerating Doctor Who in the Twenty-First Century* (London: IB Tauris, 2010).

[7] "Greeks Bearing Gifts" (BBC Three, 26 November 2006, w. Toby Whithouse, d. Colin Teague).

[8] "The Fires of Pompeii" (BBC One, 12 April 2008, w. James Moran, d. Colin Teague).

[9] See, for example, John Corner, *Critical Ideas in Television Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 12-23.

PART I

THE ONGOING STORM: THE DOCTOR IN BRITISH SOCIETY AND CULTURE

THE REGENERATION GAME: *DOCTOR WHO* AND THE CHANGING FACES OF HEROISM

JOHN PAUL GREEN

This chapter is dedicated to the memory of Matthew James Ragsdale (1995–2009). Forever in my thoughts and in my heart. You were, and remain, the best of me.

This chapter focuses on the articulation and rearticulation of masculinity and British heroism through the use of "regeneration" in the popular science fiction series *Doctor Who*. It aims to map out significant changes in the portrayal of the Doctor, encompassing both classic and new *Doctor Who*, offering a comparative study discussing the performance of masculine identity and heroism. The study will examine the way in which the series has sought not only to reshape the character to appeal to a new audience, but how, through the act of regeneration, the Doctor reaffirms or challenges dominant images of the male hero. There has been a resurgence of interest in British fictional heroes, both on television and at the cinema. James Bond was successfully re-booted[1] in the 2006 film *Casino Royale* (followed in 2008 by *Quantum of Solace*).[2] We have also seen the re-emergence of interest and production of Sherlock Holmes and Robin Hood, and *Doctor Who* can be placed firmly in this renaissance of British fictional heroes.[3]

The Doctor, in all his incarnations, is a contradictory character, literally multi-faceted. The fluidity of the Doctor's appearance also emphasises his ability to suit different trends and encompass aspects of many heroes as well as masculine identity. In *Modernity and Its Futures*, Stuart Hall examines a supposed "crisis in identity" in contemporary society and identifies "three concepts of identity", the enlightenment, sociological, and post-modern subject.[4] By Hall's admission, his conceptions are simplified, but do offer an interesting approach both in terms of masculine identity (and the figure of the Doctor himself):

> [The] Enlightenment subject was based on a conception of the human person as a fully centred, unified individual, endowed with the capacities of reason, consciousness and action, whose "centre" consisted of an inner core [...] the sociological subject reflected the growing complexity of the modern world and an awareness that this inner core of the subject was not autonomous and self-sufficient, but formed in relation to "significant others" [...] the post-modern subject, conceptualised as having no fixed, essential or permanent identity.[5]

The Doctor in all his guises encapsulates all three of Hall's concepts of identity, being in turn the Enlightenment subject, the sociological, and the postmodern. He is positioned as the essential self (in charge of his own destiny; the ability to regenerate in effect allowing him to recreate himself), but his actions are also mediated by those around him. Both Rose Tyler (Billie Piper) and Donna Noble (Catherine Tate) teach the Doctor to rein himself in, to become more human. He also represents Hall's postmodern identity because he doesn't have the "fixed, essential or permanent identity [...] historically, not biologically defined".[6] As a traveller in time and space, the Doctor can slip between and go to and from these identities. His identity is a paradox, being both fluid and fixed. Both his appearance and his position in a temporal or spatial "moment" are ever shifting: he remains undeniably the hero figure, but his heroism resonates at different levels for different times and audiences. He becomes the splintered hero, creating and recreating identities that are often conflicting and certainly unstable, and therefore the series, intentionally or not, disturbs notions of fixed masculine identity.

There had been attempts to resurrect both *Doctor Who* and James Bond in the mid 1990s. While *GoldenEye* effectively resurrected 007 with Pierce Brosnan in 1995,[7] the 1996 *Doctor Who* movie met with considerably less success in terms of producing a new series during the late 1990s and early 2000s.[8] In a 2008 interview, Steven Moffat discussed the continued success of the recent series of *Doctor Who*, very much placing his emphasis on the renegotiation of the hero figure in changing times:

> Well, I'd say, it's a great mythic character. It's a great fantastical hero, but there are many great fantastical heroes. Why do some survive and some not? The answer is, generally speaking: it's how well does change work for it? The Doctor can change brilliantly. You can have a new kind of Doctor every so often, as you will, obviously. No one will ever play that part forever. It will always change and therefore it is capable of adapting itself very exactly to the current moment, it doesn't have to be a retread of what it used to be. It can always be, in a strange way, *Doctor Who* can always be new. And that is true of James Bond as well.[9]

