

Re: FWIW: ST Enterprise Cancelled

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.history/2005-02/0571.html>

From: Pat Flannery (*flanner_at_daktel.com*)

Date: 02/06/05

Date: Sat, 05 Feb 2005 20:53:11 -0600

Andre Lieven wrote:

>Pat Flannery (*flanner@daktel.com*) writes:

>

>

>>Andre Lieven wrote:

>>

>>

>>

>>>>Instead, he waited till the man he criticizes was dead, and couldn't
>>>>offer a rebuttal to his charges...in my opinion, particularly given that
>>>>this is just about a single script for episode of a one hour television
>>>>program, his behavior in this matter impresses me both as extremely
>>>>petty and indeed wretched and base.

>>>>

>>>>

>>>That strikes me as a double standard: The **evidence** of not only
>>>Roddenberry's lies, but others, is amply made in Ellison's book.

>>>

>>>Why is your ire only aimed at the recipient of the lies, and **not**
>>>their tellers ?

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>Okay... here's one for you...since it didn't cost too much to film, and
>>since the characters were apparently acting in, rather than out of,
>>charecter...why didn't they just film it the way Harlan wanted them to?

>>

>>

>

>Well... read the book. Its all there, and its a complex web of internal
>politics. Like Roddenberry telling Harlan to " put the ship in danger ",
>so Harlan did, in a couple of scenes where Rand and some security
>guards hold the transporter room, as the time shift has made the
>Enterprise the pirate ship Condor. R told Ellison that " the network
>demands this ! ". NBC did demand... that that be **cut**.

>

>

>

>>*There doesn't seem to be any problem with it, so why didn't they just go
>>for it? If you're writing for a episodic television series, then the
>>producers of the series have the right to tell you what you will and
>>will not do with their continuing characters and overall storyline, as
>>they are the ones who have to live with how their characters and overall
>>feel of the show get modified in any particular episode, and how that
>>will affect future episodes of the series.*

>>

>>

>

>*Well, jms had a better way of dealing with this, as when a neat script
>from another writer came in, and he could work it into the arc, he did,
>so Gerrold had a script, and so on.*

>

>*Oh, don't forget that Roddenberry's mendacity caused Gerrold to sue
>R, and win a judgement of \$70,000... After Season 1 of TNG...*

>

>

>

>>*If they had it all to do over again, I doubt there would ever be an
>>Organian Treaty, as it screwed the whole Federation/Klingon rivalry up
>>royally...in fact, that's why they were very careful to tell the writers
>>for STTNG just what they could and couldn't do so as not to paint
>>themselves into a corner like that again.*

>>

>>

>

>*Indeed. It worked for that one episode, but then...*

>

>*And, they still did shit like that in TNG: Remember " I can't drive
>warp 5.5 " ?*

>

>

>

>>*You have an anthology series like Twilight Zone, and you can have far
>>more room to do what you want, but when you come to a series like Star
>>Trek, then you should realize that they, not you, have the final say in
>>how things should be done. You can run your car in the race– provided
>>you are going the direction everybody else is, and don't start pouring
>>nails on the track.*

>>

>>

>

>*And, Harlan did that. His original script included Rand, as she was with
>the cast, when that was written. When Whitney's contract was not renewed,
>he removed her character from the script.*

>

>*Read what Ellison had to say, in the book, about how, when he had a
>script on The Outer Limits, and Justman was producing, and they had a*

>cost problem with one scene, Justman sat Ellison down, and they,
>together, figured out a way to maintain a story, yet solve the problem.
>
>This is the same Justman who later claimed that Ellison's script was
>too expensive, but who *never brought* that to Ellison's attention,
>the way he did, when on TOL.
>
>
>
>>>>This guy –not to put too fine a point on it– is a world–class asshole.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>No proof offered ? Claim fails.
>>>
>>>
>>Okay, you prove to me that he's a nice guy. This ax can swing both ways.
>>
>>
>
>Sure: Read what Peter David says about Ellison, in David's afterward,
>in the book.
>
>
>
>>>>I'm glad you inspired me to do some digging around for info on this
>>>>matter. Before I started this, I thought he was a sometimes amusing
>>>>loudmouth.
>>>>Now, I'd like to spit on the little bastard.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Well, ain't hate... pretty ?
>>>
>>><shudder> I thought that you're a gifted guy, Pat. Funny and
>>>creative as hell. I still do. But, this side of you, well, its
>>>nastier than anything that you criticise Ellison for.
>>>
>>>
>>Tearing somebody's reputation apart (and I know full well that
>>Roddenberry wasn't a saint by any standard) after there is no way he can
>>defend himself is a low thing;
>>
>>
>
>As low as doing that to Ellison *for thirty years* ?
>
>You say this as if this is all based on Harlan's unsupported word:
>It ISN'T. There is *evidence* aplenty in the book.
>
>
>
>>particularly when you do it around thirty

>>years after the presumed crime, rather than when your opponent can't
>> speak for himself in regards to your criticisms.

>>

>>

>

>Thirty years of mis-speaking counts for nothing ?

>

><cough> Hypocrisy <cough>.

>

>

>

>>Using terms like

>>"Great Pretender" "El Supremo" and "an outright naked liar" is pretty

>>rough by any standards,

>>

>>

>

>I just re-read most of the book, since yesterday evening, and I don't

>find any of those phrases. Care to offer me page cites ?

>

>

That was a Harlan said he had written in the excerpt from part one of
the interview: http://www.trektoday.com/news/130300_02.shtml

>I'm amazed that Ellison didn't sue for slander. He should have.

>

And that would have been the exact way to handle this; both sides could
have gone into court; laid their claims and evidence for them on the
table, and had it settled...while both were still alive.

>

>

>>In fact this whole thing reminds me of someone else...Spike Lee to be

>>precise; he complained when he didn't get an Oscar for what he thought

>>was good work, just like Harlan's tirade over no dramatic presentation

>>Hugo being awarded in some years.

>>

>>

>

>Which years ? I have this past Worldcon's souvenir book, which lists

>all Hugo winners, since they started. That award first appeared in

>1960 (Twilight Zone, winner), again in '61 & '62 (ditto), no

>award in '63, none offered in '64, Strangelove took it in '65, none

>offered in '66, The Menagerie (TOS) took it in '67, City won in

>'68, 2001 won in '69, TV coverage of Apollo 11 (Yay, on topic. <g>)

>did in '70, no award in '71, and the last no award was in '77.

>

That's just what I was talking about– he came up and did a speech about how the Sci-Fi establishment couldn't lower itself to the level of television, and so they weren't giving that award every year...and television was like Pope; writers could do some work for it to give themselves the money to write what they wanted to at other times, even if the TV stuff was pretty lowbrow and crappy compared to what they'd like to do.

Does anybody out there have a cite for this speech? I think it was from some collection of his essays.

>

>>>*Hate makes us worse than what we hate.*

>>>

>>>

>>*Well, Harlan certainly hated Roddenberry from his choice of language,*

>>*didn't he?*

>>

>>

>

>*Huh ?*

>

>

You don't go around calling people "El Supremo" "The Great Pretender" and "an outright naked liar" if you are fond of them, do you?

Pat