In discussing James Bond, Tony Bennett and Janet Woollacott have argued that the hero "constitutes a cultural phenomenon of a particular type [...] they break free from the originating textual conditions of their existence to achieve a semi-independent existence".[10] For instance, several useful comparisons can be made—both the cinematic version of James Bond and the television *Doctor Who* originated in the early 1960s, the title characters have been played by several actors in the same series, and both were put on hiatus after 1989 to be revived in the mid 1990s.[11] John Tulloch and Manuel Alvarado discuss further similarities between Jon Pertwee's third Doctor and James Bond, remarking that many of the stories of Pertwee's era "borrowed" heavily from the James Bond movies, and there are few fictional British heroes of the twentieth century who share the cultural dominance of these two characters over a period of more than forty years.[12]

This study will examine how the character of the Doctor shifted during the original run of the series, while interjecting these observations with comparisons of the more recent Doctors from 2005 onwards. This approach will highlight how the recent incarnations of the Doctor both react to, and reaffirm or challenge the idea of the Doctor as an heroic figure in relation to the cultural and social context at the time of transmission. Given the wealth of both academic and fan-produced material available on the production of the series, I will avoid a direct discussion of the economic and broadcast context of the series, focusing instead on the cultural response to the Doctor, both historically and more recently.[13]

John Fiske on reading Roland Barthes regards modern narratives (myths) as a way of thinking about "masculinity and femininity, about the family, about success, about the British policeman, about science".[14] The fact that the title character is referred to as "Doctor" reinforces a notion of patriarchal discourse and ideology. In the 1960s, the medical profession was staffed almost entirely by male doctors and, like the figure of the policeman, the doctor is a person to be trusted and entrusted with the lives of others. The figure of the Doctor is not a doctor of medicine in the strictest sense. We are told that he is a Doctor of many things throughout the series. He is, however, reminiscent of the scientific "boffin" who emerged during World War II. The Doctor represents the discourse of scientific reason over the alien unknown or the supernatural.

In this study of the Doctor as hero I wish to move away from the seminal reading on heroes, such as Joseph Campbell's *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, to a study of the hero with just eleven faces, albeit contradictory and overlapping ones. The Doctor is the fragmented hero,

ever changing but reassuringly the same. It is this paradox I wish to examine. The Doctor represents both historical and cultural moments. In much the same way as Bennett and Woollacott look at the moments of Bond, we can map out changing performances of masculinity and senses of heroism through the changing faces of the Doctor. The Doctor's ability to regenerate opens up a world of possibilities to address the changing articulation of heroism in the late twentieth and early twenty-first century and, as Stephen Whitehead notes, "[t]he male body, like the masculinities it suggests, is always open to disruption and anxiety".[15] The Doctor's body as well as his mind becomes a site of negotiated readings of masculinity and heroism, its fluidity allowing us to map out ever shifting definitions of heroism. Tulloch and Alvarado also highlight:

> Each Doctor has been the site of intersection of different codes and each one has been encouraged to foreground the rhetoric of difference [...] although fundamentally, working for similarity and continuity to establish programme identity, orderliness and stability.[16]

This stability is problematic. While we could argue that the Doctor as a generic figure provides the reliable stability of basic heroic qualities, the instability that is brought on by physical and mental changes in each regeneration forces a repositioning of notions of masculinity and the hero. As David Rafer indicates in relation to the figure of the Doctor, the traditional hero as extolled by Joseph Campbell moves from William Hartnell's first Doctor as "wise old man [who] dispenses wisdom to the more straightforward hero figures" to the "more simplistic and chivalrous kind of hero" as portrayed by Peter Davison's fifth Doctor.[17] This points to the shifting role of the hero who, in turn, carries the moral weight of the other characters—the weight of decision and action, cause and effect, allows characters to become heroic.[18] Look at the recent portrayal of the ninth Doctor (Christopher Eccleston) who, never tiring of telling us his burden, sees and hears the universe in his head. The Doctor is the self-sacrificing hero; although safe in the knowledge that he will regenerate, it does put a question mark over the significance of the sacrifice—like Captain Scarlet, how can you make the ultimate sacrifice when you're virtually indestructible?[19] One would also suspect that the Doctor's apparent limit of twelve regenerations may be determined more by audience ratings than Gallifreyan mythology.

The BBC's Head of Drama, and co-creator of *Doctor Who*, Sydney Newman described the first Doctor as "a crotchety old bugger—any kid's grandfather".[20] Later script notes add that, although grumpy and partly senile, he would have a heart of gold, and "his forgetfulness and vagueness

alternate with flashes of brilliant thought and deduction".[21] From the outset, then, the figure of the first Doctor was described in patriarchal terms, albeit the paternalistic grandfather. William Hartnell played the first Doctor with a long white wig and an extravagant Edwardian costume, distancing himself from the universal image of the lab-coated scientist and reflecting a definite sense of Englishness. The Doctor is an alien (he has two hearts for example), yet he is presented as a well-spoken Englishman (the exception in the classic series being Sylvester McCoy's use of his own Scottish accent for the seventh Doctor). His defiance against alien invaders and villainy reflects a British colonial and national spirit. The aliens of *Doctor Who* can be compared to the oppositional villainy found in James Bond, where it "constitutes a threat to the peace and security of the Free World [...] represented by Britain".[22] The most notorious (albeit popular) enemy encountered in *Doctor Who* during the 1960s was, and arguably still is, the Daleks. These mechanical creatures, with their death cry of "Exterminate!" and plans of universal conquest, paralleled the Nazi soldiers of the World War II, and were led (in later stories at least) by their Hitler-like creator Davros. Like the Master, the Doctor's arch-enemy, Davros and his creations represent the foreign, non-English threat.[23]

The Doctor is an ambiguous figure whose originally frail external features shrouded a stronger scientific mind. The early series explicitly positioned the Doctor as grandfather to his companion Susan (Carole Ann Ford). The first Doctor would act as the fount of all knowledge and would chastise his companions for their actions, or their tastes in clothing and music. When the character of Susan Foreman was written out of the series in 1964, she was replaced in the following story ("The Rescue") by a girl companion of similar mid-teen age, Vicki (Maureen O'Brien), a pattern (of the father figure and "daughter") that would continue throughout the series' history, culminating in the 2008 episode "The Doctor's Daughter".[24]

If the first Doctor can be viewed as grandfather figure, Patrick Troughton's portrayal of the second Doctor should be considered the eccentric uncle. His character was younger and his appearance scruffier, more in keeping with the image of the absent-minded professor or the Chaplinesque "cosmic hobo". The relationship between the second Doctor and his companions is still a paternalistic one, although less obvious. This Doctor would often meet his companions on their level, acknowledging their fashions rather than correcting them on their taste. His was a more contemporary father figure (to the first Doctor's assertion of Victorian values). His haircut was styled in a mop-top similar to that worn by 1960s pop group The Beatles and his eccentricities were often of a childish nature. He played the recorder and often ran away from the monsters in the

stories. As Tulloch and Alvarado remark, "running away to outflank the enemy was Troughton's forte."[25] An important aspect of the second Doctor was that, unlike his predecessor, his hero took part in the action, whereas the older first Doctor was unable to do so and the action became focused around his male companions Ian Chesterton (William Russell) and, later, Steven Taylor (Peter Purves). In this respect, the companions were explicitly positioned as inferior to the Doctor on both an intellectual and physical level, thus rendering both male and female companions as foils to the Doctor's hero (creating a relationship similar to that of Sherlock Holmes and Doctor Watson).

Jon Pertwee's portrayal of the third Doctor showed a marked difference from his predecessors and added several significant facets to the Doctor's character. The third Doctor is perhaps most reminiscent of his fictional British contemporary hero, James Bond. This Doctor had a penchant for gadgets and fast cars: the Doctor's sonic screwdriver—a device that helped the Doctor battle aliens and unlock doors—featured heavily during Pertwee's era. The vehicles Bessie and the Whomobile were introduced specifically for the third Doctor, as alternatives to the TARDIS. He wore stylish clothing, had a taste for fine food, and the series featured international intrigue (as in "The Mind of Evil") and action.[26] As previously mentioned, the third Doctor's nemesis, the Master (Roger Delgado) acts as the dark side of the Doctor and parallels the relationship between Sherlock Holmes and Professor Moriarty.[27] A similar relationship is also played out in the new series story "Last of the Time Lords" which hints at the confrontation between Holmes and Moriarty at the Reichenbach Falls in Arthur Conan Doyle's *The Final Problem.*[28]

Another aspect of the Pertwee era was the reduction in size of the onboard TARDIS crew. This had the effect of drawing the hero and companion closer together as well as refocusing the action onto the third Doctor. While it could be argued that *Doctor Who* during this period had a much larger ensemble cast in the form of UNIT, the tensions borne out between the Doctor and Brigadier Lethbridge-Stewart (Nicholas Courtney) as well as the Doctor's own ill ease at this militaristic "extended" family, serve to refocus our attention on the Doctor and his companion.[29] When necessary the Doctor was provided with or could call upon UNIT/the extended family of the Brigadier, Captain Yates (Richard Franklin) or Sergeant Benton (John Levene), but this relationship and reliance on the military was often a tense one. The close relationship between the Doctor and his companion is further exemplified in the story "The Green Death" where a clearly envious Doctor "loses" his assistant Jo Grant (Katy Manning) to another suitor, Professor Jones (Stewart Bevan).[30] If we